CANADA

# HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

---

FIRST SESSION—TWENTY EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

18 ELIZABETH II

---

VOLUME VIII, 1969

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF APRIL, 1969, TO THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF MAY, 1969, INCLUSIVE.

---

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

---

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER, OTTAWA, 1969

29180—509½

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Monday, April 28, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF THE GOVERNOR OF VERMONT, AND MEMBERS OF THE STATE LEGISLATURE

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I wish to bring to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of a group of distinguished United States parliamentarians, namely members of the Vermont state legislature, accompanied by the Governor of that state.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** The visit of these distinguished colleagues to Ottawa and to the House of Commons is a clear indication of their interest in our Parliament, and their friendship with Canada and Canadians. On behalf of the House of Commons I extend to them a most cordial welcome to the Parliament of Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

## NEW MEMBER

**Mr. Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the house that the Clerk of the House has received from the Chief Electoral Officer certificate of the election and return of Thomas Speakman Barnett, Esquire, for the electoral district of Comox-Alberni.

## NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Thomas Speakman Barnett, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Comox-Alberni, introduced by Mr. T. C. Douglas and Mr. Harold E. Winch.

# ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

## INCOME TAX ACT

WAYS AND MEANS MOTION PURSUANT TO S.O. 60(1)

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 60(1), I wish to table notice of a ways and means motion to amend the Income Tax Act.

TABLING OF EXPLANATORY MATERIAL, PURSUANT TO S.O. 41(2)

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I wish to table a paper containing explanatory material concerning the paragraphs of this notice of motion relating to insurance companies and policyholders.

DESIGNATION OF OPPORTUNITY TO DEBATE WAYS AND MEANS ORDER, PURSUANT TO S.O. 60(2)

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 60(2), I would request the designation of an order of the day for considering the ways and means notice of motion just tabled by the Minister of Finance.

# QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PUBLIC SERVICE BILINGUAL BONUS

Question No. 1,309—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many employees of the Public Service of Canada today qualify for the special bonus made available to bilingual employees?

2. What was the total cost to the federal government for the 1967-68 fiscal year and what will be the estimated cost for the fiscal year 1968-69?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** 1. 1,951.

2. 1967-68, $468,663.99; 1968-69 (estimated), $565,670.89.

NEWFOUNDLAND—ALLOCATIONS FOR ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Question No. 1,377—**Mr. Marshall:**

Under Regional Economic Expansion Vote 10, what amounts are allocated to the Province of Newfoundland under the following (a) payments in respect of projects and programs under ARDA (b) payments in accordance with development agreements entered into with the provinces on shared cost programs (c) payments to the provinces to assist in financing programs related to Industrial Research and Development Services to Industry and Development of Industrial Infrastructures (d) incentives to Industry for the development of employment opportunities in designated

areas of Canada (e) federal share of costs of trunk highway program for the Provinces of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick in accordance with agreements entered into with the Provinces?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** (a) Provincial allotment under the Federal-Provincial Rural Development Agreement 1965-70 for 1969-70 is a maximum of $1,378,638. No specific amount is allocated to any province until provincial requirements are known; (b) No specific amount is allocated to any province until provincial requirements are known; (c) $4,260,000; (d) No amounts are specified on a geographical basis. Each application submitted by an industrial firm is assessed on its individual merit; (e) Nil (The trunk highway program is a statutory provision and is not part of Vote 10, but includes $3,327,000 allocated for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.)

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS IN YUKON AND N.W.T.

Question No. 1,445—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Who are the Regional Superintendents of Schools in the Yukon and Northwest Territories?

2. What are the educational qualifications of each Regional Superintendent?

3. How long has each Regional Superintendent been employed by the government?

4. How many schools does each Regional Superintendent supervise?

5. How many days did each Regional Superintendent spend supervising in each school in each of the past three years?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. The Yukon Territory does not have Regional or District Superintendents of Schools. Dr. R. L. Shields is Superintendent of Education, and W. C. Rongve and J. Ferbey are Assistant Superintendents.

The Regional Superintendents of Schools in the Northwest Territories are currently J. A. Coady, H. J. Darkes, N. J. Macpherson, J. McArthur and W. W. Buell.

2. The educational qualifications of the Regional Superintendents are as follows: J. A. Coady, B.A., B.Ed., 23 years teaching experience; N. J. Macpherson, B.A., B.Ed., M.Ed., 25 years teaching experience; H. J. Darkes, B.A., B.Ed., 35 years teaching experience; J. McArthur, M.A., B.Ed., 16 years teaching experience; W. W. Buell, B.A., B.Ed., 20 years teaching experience.

[Mr. Marshall.]

The qualifications of the Yukon Territory Superintendents are: R. L. Shields, B.Ed., M.A., Ph.D., 32 years teaching experience; W. C. Rongve, B.A., B. Ed., 12 years teaching experience; J. Ferbey, B.Sc., B.Ed., M.Ed., 6 years teaching experience.

3. Mr. Coady has been employed by the Federal Government for 20 years; Mr. Macpherson, seven years; Mr. Darkes, seven years; Mr. McArthur, eight years and Mr. Buell, six years. Dr. Shields has been employed by the Government of the Yukon Territory for two years; Mr. Rongve for ten years, and Mr. Ferbey for two years.

4. Mr. Coady supervises 11 schools; Mr. Macpherson 12 schools; Mr. Darkes 13 schools; Mr. McArthur 8 schools, and Mr. Buell 12 schools.

The 21 Yukon Territory schools are not allocated to individual Superintendents.

5. The following table indicates the number of days spent supervising in Northwest Territories schools by the Regional Superintendents in each of the past three years.

| Region | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fort Smith (1) | 51 | 43 | 29 |
| Inuvik (1) | 47 | 49 | 75 |
| Yellowknife | 110 | 128 | 140 |
| Keewatin | 19 | 20 | 61 |
| Baffin | 27 | 44 | 15 |

(1) Figures quoted are for 1966/67, 1967/68 and 1968/69 fiscal years respectively.

Each school in the Yukon is visited by a representative of the Superintendent's office at least once a month, with the exception of the isolated Old Crow school which is visited quarterly, weather conditions permitting.

IMPLEMENTATION OF BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM RECOMMENDATIONS

Question No. 1,464—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. How many recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism has the government implemented to date?

2. What are these recommendations?

3. Has the government estimated the cost to date of the implementation of each and, if so, at what cost?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** 1 and 2. The recommendations made by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism and contained in Books 1 and 2 of the Commission's report are under study by the government. Implementation will require, in some cases, federal legislation, in others action at the provincial level and for many

recommendations, federal-provincial co-operative action. At present an Official Languages Bill is before Parliament. Additional proposals were presented to the recent Constitutional Conference and there have been and will be meetings with the provinces to determine effective ways of implementing bilingualism programs across the country. Certain measures in this area can be taken by administrative action within the compass of existing legislation, as with the language training program in the Public Service on which the government has already embarked.

3. No.

P.E.I.—SHARED COST HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Question No. 1,580—**Mr. MacLean:**

1. What was the amount spent in cost-shared highway construction programs administered by the federal Department of Public Works in the Province of Prince Edward Island for each of the fiscal years from 1964-65 to 1968-69 inclusive?

2. What is the estimated amount to be spent in Prince Edward Island under such programs in the fiscal year 1969-70?

3. Is this amount included in the amounts proposed under the Comprehensive Development Plan?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Department of Public Works and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion as follows: 1. The total federal contributions under the cost-shared highway construction programs administered by the Department of Public Works, i.e., the Trans-Canada Highway Agreement, the Atlantic Development Board Trunk Highway program, and the Roads to Resources program of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, amounted to: 1964-65, $1,623,074.10; 1965-66, $2,408,205.80; 1966-67, $2,097,770.79; 1967-68, $3,799,904.18; 1968-69, $3,055,166.00 (estimated).

2. The estimated amount for 1969-70 is $1,813,878.

3. The Comprehensive Development Plan for Prince Edward Island shows no funds to be administered by the Department of Public Works.

P.E.I.—ECONOMIC IMPROVEMENT CORPORATION PERSONNEL

Question No. 1,586—**Mr. MacLean:**

1. (a) Has the federal government agreed to pay part or all of the cost of salaries, living expenses, etc. of persons employed by the Economic Improvement Corporation of Prince Edward Island (b) if so, what is the percentage of such cost to be borne by the federal government (c) is there a ceiling on the contribution to be made by the federal government and, if so, what is it?

2. (a) Has the federal government placed a ceiling on the number of persons employed by this Corporation and, if so, what is it (b) how many persons are employed by the Corporation at present (c) what is the salary range of persons employed by the Corporation?

3. Has the Economic Improvement Corporation of Prince Edward Island power to borrow money and, if so, are such loans guaranteed in any way by the federal government?

4. What amount was contributed by the federal government to the Economic Improvement Corporation of Prince Edward Island in each of the fiscal years to date?

5. What are the estimated amounts to be paid by the federal government to the Economic Improvement Corporation of Prince Edward Island in the fiscal year 1969-70?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** 1. (a) Yes; (b) 100 per cent; (c) Yes; $1,201,000 to March 31, 1969.

2. (a) No; (b) 92; (c) This information would have to be obtained from the Economic Improvement Corporation.

3. Yes. Loans are not guaranteed by the federal government.

4. 1967-68, $117,000; 1968-69, $1,084,000.

5. Payments will be made to the Province in respect of programs under the terms of the development agreement; there is no provision specifically for the Economic Improvement Corporation.

D.D.H. CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Question No. 1,627—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What was the original cost estimate including all components of the present DDH Construction Program and what is the present cost estimate including all components and sea trials?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** The first cost estimate for the D.D.H. Construction Program which brought together all its components was $170,240,000 in September, 1966. The final estimated cost of the same program, unchanged during the past year, is expected to fall between $220,000,000 and $225,000,000.

*Questions*

CLOSING OF RURAL POST OFFICES

Question No. 1,661—**Mr. Southam:**

1. Is it the government's intention, for economic reasons, to phase out or close 3,500 post offices in rural areas of Canada?

2. Has a study been made to analyze the economic hardship on the people and small businesses concerned if such a plan is carried out?

3. What alternative employment or compensations would be provided for the postmasters so affected in any such move on the government's part?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: 1. Under a program inaugurated in February 1967, 553 Post Offices have been closed, 217 will be closed shortly, 404 are being retained and 2,851 have yet to be examined to determine whether they should be closed because of their limited usefulness. With improved population mobility, limited shopping facilities in the smaller communities, the movement of people from rural areas to large urban centres and a widespread centralized school system, it became apparent that a re-examination of the usefulness of these small Post Offices was imperative. The situation with respect to each individual Post Office is examined separately.

2. Consideration is given to the effect of the closing on individuals and on the community. Basically, the policy is that if equivalent service can be provided—and often improved service—through rural mail delivery to individual or group mail boxes, a post office that has outlived its useful purpose will be closed. If rural mail delivery is not practicable, service should be available through an adjacent post office. Failing an adequate alternative service, the post office in question will be kept in operation.

3. No alternative employment is offered by the Government but those postmasters under superannuation would receive benefits in accordance with the Public Service Superannuation Act.

P.E.I. CAUSEWAY—FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

Question No. 1,760—**Mr. Mather:**

What was the estimated federal contribution to the projected Prince Edward Island Causeway on a per capita basis re the people of Prince Edward Island?

[Mr. Groos.]

**Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of Transport):** On an estimated capital cost of $180 million $1,627 per capita.

LACHUTE, QUE., INDIAN RELOCATION

Question No. 1,809—**Mr. Simpson:**

1. Did the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development undertake a program of relocation and retraining for Indian students from the James Bay region in Lachute, Quebec?

2. When did the program begin?

3. How many students enrolled at the beginning?

4. How many students are now enrolled?

5. If any students left, who were they, and what were the reasons given?

6. What screening procedure was followed in selecting the students?

7. What special steps were taken in Lachute (a) with local citizen groups to provide accommodation or hospitality (b) with the manpower training courses to modify courses of instruction?

8. Was this a pilot project?

9. If so, will there be a full report prepared and released to the public?

10. Is it the intention of the government to bring more Indian students to this training centre at Lachute?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. In November 1968, a departmental counsellor made a survey of Indian people in the James Bay area who were interested in upgrading. This information was relayed to the Department of Manpower. We have been informed by the Department of Manpower that several English speaking upgrading classes at the Grade 8 to 10 level at Lachute were organized. Since this was the nearest location where English speaking courses were available in the province of Quebec in relation to the James Bay area, the Department of Manpower approved admission for those Indian people from the James Bay area who met entrance requirements.

2. The Indian students arrived at Lachute on Friday, January 24 and commenced training on Monday, January 27. They were several days late due to weather conditions.

3. Fourteen students enrolled at the beginning.

4. Two students were enrolled as of March 31, 1969.

*Questions*

| 5. Name of Student | Reason for Leaving | Date of Leaving |
|---|---|---|
| William Salt | Involved with law | February 11, 1969 |
| Matthew Rat | Homesick | February 11, 1969 |
| Jimmy Gilpin | Homesick | February 11, 1969 |
| Donald Gilpin | Homesick | February 11, 1969 |
| Isaac Matches | Homesick | February 25, 1969 |
| Stuart Matches | Homesick | February 25, 1969 |
| George Sealhunter | Did not like Lachute | February 25, 1969 |
| Bobby Rat | Hospitalized as a result of fight. Went home on discharge | February 22, 1969 |
| Jimmy Kanatewat | Unable to adapt to Lachute | February 24, 1969 |
| Andrew Napash | Illness at home | March 10, 1969 |
| Louis Kanatewat | Hunting season started | March 14, 1969 |
| George Lameboy | Hunting season started | March 14, 1969. |

6. Prime selection standard was an expression of interest in further training as indicated to the Department of Indian Affairs Counsellor at the time of the survey in November 1968. Candidates were screened on the basis of satisfactory academic prerequisites and a stated desire to follow up with skill training.

7. (a) (i) Local people were involved in helping to find suitable boarding homes, (ii) On arrival students were met by Department of Manpower representatives and taken to boarding places. At this time they were also given a brief orientation to the community of Lachute. (b) (i) Because of the students language handicap, supplementary English instruction was provided to assist them in their studies; (ii) Special instruction in French was provided since the Lachute community is predominantly French speaking; (iii) The Department of Indian Affairs employed an Indian teacher from Oka to counsel and tutor the students three hours an evening, three evenings a week; (iv) The Anglican Minister of Lachute was made aware of the students coming to the community, since they were all of that religious denomination; (v) A social worker from McGill University showed interest in the group and accompanied the special teacher to assist in counselling the students.

8. This was not considered a pilot project. It is one of the regular type of programs conducted by the Provincial Department of Education, where the Department of Manpower buy spaces on behalf of students who meet their regulations.

9. Since this is not a pilot or special program, no report as such is planned to deal with this particular class.

10. The government is not contemplating bringing more Indian students from the James Bay area to the training center at Lachute.

29180—510

DR. BORIS DOTSENKO

Question No. 1,810—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. Has Dr. Boris Dotsenko of Edmonton applied for the status of a landed immigrant in Canada (a) if so, has that status been granted (b) if not, what is the present status of Dr. Dotsenko and what are the reasons for the failure to grant him status as a landed immigrant?

2. Has the case of Dr. Boris Dotsenko been the subject of discussion between the Government of Canada and the government of any other country (a) if so, what was the other country (b) what was the nature of the discussion (c) what was the result of the discussion?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Department of the Secretary of State for External Affairs as follows: 1. Yes, Dr. Dotsenko has applied for landed immigrant status. His application is still under review and pending its approval he is permitted to remain in Canada under non-immigrant status. This is normal practice in cases of this type.

2. Yes. (a) The Government of the USSR; (b) On September 4, 1967, on learning of Dr. Dotsenko's intention to remain in Canada, the Soviet Embassy approached the Canadian Government in order to arrange an interview with him; (c) Dr. Dotsenko agreed, and an interview took place on September 6, 1967. During the following month there was an exchange of correspondence with the Soviet Embassy on matters arising from the interview. In the course of that correspondence the Department of External Affairs had occasion to confirm to the Embassy that Dr. Dotsenko was free both to meet again with Embassy representatives and to leave Canada if he wished to do so. He was likewise free to remain in

Canada provided he could satisfy the requirements of the Department of Manpower and Immigration.

ACQUISITION OF COMPUTER SCIENCES CORPORATION

Question No. 1,833—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. Has an investigation been made by the Restrictive Trades Practices Commission or by any other federal agency, into the recent acquisition of the Computer Sciences Corporation of Canada by Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Telecommunications Ltd.?

2. If so, what is the finding and what action, if any, is now being contemplated?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** 1 and 2. As the hon. member was informed by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on March 10 the matter has been referred to the Director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigation Act in order that he may consider whether the matter is one coming within the scope of that Act and, if so, whether it affords him reason to believe there may have been a violation of the Act so as to warrant formal inquiry.

The Department of Communications has the responsibility of conducting studies concerning telecommunications matters as they affect the public interest. The question of the relationship between the telecommunications carriers and the computing industry is one of many complex matters within the scope of this responsibility and which, it is expected, in due course, can be the subject of suitable policy determination.

PROSECUTIONS FROM CONSUMER COMPLAINTS

Question No. 1,836—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. What prosecutions if any, have resulted from the more than 4,500 complaints that have been written into the Department of Consumer Affairs, Box 99?

2. Have any of the complaints received been referred to the Director of Combines Investigation and, if so, how many?

3. Have there been any recurring complaints and, if so, what steps has the Department taken to publicize them?

4. Are any changes to existing legislation or is any new legislation contemplated as a result of complaints already received?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** 1. Two. Cana (House) Ware; Anglo French Carpet Co. Ltd.

2. Yes. All complaints, replies to which may require reference to the Combines Investigation Act or to section 306 of the Criminal Code which Bill C-150 proposes to transfer to the Act as section 33D, are referred to the Director of Investigation and Restarch. 87 complaints have been so referred.

3. Yes. By means of a publication entitled "Consumer Communiqué", speeches, and media reports.

4. Yes.

COLLECTIONS ON 1,274 DEBTS

Question No. 1,839—**Mr. Hales:**

Of the 1,274 debts due, and claims by her Majesty amounting to $19,037,920 which were deleted from the accounts by authority of Treasury Board Vote 7c, Appropriation Act No. 1, 1968, how many have since been collected in whole or in part and what is the total amount since collected?

**Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board):**

| Department | Partial Repayment | Full Repayment | Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Indian Affairs and Northern Development | 1 | | $3,197.00 |
| National Revenue (Taxation) | | 1 | 2,727.77 |
| " " | 2 | | 54.59 |
| | | | 1,557.64 |
| Veterans Affairs | 1 | | 534.17 |
| | | Total | $8,071.17 |

DIGBY, N.S., WHARF CONTRACTS

Question No. 1,863—**Mr. Comeau:**

Have contracts been awarded for the construction of the new wharf at Digby or for preliminary testings for the proposed construction of the new ferry wharf (a) if so, to whom were these contracts awarded (b) if not, when will such contracts be awarded?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** No construction contracts have yet been awarded. Responsibility for preliminary tests and necessary soil data, now being obtained, is with the department's consultants. (a) Not applicable; (b) A contract for the construction of the spur wharf for the Department of Fisheries is expected to be awarded this summer and late this year for the new ferry wharf.

[*English*]

PUBLICATION OF HOUSE DEBATES

Question No. 1,871—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

What was the cost of publication of the House of Commons Debates for the years 1966 and 1967 in (a) the French edition (b) the English edition.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Supply and Services):** Insofar as the Canadian Government Printing Bureau—Printing and Publishing Office—is concerned:

| | (a) French | (b) English |
|---|---|---|
| 1966 | $384,477.46 | $582,638.46 |
| 1967 | $371,889.93 | $569,007.87 |

[*English*]

SHEFFORD, QUE., POST OFFICES

Question No. 1,908—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. What post offices were built in the federal constituency of Shefford during the last ten years?

2. What requests were made for the construction of post offices in the federal constituency of Shefford during the last ten years?

3. What was the cost of each post office built in the federal constituency of Shefford during the last ten years?

4. (a) What requests for the construction of post offices in the federal constituency of Shefford, made during the last ten years, were not accepted (b) and for what reasons?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** 1 and 3:

| Year | Location | Cost |
|---|---|---|
| 1962 | Abbotsford | $20,307.88 |
| | Valcourt | 19,051.45 |
| 1965 | Roxton Falls | 22,918.25 |
| 1967 | Ange Gardien de Rouville | 28,797.71 |
| 1968 | St. Césaire | 74,852.77 |
| | Ste. Christine | 22,268.07 |

2. Seven requests.

4. (a) St. Joachim de Shefford; (b) Cancellation of 1968-69 winter works program.

[*English*]

CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT REPORTS

Question No. 1,918—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. How many Canadian companies have failed to file annual reports to the government as required under the provisions of the Canada Corporations Act for the following years: 1950, 1955, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968?

2. How many corporations have failed to file their annual reports since their incorporation?

3. Has the federal government imposed penalties on those corporations who have failed to file annual returns to the government and, if not, for what reason?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** 1. Subject to what is said below in reply to part 3 of the question, there are no figures available on the number of companies in default of having filed the Annual Return due on June 1st of every year. These Annual Returns are received before, and in many instances, after June 1st and it is known only weeks after that date, when all the Annual Returns have been examined, whether a company is in default or not.

2. A list of the corporations that have, for any year since their incorporation, failed to file the Annual Return does not exist. The number of existing companies, however, that were, on April 18, 1969, in default of filing the Annual Return that was due on June 1st, 1968, was 1396.

3. There are two means available to the government under the law for the enforcement of the provisions requiring companies to file the Annual Return. The prosecution of the defaulting companies before the Court is one; the other is the dissolution of the company which can be effected when the company has failed to file the Annual Return for three consecutive years. It has always been felt that the important objective here

was to force compliance with the Act. Since 1965, when the Act was amended to provide for the dissolution of companies in default for three consecutive years, the rate of compliance has substantially improved. In 1967, 603 companies were dissolved under these new provisions, and, in 1968, 643. As of this date, 542 companies have been in default for two years and, unless they comply upon receipt of a notice of default to be sent shortly after June 1st, they will be dissolved.

AIRPORTS—FACTORS IN SELECTION OF ST. JEROME, QUE.

Question No. 1,920—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Did the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion agree to the selection of a new airport site at St. Jerome, Quebec, as announced by the Minister of Transport?

2. If so, what factors were taken into consideration by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in the selection of that site with regards to the general problems of regional economic disparities in Quebec?

3. Was a cost-benefit study prepared with regard to the selection of the airport's site in the Province of Quebec and, if so, would the Minister Table the study?

4. If no cost-benefit study had been undertaken, why was the Treasury Board's P.O.B.S. not followed?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Expansion):** 1. The selection of the site was made by the federal cabinet of which the Minister of Regional Economic Expension is a member.

2. The factors taken into account, in assessing the effect of different locations in relation to economic disparities, were the income multiplier, the employment multiplier and the spatial multiplier.

3. This economic assessment was contained in the Higgins report, which has been tabled. Both benefits and costs of alternative locations were compared.

4. Not applicable.

PLAINCLOTHES R.C.M.P. OFFICERS

Question No. 1,923—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many plain clothes RCMP Officers are located at (a) Ottawa Airport (b) Toronto Airport (c) Montreal Airport and what kind of work are they engaged in?

2. How many unmarked motor vehicles are used by the RCMP at/or about the airport at (a) Ottawa (b) Toronto (c) Montreal and how are they utilized?

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** 1. (a), (b) and (c), Nil.

2. (a) and (c) Ottawa and Montreal Airport R.C.M. Police Detachments have no unmarked motor vehicles; (b) Toronto Airport R.C.M. Police Detachment has one unmarked motor vehicle.

PRE-DOCTORAL N.R.C. GRANTS

Question No. 1,927—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. In the academic years 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70, how many applications for predoctoral National Research Council grants were received?

2. In those years, how many were granted?

3. In those years, how many were turned down for lack of funds rather than lack of merit?

**Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board):** 1 and 2. Predoctoral Awards:

| | Applications | | | Awards | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Renewals | New | Total | Renewals | New | Total |
| 1965-66 | 331 | 1797 | 2128 | 315 | 839 | 1154 |
| 1966-67 | 473 | 2594 | 3067 | 473 | 1177 | 1650 |
| 1967-68 | 700 | 3004 | 3704 | 700 | 1480 | 2180 |
| 1968-69 | 931 | 2849 | 3780 | 931 | 1831 | 2762 |
| 1969-70 | 951 | 2780 | 3731 | 949 | 1713 | 2662 |
| Total | 3386 | 13024 | 16410 | 3368 | 7040 | 10408 |

The application figures for 1968-69 and 1969-70 are incomplete. In 1968 a new method of selection was introduced. Under the new selection procedures the applications of candidates currently attending a Canadian university are considered first by a special university committee and are placed in three categories, as follows: A list: Highly Recommended; B list: Recommended (in order of merit); C list: Not Recommended.

Students in the A and B lists receive further consideration by the N.R.C. Scholarships Selection Committee. Those on the A lists normally receive awards and those on the B lists receive awards to the limit of the availability of funds. Students on the C lists are those who are not recommended by the university committees and their applications are not forwarded to the N.R.C. The total applications for 1968-69 and 1969-70 does not include C list students.

Because of a limited budget for 1969-70 universities were requested to reduce the size of their A and B lists. This explains why there were fewer applications in 1969-70 than in 1968-69.

3. It is not possible to say with any degree of accuracy the number of candidates who were turned down for lack of funds in recent years. This information has never been recorded. However, from 1965 to 1968 inclusive, most of the worthy candidates, by N.R.C. Scholarship standards, received awards.

As a result of a substantial increase in commitments in connection with post-graduate scholarships and postdoctorate fellowships previously awarded there was less money available for new awards in 1969 than was available in 1968.

The increased commitment was as a result of an increase in the number of (a) renewals, and (b) awards for which final payments had to be provided out of the 1969 budget.

Renewals are not awarded competitively; they are renewed on the basis of certified reports of satisfactory progress.

The scholarships and fellowships for which money for final payments must be provided out of the 1969 budget are 1968 awards. The academic year does not coincide with the government fiscal year and out of each year's budget provision must be made for the final payments of the previous year's awards. The rather large increase in the number of awards offered in 1968 resulted in a greatly increased commitment in 1969 over that which was required in 1968 for final payments of 1967 awards.

## APPROVAL OF BROADCAST ADVERTISING

Question No. 1,933—**Mr. Monteith:**

1. Is there a regulation that the Department of National Health and Welfare must approve, in advance of broadcasting radio or television advertising, relating to food, drugs, or cosmetics for (a) human use (b) animal use?

2. If so, who are the officials in the Department who have the responsibility of assigning or withholding approval, and what are their qualifications?

3. In the last six months, have any proposed advertisements been denied approval and, if so, how many?

4. Are there some classes of food, drugs or cosmetics the advertisement of which, does not require advance approval and, if so, what are these classes, and why are they exempt?

5. Does the same, or an equivalent, regulation apply to advertising in newspapers or media other than radio or television and, if not, for what reason?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** 1. Regulations under the Broadcasting Act require that no station shall broadcast any advertisement for any article to which the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act or the Food and Drugs Act applies unless the advertisement has been approved by the Department of National Health and Welfare. This requirement relates to drugs for human and animal use and to foods and cosmetics for human use.

2. Radio and TV commercials are reviewed at Ottawa by officers of the Bureau of Operations, Food and Drug Directorate, all of whom are university graduates in science, are Food and Drug inspectors with many years of experience and have a thorough knowledge of the Food and Drugs Act and Regulations and the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act and their interpretation. Since July, 1968 the review of radio and TV commercials for food has been the responsibility of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. These officers have the same background as outlined above.

3. In the six-month period ending March 31, 1969, approximately 170 commercials for drugs and cosmetics were denied approval (out of some 3,446 commercials reviewed). Some 300 commercials for foods were rejected (out of a total of 9,618).

4. Radio and TV commercials which do not contain any claims and mention only the name of the product, the name of the place where the product may be obtained and the price of the product, do not require clearance prior to broadcast. The reason is that no promotional claims are made. Advertisements for perishable food products such as fresh fruit, vegetables, fish, meat, and some bakery products, which make claims as to quality, flavour, etc., may be given temporary clearance by the local Food and Drug inspector. This exemption is granted because of the

nature of the product and the need for immediate clearance without the necessity of submitting the commercial two weeks in advance of broadcast.

5. Preclearance of advertisements in newspapers or media other than radio or TV is not required since these advertisements do not come under the authority of the Broadcasting Act and there is no authority for prereview under the Food and Drugs Act or the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act.

HALIFAX-DARTMOUTH WATER SUPPLY

Question No. 1,954—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Did the Atlantic Development Board make any recommendations with regard to the water supply for metropolitan Halifax-Dartmouth and, if so, what is their gist?

2. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the government reached a decision as to a federal role in the development of such a supply system and, if so, what is this role to be?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** 1. Yes. The board made a recommendation for financial assistance on a shared-cost basis for a water system for the area; such assistance to be subject to selection of a water development scheme agreeable to the parties concerned and to have regard to the question of appropriate water rates.

2. No.

CONSUMER COMMUNIQUÉ DISTRIBUTION

Question No. 1,961—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. What is the distribution of the Consumer Communique issued by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

2. What is the breakdown of the distribution between (a) private individuals (b) newspapers (c) magazines, and (d) other business concerns?

3. How frequently has the Consumer Communique been issued since the first one in July, 1968 and what topics have been dealt with in each issue?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** 1. 28,000.

2. (a) 26,134; (b) 1,597 (includes 409 radio and television stations); (c) 171; (d) None as such; all requests included in over-all mailing list.

3. Twice; buying carpeting; misleading price advertising.

[Mr. Munro.]

*ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

Question No. 1,968—**Mr. Brewin:**

1. Has the Department of National Defence or the government employed or secured the services of any groups or individuals outside of the Public Service for the purposes of advice, consultation or information in respect to the deployment of an anti-ballistic missile system in the United States of America or its implications for the security and defence of Canada?

2. If so, are any such studies under way (a) when were they begun (b) what are the names and qualifications of those involved in the studies?

3. Will the results of such studies be made available to the public or to Parliament through the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, the answer to parts 1 and 2 of this question is as follows: In 1967, the Chairman, Defence Research Board engaged Dr. R. W. Nicholls, Professor and Chairman, Department of Physics, Centre for Research in Experimental Space Science, York University, Toronto, to prepare an informal unclassified report entitled "The Physical Phenomenology of Nuclear Explosions in the Atmosphere and in Space." This study, which was commenced in July and completed in August, 1967, was not concerned with the deployment of an anti-ballistic missile system but it was concerned with the effects of nuclear explosions at various altitudes.

The answer to part 3 is: Yes, if requested.

VISITS BY HIGH COMMISSIONER TO ZAMBIA

Question No. 1,991—**Mr. Lewis:**

1. How many times did the Canadian High Commissioner in Tanzania visit Zambia in the year 1968?

2. Has the Canadian High Commission in Tanzania ever informed the government of Portuguese military incursions into Zambia?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1. The present Canadian High Commissioner to Tanzania visited Zambia four times in 1968. His predecessor as the accredited Canadian representative also visited Zambia once in 1968.

2. Reports of Portuguese military incursions into Zambia have been transmitted to the government by the Canadian High Commission in Tanzania.

AMHERST, N.S., ECONOMIC EXPANSION OPERATIONS

Question No. 2,064—**Mr. Coates:**

Is the Department of Regional Economic Expansion considering the closure or any reductions in the operations of the Department at Amherst, Nova Scotia and, if so, what are its intentions in this regard and for what reasons?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** In accordance with agreements made with the three Maritime provinces in 1966, these provinces will next April assume the operation and maintenance of all works undertaken under the Maritime Marshland Rehabilitation Act. There will accordingly be some adjustments in the work of federal staff located at Moncton and Amherst. This is currently being reviewed in relation to the other responsibilities of the Department.

NEW START PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,071—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Where are the present New Start programs located in each Province and Territory of Canada?

2 How long is it anticipated that each will continue in operation?

3. What is the estimated cost of each project?

4. How many New Start projects are pending and where will each be located and what is the criteria for priorities of each proposal?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** 1. Yarmouth County, Nova Scotia; Kings County, P.E.I.; Prince Albert, Saskatchewan; Lac la Biche, Alberta.

2. Until March 31, 1971.

3. Between $3,000,000-$4,000,000.

4. (a) Two; (b) The Pas, Manitoba and Richibucto, N.B.; (c) Priorities are determined by the nature of the problems confronting the disadvantaged people of the area in relation to the opportunities for stable and rewarding employment which may be available.

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO UNIVERSITIES

Question No. 1,398—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. What amounts were allocated by the federal government, over the past five years, to assist Canadian universities?

2. What amounts were loaned to each Canadian university?

Return tabled.

DEPUTY MINISTERS—NAMES AND SALARIES

Question No. 1,534—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What are the names of each of the individuals who hold positions of Deputy Minister in the federal government and what is the salary of each and on what date was this salary determined?

2. What are the names of the individuals who hold positions of the rank of Assistant Deputy Minister and what is the present salary of each and on what date was the present salary determined?

Return tabled.

CROWN CORPORATIONS—NAMES AND SALARIES OF PRESIDENTS

Question No. 1,535—**Mr. Coates:**

What are the names of the individuals who hold the rank of President of Crown Corporations of the federal government, what is the salary of each, and on what date was the present salary determined?

Return tabled.

TOBACCO—REVENUE FROM AND EXPENDITURE ON RESEARCH

Question No. 1,773—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How much revenue has the federal government received from the sale of (a) cigarettes (b) cigars (c) chewing tobacco (d) pipe tobacco (e) snuff, in each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. How much subsidy and/or support has the federal government paid to tobacco farmers during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3. How much revenue has the federal government received from the advertising of tobacco in any form during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

4. How much money has the federal government spent on research on the health hazards resulting from the use of tobacco in each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

5. How much money has the federal government spent on research on tobacco farming and tobacco growing in each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

6. How much money has the federal government spent in advertising the hazards of smoking and/or evils of tobacco in each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Return tabled.

AREA DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION COST

Question No. 1,850—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. How much money was granted under the Area Development Administration, each year, from its inception until the end of 1968?

2. What are the names and locations of the companies that received such grants?

3. What was the amount of the grant in each case and in which year was it extended to the various companies?

Return tabled.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### AIR CANADA

STRIKE OF MECHANICS—INQUIRY AS TO PROGRESS IN NEGOTIATIONS

**Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this matter to the country, I ask the Minister of Labour whether he can report on the status of the Air Canada negotiations with its employees.

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, the negotiations between Air Canada and the International Association of Machinists broke off last evening. At the present moment there are no meaningful talks going on between Air Canada and this particular group of employees. I have no way of predicting how long it will be before the employees and employer resume negotiations, and I can only point to the fact that there are alternative methods of transportation in this country.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Whom are you fooling?

**Mr. MacEwan:** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister whether he will take it upon himself to try to get the parties together. This matter is very important to transportation in this country.

**Mr. Mackasey:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I returned from a short holiday a week ago yesterday I did precisely that and succeeded in getting both parties to resume negotiations. I believe they began negotiations a week ago yesterday. I am rather pleased in one respect, namely that the parties were able, particularly on Friday of last week in Ottawa, to clean up all non-monetary issues which were at that time hampering the discussions of the monetary issues and which, according to both parties, had priority. These items have been cleared up, and when the negotiations broke off last evening there remained only the monetary clauses.

I will be very pleased to take the suggestion of the hon. member into consideration, and when both sides request the assistance of the Department of Labour or even of the Minister of Labour and are prepared to ask for that assistance jointly I will be happy to give it.

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Minister of Labour whether he has been able to inform Air Canada on behalf of the government that the corporation is not tied to any official or unofficial guidelines with regard to the limits which they are permitted to offer to the negotiating union, so that the two sides may negotiate and bargain for a settlement in the normal way.



**Mr. Mackasey:** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman has raised a very important point. This morning I reviewed *Hansard*, and from this I see that the Prime Minister made it quite clear last week that Air Canada has the right to bargain with its employees independently of government intervention. I could not continue my role as Minister of Labour if I thought there was government interference in any Crown corporation.

**Mr. Lewis:** I hope there is not.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Labour. Has the government received any information from the International Association of Machinists that it might instruct its members working for other airlines either to observe picket lines, or to come out in a sympathy strike, because it felt that the government was imposing certain guidelines with regard to wages?

**Mr. Mackasey:** I think the point should be clarified, Mr. Speaker. The International Association of Machinists has not been negotiating with the government but rather with Air Canada, which happens to be a Crown corporation, but which, in my view, has been given no special preferential treatment any more than, say, Ogilvie Flour Mills Company or other companies which come under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act. I consider Air Canada to be completely free to negotiate with its employees and to establish wage rates as they see fit, and which they are capable of paying.

With regard to whether or not the International Association of Machinists have advanced that particular suggestion, the answer is no, because at no time have they dealt directly with the government, certainly not through the Minister of Labour; and I doubt if they negotiated or discussed their problem with the government through any other minister.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** I have a supplementary question, to clear up the point. There is no suggestion that the union has to

deal with the government. My question was whether it has informed the government either directly or indirectly that this might happen.

**Mr. Mackasey:** To the best of my knowledge the answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

## AIR TRANSPORT

### AIR CANADA STRIKE—EXPANSION OF LICENSING TO MEET ALLEGED MONOPOLY POSITION

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. As several groups of employees of Air Canada during the past two years have demonstrated on several occasions that they have the ability to deny air transportation to the great majority of Canadians who want to use that mode of transportation, and this has been denied for considerable periods of time, as appears to be the case today, has the Prime Minister or the government given consideration to expanding significantly the air transport licences of Canadian Pacific Airlines and other air transport carriers in Canada, and in this way reducing the monopoly position enjoyed by Air Canada?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** May I take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

## LABOUR RELATIONS

### WOODS REPORT—INQUIRY AS TO IMPLEMENTATION

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** I have a supplementary question which I should like to direct either to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of Labour. In view of the numerous strikes in Canada in these essential industries, has the government given serious consideration to implementing the recommendations of the Woods report.

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** The basic philosophy of the Woods report is that there should be a minimum of government interference with labour relations in this country. I should like to remind the hon. member that the official labour spokesman for his party, as well as hon. gentlemen on the front bench opposite me, endorsed the philosophy of the Freedman report, again a very pro-labour report, showing a progressive attitude on the part of the opposition. I hope no one will suggest reactionary solutions to this strike since strikes are inevitable under free collective bargaining. This sort of strike has taken place before in Canada and I think will take place periodically in the future. If we want to live in a democracy we shall have to get used to the idea. I do not think we are faced with a national emergency. It is true the strike is disruptive and unpleasant, but I repeat that there are alternative methods of transportation available and Canadians will have to use them in the interval.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

## INDUSTRY

### DEVCO—COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF MINERS

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, with respect to another Crown corporation called Devco. Why, then, did the minister support the plan for the compulsory retirement of these employees at the age of 60?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## WATER RESOURCES

### POLLUTION OF CANADA-U.S. BOUNDARY WATERS

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** May I direct a question to the Prime Minister regarding the confidential report which has been submitted to the International Joint Commission on the subject of the pollution of Canadian-United States boundary waters? In view of the fact that Mr. Arnold Heeney, the chairman of the Canadian section of that commission, has described the situation as worrisome, pointing out that the conditions in Lake Erie are bad and that conditions in Lake Ontario are far from satisfactory, may I ask the Prime Minister when this report will be made public and available to members of the House of Commons?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** The hon. gentleman refers to a confidential report. He has probably had access to it before I have, so I will take the question as notice.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. No one minds the Prime Minister's

trying to be witty from time to time, even when he only half succeeds. But I do not have a copy of the report. I am referring to an item which appeared in the newspapers containing the remarks of the chairman of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission, and I am simply asking when this important report, which the chairman describes as being the most comprehensive yet compiled, will be made public, because it will be of great interest to the people. I submit I should be allowed to ask that question without any facetious interjections.

## COMBINES

DRUGS—PRICE FIXING BY B.C. PHARMACISTS

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the serious implications for all federally and provincially sponsored drug programs arising from the decision of the B.C. Professional Pharmacists Society to make a one dollar surcharge on prescriptions for welfare patients, and in view of the request a week ago by British Columbia's welfare minister that the combines investigation branch be asked for a speedy decision in this connection, may I ask the minister what has been the result of this request to date?

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not sure whether this is not the type of question which should be discussed at the time of adjournment or placed on the order paper.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I think this is an important question because the welfare minister stated that druggists already receive no lower—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The matter may be important but I suggest the hon. member is, rather, looking for an argument with the minister, and I do not think in its present form the question can be accepted. If there is urgency, the hon. member knows that under the rules she can give notice and the matter will be considered at the time of the adjournment.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** There is one final point I should like to make, Mr. Speaker. I believe the minister was rising to answer my question.

**Mr. Speaker:** He can rise just as easily at ten o'clock.

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

## CONSUMER AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO SETTING UP OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** A supplementary question—

**Mr. Speaker:** There cannot be a supplementary. The hon. member could ask a related questions, perhaps.

**Mr. Baldwin:** It is a related and equally non-argumentative question. Has the minister yet had a productive meeting of minds with the Prime Minister so that the names of those who are to be members of the prices and wages board can be announced?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Our minds are in the process of meeting, Mr. Speaker.

## RESEARCH

ACTION ON MACDONALD REPORT ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

**Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Is the minister now in a position to answer the question I directed to the Prime Minister on Friday last and which he said the Secretary of State would answer when he was next in the house? My question is: What procedure does the government intend to follow to deal with the wide-ranging recommendations of the Macdonald report on scientific research?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this report has been available long enough to expect from the government a detailed and immediate policy. Its content has been known to us since last Thursday only. I could not even say how this report affects the responsibilities of my own department.

[*English*]

## COMPANY OF YOUNG CANADIANS

PROCEDURE TOWARD APPOINTMENT OF PERMANENT COUNCIL

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Secretary of State, of which I have given him notice. In view of the fact that the statute that three years ago set up the Company of Young Canadians provided that there be a

permanent council, partly elected by volunteers, and the further fact that such council has not yet been established, will the minister inform the house whether election procedures for the purpose are in process of being prepared, and when the election of the permanent council may be expected?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Quite willingly, Mr. Speaker. The Company of Young Canadians sent us draft regulations which are now under consideration and which will have to be submitted soon to the cabinet.

[*English*]

**Mr. Lewis:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I also ask the minister whether he received a letter from the volunteers association of the Company dealing with this matter. If so, what reply has he given the association; if he has not yet given a reply, will he be able to assure them of the election of the council within the next month or two?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pelletier:** I have in fact received representations and I intend to reply when I am better able to foresee how long it will be before approval is given to the election procedure needed to establish the permanent council.

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT REACTION TO SUGGESTED DISBANDMENT

**Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State. In view of the wide spread disfavour with which the work of the Company of Young Canadians is held by a large number of people in Canada, is the government now considering the disbandment of this organization?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, like everyone else, I am aware of the criticism, at times quite severe, to be found in the newspapers against the Company of Young Canadians. I hope that the hon. member is also aware of the very good things that are often said about it.

There is absolutely no question at the present time of putting an end to the activities of the Company.

[*English*]

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ADDITIONAL PASSPORT ISSUING SERVICE

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can the minister advise the house of any plans for solving the problems in the passport office occasioned by the resignation of five staff members due to unsatisfactory working conditions?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I had a report I could have given the house but I was not satisfied that it answered all of the questions that were in the minds of hon. members. I am sure that one of the reasons for the resignation of some of these members of the staff of the passport office is the great burden of overtime work they have all had to bear. We have increased the staff of the passport office by many, many scores. Notwithstanding that, 7,500 hours of overtime have been worked. We are asking the staff to work Saturdays on a regular basis. I hope the members of the house will realize what a tremendous job the passport office is doing, notwithstanding the fact that some passports have not been issued as quickly as they would have liked.

**Mr. Fairweather:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would it not be possible to augment the government's very sensible plan to open regional offices, as announced some months ago?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, if it were as easy as that we should have done it yesterday. The trouble is that we have to have trained personnel. The purpose of the passport office in part is to see that unauthorized persons do not obtain passports. I do not think we ought to reduce security provisions in order to increase volume.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government considered increasing the staff of its office in Ottawa so that applications may be processed more quickly. Also, will that staff be payed at a higher than usual rate for any overtime it puts in?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, the staff has already been augmented by 90 persons in recent weeks. We brought them in to deal with the overload. One of our problems of course is lack of space. Perhaps I should not

complain about Treasury Board, but it is very difficult to have new buildings built.

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister tell us when the passport service will return to normalcy? Will this be in the near future, so that people applying for passports may be assured they can obtain their passports soon; and if not in two or three weeks, then whether in fact they will be informed it may take two or three months or longer for people to obtain passports.

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, within the next few days I intend to embark on an advertising program which I hope will help to clarify the situation. I expect that the peak of passport applications—more passports than anticipated have been applied for—will be over by the middle of June.

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, what has the minister to propose with respect to those Canadians who lose financially because of long delays in obtaining passports? Will there be any repayment of fees to persons who cannot obtain requisite service, or who cannot obtain their passports?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please. The hon. member has asked a question. I do not think he should pursue the matter further.

**Some hon. Members:** Answer.

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, when making a statement I hope to deal with this question, among others.

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In his statement would the minister please advise if there will be special provisions to take care of Canadians affected by the Air Canada strike? I am thinking of Canadians who wish to obtain passports, and in particular I have in mind several people who in the next day or two will wish to obtain passports to travel east. Will there be some provisions to enable them to obtain passports in Canada House in England? They might pick them up there, hopefully

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I think the complications brought about by the Air Canada strike are greater even than those suggested by the hon. member. But I will look into his suggestion.

[Mr. Sharp.]

## SPORTS

### AGREEMENTS WITH QUEBEC CONCERNING GRANTS FOR RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

**Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Considering the statement made recently by Gabriel Loubier, Minister of Tourism for Quebec, that the federal minister had reneged on certain agreements with Quebec relating to grants having to do with sports and recreation, will the minister state whether any agreements have been reached with Quebec on this subject and whether he in fact reneged on them?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, no, I have not reneged on any agreements. We had several discussions with the Quebec Minister of Tourism and although he made many suggestions relating to Quebec's participation in the amateur sports program, I indicated that we would entertain what was suggested. No commitment has been given. Before the Quebec minister went to the press I endeavoured personally to reach him on several occasions to talk to him about this, but was unable to do so. He was unavailable.

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

### WOODS REPORT—REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION BY STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. It is supplementary to one I asked him two weeks ago today concerning the Woods report and the time of its reference to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. Can the minister say whether this will be done soon?

**Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the answer I gave two weeks ago still stands. As soon as the white paper is ready we shall refer it to the appropriate committee.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure us that this will be done in sufficient time to permit this matter to be dealt with during the present session?

**Mr. Dubé:** Mr. Speaker, it is still my hope that it will be done as quickly as possible. I am afraid that is all I can say at this time.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

ALLEGED EXCESSIVE CHARGE BY AIR CANADA FOR CARRYING MAIL

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Was the Postmaster General expressing the view of the government when he said in Edmonton last night that the government is paying far too much to have its mail transported by Air Canada? I ask this question, particularly in view of his statement to the effect that he had not revealed this to his cabinet colleagues and that he really should not have said anything about it.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Hees:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Prime Minister take steps to promote more dialogue between members of his government?

## INCOME TAX

AIR CANADA STRIKE—EXTENSION OF FILING DEADLINE

**Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Minister of National Revenue. In view of the Air Canada strike and the failure of the Post Office Department to accustom itself to the five day week delivery of mail, will the minister consider extending the deadline for the return of income tax payments from midnight of Wednesday, April 30 to midnight of Monday, May 5?

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the facts the hon. member has referred to, there is nothing to prevent our people from mailing their income tax returns before April 30.

**Mr. Hales:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister talk to his colleague, the Postmaster General, and ask him to make provisions for stamping in an appropriate manner all mail posted before midnight on April 30.

[*Translation*]

## AGRICULTURE

DAIRYING—POLICY RESPECTING INDUSTRIAL MILK

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

As the industrial milk producers are not satisfied with the milk policy for 1969, has the minister received recently representations from the Quebec C.F.U. or does the minister intend, in the next few days, to meet with representatives of Quebec agricultural organizations with a view to considering the industrial milk policy?

[*English*]

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, we have received a number of communications from farm organizations, including the one the hon. member mentioned. The minister and the department will be happy to meet with representatives of organizations to explain the reasons for making adjustments with respect to the new dairy year.

DAIRYING—COMPLAINTS FROM WESTERN PRODUCERS

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister say whether he is taking any action to deal with representations of western Canadian dairy producers who allege that present Canadian Dairy Commission Policies militate against dairy production in western Canada?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, we do not accept the preamble to that type of question.

[*Translation*]

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

RESIGNATION OF GENERAL DE GAULLE

**Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Prime Minister.

I wish to know whether the Prime Minister has sent a telegram expressing our condolences to General de Gaulle, the former President of the French Republic, who resigned this morning. If so, can he advise us of the text of this telegram?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** No, Mr. Speaker, I have not sent any such telegram. In my opinion, anyone engaged in politics knows that a politician's career is somewhat short-lived and I think the General is no more surprised than I am myself.

[*English*]

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government received a message of condolence from the government of France on the resignation of the Minister of Transport?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

MAINLAND CHINA—U.S. REACTION TO CANADIAN RECOGNITION

**Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is the minister now prepared to table the statement he referred to on Wednesday last by the Secretary of State of the United States expressing concern about Canada's statement on Red China. Can the minister at the same time say whether Canada received a note on this matter and also what Canada's reply was?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Well, Mr. Speaker, when I answered that question the other day I had reservations about it. I said that if the house considered it necessary, I would make public the statement. If the hon. member really wishes me to get hold of Mr. Rogers' statement, I shall be happy to do so. Our answer to the United States, and I cannot recall now whether there was a note, was that we intend to proceed.

**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. On Wednesday last when the minister replied to this question he spoke rather casually about the statement made by the United States Secretary of State, intimating it was published many weeks ago. He said he would get it for the house and table it if necessary. I hope he does get it, and that he tables it.

## UNITED NATIONS

CONSIDERATION BY CANADA OF PEACEKEEPING UNIT

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I ask him through you, Mr. Speaker, if his attention has been called to a study or report of an influential group in the United States which has called on its own government to take the lead in working for a standing force of 40,000 men to be used by the United Nations for its peacekeeping operations? Will the government of Canada consider this report and discuss it with the United States government?

**Mr. Speaker:** The question asked by the hon. member is of a very general nature. I doubt whether it should be asked at this time.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

CRIME PREVENTION DISCUSSIONS WITH U.S. AUTHORITIES

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Has there of recent date been any meaningful consultation with the United States regarding crime prevention? Have any anti-crime measures been taken in view of the fact that the director of the Montreal police force, Jean-Paul Gilbert, has predicted there will be a wave of criminals entering Canada from the United States?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Approximately three or four weeks ago the Solicitor General and I were in Washington, where we had personal discussions for two days with the Attorney General of the United States, John Mitchell, the Deputy Attorney General, Dick Kleindienst, and most of their senior officials, including the crime investigation branch. We spent about four hours discussing the anti-crime network. The officials gave us advance information about the new strike force announced recently by the President of the United States.

HAL BANKS—POSSIBILITY OF RENEWING EXTRADITION PROCEEDINGS

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the discussions with these gentlemen, did the question of the extradition of Hal Banks come up? If so, what view did the government express?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Neither side brought up that question during the discussions.

**Mr. Hees:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did both feel that politically this is a very sensitive matter?

## INDUSTRY

DEVCO—COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF MINERS

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Now that the compulsory aspect of the Devco early retirement plan is in effect, will the government move quickly to assure that Devco carries out that part of the legislation which compels them to provide for former miners?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Perhaps the hon. member would like to ask this question of the minister responsible for Devco.

**Mr. MacInnis:** If the Prime Minister will examine the question I asked, he will see that the government move to give assurance that Devco carries out that portion of the legislation which compels them to look after the miners, is a question for the Prime Minister. If the Prime Minister would only realize that he is leading the government—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

## FLOODS

### TRAIL, B.C.—ACTION TO CONTROL EMERGENCY SITUATION

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Prime Minister. Last Friday I directed a question to the Prime Minister regarding federal assistance to the flood damaged city of Trail. At that time the Prime Minister indicated that later in the day he would be contacting both the Premier of British Columbia and the Mayor of Trail. May I inquire what assistance the federal government has offered to the city of Trail to assist in rehabilitation of the flooded areas?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I did answer these telegrams on Friday and I said that after we had further reports of the damage we would be prepared to discuss this matter with the relevant authorities.

**Mr. Harding:** May I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Public Works? Has the Department of Public Works any plans to assist in the rehabilitation of the Trail area? If so, would the minister indicate what has been done to date and what assistance, if any, his department can offer to the Trail area?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, as a result of a great number of representations, including the representations made by the hon. member for Okanagan-Boundary and others, a commitment was made by the Prime Minister that someone be sent to this area. The Department of Public Works has co-operated and Mr. Stevens has been to Trail, has now returned to Vancouver, and is making a report.

I have been in touch with the Mayor of Trail. When the report is received an announcement will be made by the government as to its responsibility or otherwise. There are estimates of damage in the area of $1 million or $1½ million. In light of the fact there is provincial legislation covering such disasters, it might be construed this misfortune is within the financial capacity of the province of British Columbia.

## FINANCE

### SECURITIES COMMISSION—REQUEST FOR PROGRESS REPORT

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** My question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on the subject of the proposed national securities commission. Will the minister advise whether he has made any progress since I last inquired about his negotiations with the provinces, or are these negotiations still stalled?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, discussions are continuing within my department, within the government, and with appropriate provincial officials.

## COMMUNICATIONS

### DISSEMINATION OF GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

**Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill):** I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. My question is with regard to the statements made by the Secretary of State in London, Ontario, on Friday last, with reference to the methods of presentation of government propaganda. He said:

> Nowadays you can leave the written press free if you can manipulate the radio and television facilities.

I ask the Secretary of State whether this is a statement of government policy in this area?

**Mr. Speaker:** I suggest to the hon. member the question as asked is argumentative and cannot be asked in that way at this time.

**Mr. Simpson:** In view of the fact that the Secretary of State is the minister responsible for one of the largest news media in Canada, the C.B.C., and is expressing opinions of this nature, does the Prime Minister intend—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member is being argumentative and I suggest the matter should not be pursued.

[*Later:*]

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State. Was the minister stating government policy when he said in London, Ontario, that the press no longer has much importance except to himself and other members of the upper middle class?

**Hon. Gerard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Of course I said no such thing, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The question cannot be asked of the minister.

[*Later:*]

**Mr. Schreyer:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is that you allowed the Secretary of State to answer the question—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I did not allow it. I believe the Secretary of State got up a little too quickly. I suggested that the question should not be asked. Perhaps I should have moved a little faster, but perhaps after 40 minutes of questioning the Speaker does not move as quickly at the end as he does at the beginning.

## AIR CANADA

### STRIKE OF MECHANICS—AVAILABILITY OF ALTERNATIVE MODES OF TRAVEL

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** My question is supplementary to that asked the Minister of Labour with regard to the Air Canada strike. Will the minister elaborate on his statement that alternative modes of transportation are available? Does the minister mean between Montreal and Ottawa or between western Canada and eastern Canada? If he means the latter, I wish he would get up to date information.

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I would not want to leave the impression that the strike is not inconvenient. It is certainly more inconvenient in some parts of the country than in others. I say there are two major railways running across the country as well as Canadian Pacific Airlines, Transair, Nordair, Royalaire and I believe other charter airlines. They are doing the best possible to take up the slack caused by this particular strike. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this is a dispute between Air Canada and a certain group of key employees. It is not the time for the government to be stampeded into reactionary statements or action.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. McIntosh:** A further supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Possibly the minister is not aware that when you try to get reservations in any of the modes he suggested, the best they can guarantee right now on travelling from western to eastern Canada is May 7. I ask the minister if he will prevail on the existing railways, Canadian National and Canadian Pacific, to make available additional rolling stock to facilitate the demands that are prominent right now in western Canada, so that innocent people will not suffer?

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

### ISSUING OF PASSPORTS FOR EXTENDED PERIOD

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the crisis in the passport department, will the minister give consideration to reissuing passports for an additional five years, rather than issuing new passports, as a solution to a problem which seems to be out of hand at the present time?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** No, Mr. Speaker. I do not think that would be a wise thing to do. I believe we should continue as we have been doing to increase the security underlying Canadian passports. These are very valuable documents, and it was not doing Canada's reputation any good to have them issued as loosely as in the past.

## THE MINISTRY

### INQUIRY CONCERNING NEW MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister has now had an opportunity over the weekend to consider the events of late last week flowing from the resignation of the minister, and having read the many speeches resulting therefrom, is he now giving some consideration to the setting up of a separate ministry of housing and urban development?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Well, Mr. Speaker, the many speeches I heard were mainly concerned with constitutional problems. I do not remember reading any that suggested that this kind of department would increase the constitutional power of the government.

## AGRICULTURE

### ST. PAUL, ALTA.—PROTEST AGAINST FARM INCOMES

**Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Would he tell the house and the people of this country what measure his government proposes to alleviate the conditions which today in the town of St. Paul, Alberta, have brought more than 800 farmers out to a mass rally to protest depressed farm incomes? Can he indicate to the farmers of Canada when the nation's agricultural community might be included in the just society?

### SASKATOON, SASK.—PROTEST AGAINST FARM INCOMES

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. In view of the wire received from the Saskatoon Board of Trade regarding the serious situation which faces agricultural communities in western Canada would the Prime Minister inform the house concerning the nature of his reply.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I am not aware of having received such a telegram, Mr. Speaker.

## CANADA COUNCIL

### SCHOLARSHIP TO JON BORDO

**Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. Now that he has explained to his own satisfaction the granting of a Canada Council award to one student radical leader, could he now look into the $3,500 Canada Council scholarship granted to one Jon Bordo, self-described student radical leader at the University of Alberta.

## CANADA PENSION PLAN

### EXEMPTION OF OLD ORDER MENNONITES

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I should like to ask him whether he has discussed with representatives of the provinces the possibility of obtaining an exemption for the Old Order of Mennonites from the provisions of the Canada Pension Plan, and if so what has been the result of those discussions?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest this is the type of question which should be placed on the order paper.

## IMMIGRATION

### DELAYS IN HEARINGS

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to diret my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Will the minister undertake to investigate reports of an inordinate delay in granting hearings to immigrant applicants who apply for special inquiries or other proceedings?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Yes. I would be glad to investigate this in general, and if my hon. friend has any specific cases I would be glad to consider those also.

### ADMISSION OF DRAFT DODGERS AND DESERTERS

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Could the minister inform the house how soon we might expect a report on immigration policies respecting United States military deserters?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** No. I am not ready yet to make any such statement.

### RUDOLPH HOLATA—PROTEST AGAINST HOLDING IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

**Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Since I had been recognized just before the previous point of order I wonder if I might ask a question which I believe is very urgent.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member cannot do this on a point of order. He might be allowed to do it with the unanimous agreement of the house.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Paproski:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs based on his statement of Thursday, April 24 regarding the imprisonment of Rudolph Holata. My question is the same as the one I asked previously. Has the Canadian government protested the arrest and imprisonment of a Canadian citizen and employee of the Canadian government and if not why not?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I gave a full answer to that question.

*Business of the House*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the government house leader would consider calling a meeting of house leaders perhaps later today to see whether we might have a discussion about the time to be spent on the matters we are about to begin to debate. I am not suggesting any over-all time limit in view of certain positions which have been taken, but I wonder whether the house leader would consider calling a meeting so that we might discuss the time we would spend on the first eight or ten amendments which are now before the house.

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned to the member and to the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) I should like if possible to arrange a meeting this evening. I hope just as soon as the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) returns to the house we might be able to arrange a meeting for possibly after eight o'clock this evening. I think it might be useful to work out a procedure, in view of the fact that we have used up the equivalent of 12 full sitting days for the second reading and report stages, and since there are only 25 sitting days remaining for legislation at this session.

[*Translation*]

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Friday, April 25, consideration of Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi)** moved amendment No. 15:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by inserting

[Mr. Sharp.]

in clause 15, after the words "person who" on line 11 on page 35, the following words:

"being unavoidably prevented from finding a medical practitioner".

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I moved that amendment to clause 15 on page 35 of reprinted Bill C-150 in order to clarify the meaning of subsection (2) of the section 209, so as to prevent any misunderstanding in the implementation of this legislation.

First I shall read the new section 209 which clause 15 of Bill C-150 would substitute to the present section. I quote:

(1) Every one who causes the death, in the act of birth, of any child that has not become a human being, in such a manner that, if the child were a human being, he would be guilty of murder, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life.

(2) This section does not apply to a person who, by means that, in good faith, he considers necessary to preserve the life of the mother of a child, causes the death of such child.

So the amendment I move Mr. Speaker, would add after the words "a person who" the following words:

"being unavoidably prevented from finding a medical practitioner."

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would prevent any person from killing a child in the act of birth if it is possible for such a person to find a qualified practitioner.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed amendment to Bill C-150 would open the door to any quack who could say afterwards he acted in good faith and thus would not be prosecuted for criminal negligence.

The amendment I am introducing would oblige the woman seeking abortion, under section 209, to take all possible practical steps to find a qualified doctor to perform the abortion. Thus, in case of practical impossibility, the woman concerned could go to another person she feels is qualified enough to perform the abortion.

I am thinking, in particular, of areas very far from medical centers, hospitals, or qualified doctors. Were the case to arise in such places, it would become necessary to request to help of a person who, though not a doctor, could provide the help needed by the woman or girl whose life is endangered.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Model Penal Code of the American Law Institute, abortion will be justified only when performed in an

accredited hospital, except in cases of emergency, when hospital services are unavailable.

I would like to point out here that this section from the Model Penal Code of the American Law Institute has not yet been adopted everywhere in the United States; it is simply suggested that with its inherent restrictions it should become part and parcel of the American law.

In my opinion, we should here in Canada enforce the same restrictions in the case of persons likely to perform abortion, I mean doctors. Mr. Speaker, if I have introduced this amendment to the Criminal Code, it is with a view to throwing some light on paragraph 2, section 209, so that persons lacking the qualifications to perform abortion would do so only if it were truly impossible to find a qualified doctor or if the services of a duly accredited hospital were not available.

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, the time has now come to study the amendments to the clauses of Bill C-150 dealing with abortion.

With regard to the first amendment proposed to us, I feel it would be well to consider the importance of the specification suggested by my colleague, the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise).

When the doctor is not at the bedside of a woman about to give birth or to have a miscarriage, it is absolutely normal for the persons closest to her to try and help her. However, Mr. Speaker, this type of situation seldom occurs. Indeed, considering modern progress, the number of public clinics and means of communications, it is practically impossible for that type of situation to occur.

That is why we want to make the legislation more specific with regard to the intervention of another person. This would make the legislation even more efficient.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that all those things should be considered. It would be extremely easy for clever people to use some means to an end that would not always be good.

By proposing this amendment, we want to prevent—and we take this opportunity to say so—in the event where it is really impossible to find a doctor, that the one who lends a hand should be accused of homicide or infanticide. It would be completely in order for that person not to have to suffer the consequences of an inadequate law.

We all agree on that. I insist on the fact that those cases do not occur. I fail to see how anyone other than a doctor could be authorized to procure an abortion.

• (3:10 p.m.)

The legislation even states specifically that these are cases which will be decided by a board of doctors. Therefore, is it possible that a person would have to provoke abortion? This will never happen.

What can happen is a birth, as mentioned in the section. Therefore, at the time of delivery, even if it is premature, there is of course a birth. The birth can be normal. I cannot possibly imagine that the person who would give this service would provoke the death of the child during birth. In other words, it is practically impossible that a person could be accused of having provoked the death during the process of birth. I cannot see how such a situation could occur.

Last week, or two weeks ago, here, in Ottawa, a woman gave birth to a child on her way to the hospital, in a taxi or in a police car.

Mr. Speaker, even if I have never had the opportunity of seeing such things, I feel that, in these circumstances, I would know what to do. This situation does not occur very often. That is why we want to bring in this legislation a particular provision in order to avoid illegal abortions and to prevent unscrupulous people to prevail themselves of this clause to work in a field exclusively reserved to doctors.

That is why we want to add in section 209 the following words:

—being unavoidably prevented from finding a medical practitioner.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, there are some isolated areas where no physician is available. Therefore, one could presume that the legislation was devised having regard to such situations. In general, when a pregnancy evolves normally, no serious complications occur. But when difficulties crop up, pregnant women go where they can easily be treated by physicians or where the physician is willing to make house calls.

By adding to that clause the words "being unavoidably prevented from finding a medical practitioner", we might limit the number of possible cases and run the risk of making the legislation applicable to unforeseen situations.

As everybody knows, the interpretation of statutes is always emphasized, especially by those who wish to use them for improper purposes. It is unfortunate, but it is common

knowledge. People often say that nobody is more familiar with the law than a thief. Nobody is better acquainted with the law than a person bent on mischief.

Therefore, we must be explicit and not be content to say:

This section does not apply to a person who, by means that, in good faith, he considers necessary to preserve the life of the mother of a child, causes the death of such child.

Indeed, if we find it good enough to say:

—by means that, in good faith—

—several individuals will come and prove their good faith after having procured abortion, caused the death of a child almost fully developed, and then, abnormal and criminal acts will again be justified.

This is why we ask that these words be added, and the clause would then read:

This section does not apply to a person who, ... being unavoidably prevented from finding a medical practitioner—

By so doing, we specify a most important point since it excludes, as my colleague said a while ago, the quacks and other unscrupulous people that are always ready to render a service to persons in trouble. It often happens that a pregnant woman is momentarily depressed and she sometimes feels compelled to resort to the services of individuals who will appear willing to help her while their sole intention is to extract money from her.

Then they will try to do something which only a doctor is allowed to do. This is why the clause should be amended to read:

This section does not apply to a person who, being unavoidably prevented from finding a medical practitioner, by means that, in good faith, he considers necessary to preserve the life of the mother of a child that has not yet become a human being, causes the death of such child.

Mr. Speaker, I will sum up my views by saying that such a case almost never happens because nature already does things rather well and, generally, there are no particular difficulties.

Thanks to the progress of medicine, a woman who becomes pregnant knows it after a few months. At that time she is already under medical care, and since it almost never happens that a person other than a doctor is called to help a pregnant woman, let us not allow shady individuals to take advantage of the vagueness of this clause to counter precisely the principle we want to incorporate in this legislation.

[Mr. Matte.]

I think we should then add, if this section is approved:

—being unavoidably prevented from finding a medical practitioner—

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question on the amendment moved by Mr. Laprise?

[*English*]

Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those a 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. I declare the motion negatived on division.

Amendment No. 15 (Mr. Laprise) negatived on division.

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. McCleave—

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, may I move this motion on the hon. member's behalf? The hon. member is not here at the moment; he is away on other business.

**Mr. Woolliams (for Mr. McCleave)** moved amendment No. 21:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by inserting in clause 18 after subsection 7 of section 237 on page 44 the following subsection:

"(8) Nothing in this section shall be construed as obliging any hospital to establish a therapeutic abortion committee or any qualified medical practitioner to procure the miscarriage of a female person."

He said: I shall be very brief on this point, Mr. Speaker, because the amendment speaks for itself. It reads:

Nothing in this section shall be construed as obliging any hospital to establish a therapeutic abortion committee or any qualified medical practitioner to procure the miscarriage of a female person.

In other words, there shall be nothing in the Criminal Code that would force a hospital

to set up a special therapeutic abortion committee or to compel a doctor to perform the operation. The amendment is that simple. I think it merely clarifies the law. The witnesses who appeared before the committee—the minister will verify this—pointed out that the rules and regulations which govern hospitals are within the jurisdiction of the provinces; most hospitals come under the jurisdiction of the provinces.

Basically, the suggestion is that the Criminal Code does not and should not require a hospital to set up a committee to deal with this question. A hospital may set up a committee to deal with it, or ask a doctor to carry out the operation, but there should be nothing in the act that forces a hospital to do so. This matter is really clarified by the provincial law, but it is thought that the hon. member's amendment would clarify the position so that hospitals will understand what is intended and that provincial law governs in this regard There is nothing more I need to say. That is what it really means.

• (3:20 p.m.)

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker there are just a couple of questions which I should like the minister to answer. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has touched on them. I refer to the distinction between civil and criminal law, particularly the implication here with regard to the responsibility of hospitals and medical practitioners. I think this is quite important, not only for us. The value of the amendment put forward is that it would make the position of the government in this respect more clear. As the minister knows, there is a general section in the Code, I believe it is section 107, which provides that anyone who fails to obey any act or regulation of parliament is, by inference, guilty of an offence. This would be of some consequence to medical practitioners who are concerned with what their duties are under the law.

Inasmuch as we in this party have taken it upon ourselves to vote on the various clauses and amendments in Bill C-150 as our consciences dictate, I believe that medical practitioners should have a similar freedom. I know what most of them would probably do, but I think they should have that right and freedom. Therefore it becomes incumbent upon the government to indicate what opinion has been given to the minister by his legal officers as to the responsibilities, not only under the criminal but under the civil law, because one of these amendments is obviously drafted in the belief that there may even be a civil responsibility falling upon a hospital or upon a doctor in the case of abortions.

I want to remind the minister of a case of which he may not be aware because the section is not now in the Code. Some years ago there was a provision in the Criminal Code that no civil proceedings could be launched against any person who had been charged with common assault and had suffered a penalty or had been acquitted of the charge. This was distinct from proceedings in respect of charges of grievous or actual bodily harm where civil actions could follow. That particular section dealing with common assault, which no longer appears in the Code, was the subject of varying interpretations by the appellate division in the province of Nova Scotia and, I think, in one other province. The Supreme Court of Canada gave no authoritative decision on the point. It was held in one of these judgments that the federal parliament had no jurisdiction to enact legislation under the guise of the Criminal Code, attempting to amend or change the Criminal Code by saying that civil proceedings could or could not be taken in cases of a possible infraction of the Criminal Code. In other words, the criminal law was to be considered by itself and it was not possible for the federal parliament to go outside the criminal law and to say that once an act had been declared to be a criminal act it should or should not be the subject of civil proceedings.

I am quite confident that a great many medical practitioners and hospitals in this country will be most concerned as to what their legal position will be and what the government is purporting to do in this bill. For example, there is an implication in clause 18 that there is a statutory duty falling upon a medical practitioner or upon a hospital and that the refusal by a medical practitioner or by a hospital to permit to be carried on within the precincts of that hospital or by that medical practitioner the act of abortion, which has been made legal under certain circumstances by amendments to the Criminal Code, might subject either the medical practitioner or the hospital to certain penalties either in the civil law by an action for damages or under the criminal law.

I have my own views on this matter but I bring it up to permit the minister to indicate the government's position. Under the rules under which we operate, what the minister

says in the house is not binding upon any court, but I am sure it will be of some interest to us, and certainly to myself, to know what his view is before I come to a decision on which way I intend to vote on this amendment.

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 21 on the order paper and the related amendments, 22, 23, 31, 39, 40 and 41, purport to exempt from any civil liability hospitals which may fail to set up a therapeutic abortion committee, or a doctor who may refuse to perform a therapeutic abortion, or any practitioner who may refuse to participate in this type of operation. I may say that a therapeutic abortion is only one of a number of situations where conscience may preclude a doctor or a nurse from participating in an operation which is lawful. I might bring to the attention of the house the question of blood transfusion in the case of a doctor who is a Jehovah's Witness. There is the case of a doctor faced with the problem of administering a blood transfusion to a child whose parents refuse consent on the ground that such an operation is contrary to their religious belief. In other cases doctors are often faced with a problem of conscience when they may be called upon to perform a hysterectomy or a tubal ligature following several Caesarean deliveries. There are also other grey areas where questions of conscience arise, even though conflicting views or doubts exist as to the law, for example, in the case of sterilization generally and also organ transplants. So this is not a unique situation for the medical profession.

Also, I should like to draw to the attention of the house the fact that the substance of these amendments does no more than recognize what has actually been happening already in a number of hospitals with respect to therapeutic abortions. We have no evidence that questions of conscience have posed a practical problem.

Getting down to the question of criminal obligation or liability or civil obligation and liability arising from this amendment, let me say briefly that according to the advice I have received there is nothing in clause 18 to which these amendments relate which would in any way impose a criminal obligation or criminal responsibility on a hospital which refused to set up a therapeutic abortion committee or upon a doctor who refused, for reasons of his own personal conscience, to perform such an abortion, or upon a nurse or any other person involved in the medical services who refused to perform or participate in a therapeutic abortion. So there is no additional criminal obligation or liability attaching to the medical profession as a result of clause 18.

Turning now to civil liability, the civil liability of doctors, nurses or hospitals is based on negligence, that is to say, the failure to meet the standard of care owing to the patient. Although the phrase "standard of care" is a common law expression, the same standard of care is required within the civil law as well, and although the philosophical approach to negligence is different from that of the law of delict, in effect a reasonable standard of care is required in both cases. Obviously this standard of care is to some extent affected by legislation, including the Criminal Code, in the sense that a doctor would not be held civilly liable for failure to perform an act which the law prohibits him from performing. Where, however, the act may lawfully be done, as is the case under the proposed amendment to section 237, one of the factors to be taken into account in the event that the question of civil liability arose would obviously be whether or not the patient had been fairly and properly advised of the limitation imposed by conscience on the range of treatment available to the doctor and to the hospital.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Section 237 as amended imposes no duty on the board of a hospital to set up a therapeutic abortion committee; it imposes no duty on any medical practitioner to perform an abortion; it imposes no duty even on a medical practitioner to initiate an application on behalf of a patient. In these circumstances it is not considered necessary to purport to exempt them from duties which are not imposed by the criminal law. On the other hand, if we were to purport to grant such an exemption it might be misleading to the medical profession and unfair to patients, because such a conscience clause, so far as the medical profession is concerned, might tend to obscure the civil obligation of the profession to the patient to ensure that a patient is able to make a free choice as to both her medical adviser and hospital, untrammelled by the limitations on the conscience of her medical adviser or by the policy of a particular hospital. In other words, it is clear that under civil law, in the case of a

hospital not having the facilities or not choosing to have the facilities, or of a doctor precluded by his own conscience from performing such abortions, there might be civil liability attaching to both to advise a patient of her right to go to another hospital and ask for another doctor. But certainly there is no civil liability attaching, as far as we can see, as a result of the operation of the Criminal Code itself.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Am I to take it there is no intention on the part of the government, particularly by this amendment, to vary the rules as to civil responsibility which normally exist between an individual and a hospital or an individual and a doctor, or to prevent provincial laws from operating? This is a sensitive area, as has been illustrated by the events of the last few days and the exchange which took place between the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Hellyer). The minister seemed to think the Prime Minister was trying to lock the country into a constitutional chastity belt despite the fact that the provinces lost their jurisdictional chastity a long time ago. I want to be sure we are safe here.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The hon. member suggests there is a constitutional aspect to this as well. The relationships in civil law between the patient and the doctor, between the patient and the nurse, between the doctor and the hospital, the nurse and the hospital, are relationships falling within the operation of provincial law, the civil law and the constitutional responsibility of the provinces—the subject of statutes which regulate hospitals and the professions. These are properly provincial matters, and this is another reason not to trespass on any of these civil relationships which may be accessory but which are not directly affected by this legislation.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister.

In that case, if a constitutional matter is involved, would it not have been advisable to let the provinces adopt some legislation relating to abortion, and has any consideration been given to such a course of action?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I do not deem it right to use the Criminal Code to infringe upon the constitutional or civil law of a province. According to legal experts, clause 18 does not impose any criminal obligation or responsibility, nor any civil liability. Civil liabilities are determined rather by the civil law and I do not find any advantage in using the Criminal Code to affect civil relations between parties. Such matters come exclusively under provincial jurisdiction.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the minister.

Since this obviously relates to the social aspect, to health, would it not be preferable, before amending the Criminal Code, to hear the views of the provinces on the matter?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that, since civil relations come under another aspect of the law, they are not directly affected by the amendment to clause 18. I see no reason to wait until the provinces have been consulted.

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to support amendment No. 21, proposed by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave), because I myself presented an amendment along those lines. In fact, it is amendment No. 31, which reads as follows:

> Nothing in subsections (4), (5), (6), and (7) shall apply to any group of medical practitioners nor to any medical practitioner, who has refused to proceed with an abortion nor to any member of the hospital staff of a hospital who has refused to take part in an abortion on purely medical grounds or on any other grounds, so that no judicial proceedings may be instituted against them.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment means that no judicial proceedings may be instituted against any group of doctors, any member of the hospital staff of a hospital, or any doctor who has refused to perform an abortion or to take part in one.

The fact that six amendments proposed relate to the same subject shows how important it is to clarify Bill C-150, and particularly clause 18.

There were many questions raised on that point? Gynecologists and physicians have feared that if clause 18 were passed as proposed by the government, the bill could on some occasions coerce those who, for reasons of principles or any others, refuse to perform an abortion.

Then, if a woman asked for an abortion and died during the operation, some legal proceedings could be brought against the hospital or the physician. Such a situation could be quite embarrassing and since they would be liable to legal proceedings, the physicians or hospital authorities would be in a dilemma.

On one hand, there is the conscience and on the other the law which compels us to ignore our beliefs and our conscience. This is dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that if, under section 18, women are given all possible freedon to obtain an abortion, the same freedom should be granted to the physicians or the personnel of any hospital.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Many are concerned about that amendment. Indeed, the Catholic bishops of Canada have recently made a few suggestions, after having thoroughly studied the bill. It is no secret that since the government has proposed amendments to the Criminal Code, especially in connection with abortion, the Catholic bishops of Canada have on several occasions throughly examined that problem.

As for our amendment, the Canadian Bishops' Conference renewed their request to the government and to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) a few days ago, so that the amendment to the Criminal Code would at least respect the freedom of all physicians and hospitals, because this bill could allow proceedings to be taken against them or make them liable to public prosecution.

In my opinion Mr. Speaker, this is of great importance, since the question is whether or not the doctors' and hospitals' freedom is to be respected. I think that such a question should not be put in the house, and least of all be subject to an amendment to the Criminal Code.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, the government should, I think, pass the amendment before the house in order to permit a vote on the matter because I hope that the minister would not want to take this responsibility alone and for his government. He should in that regard respect the freedom of doctors, hospitals and their personnel to perform or not to perform abortions on request.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I have been in this house for ten months, and I am still at a loss to find a way to have our arguments taken into consideration.

And what is even more discouraging is to realize that everything has been decided in advance. Nothing is more depressing for us than to realize that all we do is bring forward, for posterity, arguments which we did not make up ourselves, but found by referring to appropriate sources.

[Mr. Laprise.]

Since this matter deals first of all with medicine and the first signs of life, we consulted scientists and gynaecologists who explained to us what is a human being and at what time it appears in the human foetus.

Medical practitioners explained to us why they objected to abortion, and that is why we ask, in this amendment which I fully support, that gynecologists, whose opinion we must take into serious consideration, are not subjected to such an obligation.

We did not invent our arguments. We consulted the Association of the Hospital Medical Boards of the province of Quebec Inc., whose opinion should not be taken without due consideration.

Its submission was made to us in January 1969, and it reads as follows:

> You will find herewith the opinion of the Association of Hospital Medical Boards of the province of Quebec on the matter of abortion, now being considered in the house.
>
> This report represents the general opinion of medical practitioners in the hospitals of the province.
>
> We hope that this will enlighten you so that you may take a fair and equitable position towards every citizen of our country.

Mr. Speaker, an argument based on such an opinion deserves consideration, it seems to me.

In this brief, the Association requests, and I quote:

> The Q.A.H.M.B. agrees:
> —that an amendment to the existing text of the Criminal Code be submitted.

Mr. Speaker, we moved many amendments. To prove that this is an important matter, we moved seven amendments on this subject. The minister said a moment ago, that this is not a problem, since we are enacting a legislation based on an established situation in hospitals. As a matter of fact, I do not know where the minister has obtained this information, but when an association of hospitals makes a statement like the one I just quoted, I suggest the minister should think about it seriously. Perhaps he has considered only the whole country. As far as I am concerned, I am not speaking here for the whole country, although the documents we have received prove that the situation is almost the same throughout Canada.

But as regards the province of Quebec, the Association of Hospital Medical Boards of the province of Quebec agrees:

> —that the procedure for the consideration of cases by therapeutic abortion committees in every hospital be accepted.

—that the doctors who decide, after serious consideration within their hospital committee, to approve a therapeutic abortion be no longer considered guilty of that act under the Criminal Code.

In effect, it is the safeguard of their integrity and of their profession that it is sought to ensure. I go on quoting:

We believe that scientific medical research alone can bring the true solution to this problem, and we favour the setting up of any study committee.

One can see, Mr. Speaker, that these are not ordinary men speaking, but real professionals. And they are telling us that medical experts alone can express their views on that question. But if we decide to pass a legislation, even though the doctors themselves ask that we should not legislate now, because scientific and medical research are still not advanced enough, we will be disregarding the advice of these experienced men.

The report goes on, and I quote:

—that abortion, in the present state of medical science, is still considered killing a human being; that every doctor or hospital should be free to refuse to take part in that medical practice.

That is the very purpose of the amendment before us. After having studied this bill, doctors considered all that had been said on the subject for the last few months. This is the reason why they thought fit to advise those who will have to make a decision on the course to follow. I am reading on:

—that this technique where the life of a human being (foetus) is at stake, the decision must not be left to the patient alone.

—We are against a bill which would give rise to false hopes among the population.

We furthermore ask that hospital, authorized to perform therapeutic abortions, be appointed by medical associations in every province to ensure the quality of the established standards.

Mr. Speaker, the question I was putting earlier to the hon. minister was precisely presenting the same view point. We are dealing with the public health, which is a provincial responsibility. And if this legislation is contrary to the set standards, the mentality and the established rules according to the views of the doctors of a particular province, especially in the case of Quebec, it is undoubtedly going against current opinion.

This is another reason for doctors to object, and of course I fully support such an attitude.

And the Association concludes as follows:

• (3:50 p.m.)

This is why the Q.A.H.M.B. is against the present text of the amendment C-195 and wants it to be amended in order to restrict its provisions to the cases where the mother's life is seriously jeopardized.



Mr. Speaker, when we examine the amendment requiring that nothing in the clause be construed so as to make compulsory for a hospital to establish a committee dealing with therapeutic abortion or for a qualified medical practitioner to procure the miscarriage of a female person, we can see the tremendous importance of that amendment. Why? Because it deals with the individuals who are most intimately involved in the problem. I refer, of course to the medical practioners themselves. When physicians demand to be protected by us, we should consider their request seriously.

I am told that the situation never arises, that an accomplished fact is merely being sanctioned; that the attitude of Catholic hospitals is being explained; that we live in a pluralistic society. We recognize all that.

Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing here with a matter of religion, but one of conscience. It is a question of mentality. Why not respect the various ways of seeing things? I repeat that we should follow the advice given to us, almost pathetically, by the doctors themselves who are trying to make us understand that we are trespassing on their grounds.

We have dealt only with the social aspect of the question, when the only thing that really matters in fact is whether or not one should approve abortion.

It is imperative that we should know whether we are dealing with a human being or not, whether or not there is murder when the foetus is killed. Doctors or scientists only can tell us that.

Now, they themselves tell us to be careful. They say that the progress of medicine is such that we must prevent major errors being committed by legislating on matters which, not only do not concern us, but concern only the doctor and his patient.

To go back to the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards, and more specifically to the brief it presented on the omnibus bill. For over 20 years now, that Association has represented hospital doctors in that province. We are therefore not dealing with just anybody, not with the members of the Ralliement créditiste, nor layment in this regard. The medical board is the organization which, in every hospital, groups all the doctors who practice there.

Recently, following the introduction of the government bill on abortion, this Association consulted all its members, by writing to them, or on the occasion of meetings called to

discuss this bill. The directors of the Association studied all the opinions expressed and they would be glad to submit their conclusions on abortion and on this bill.

We do not base them on the opinions of a couple of doctors, or on those of a small group but on that of all the doctors of a province as a whole, which is, in itself, a nation. Are we going to disregard all that? It would be far better, Mr. Speaker, to grant the provinces the right to legislate on that matter, in spite of the Criminal Code. Let Quebec become independent, if it has to! If we are to accept everything that is going on here, within this chamber which is on the way to becoming a modern Sodom and Gomorrha, I understand better still those who promote the independence of Quebec and want all the Quebecers to be sole judges of what they have to do, according to their own way of thinking.

Such are, Mr. Speaker, the arguments that come to my mind following this brief submitted by all the doctors of Quebec as a whole, a brief simply pooh-poohed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner).

The doctors of the Quebec hospitals believe that any abortion is a homicide, that the foetus is a human being. Should therefore people who hold such a belief be compelled to perform abortion? That is what we want to prevent by the proposed amendment. I cannot help thinking, Mr. Speaker, how strange it is that something which appears to me so logical, so sensible and so clear will of course be rejected. Nothing could be more stupid.

I revert to what I said at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, namely, that the problem is to find means to convince those people. I have been wondering about that for ten months, for we refuse to believe what the newspapers said last week, to wit, that most people favour abortion. We have received indications to the contrary as late as this morning, at least from the province of Quebec.

I am more and more convinced that sooner or later those opposing the controversial sections of Bill C-150, even those who, at the present time, yield to Trudeau madness, Trudeaumania or anything that issues from Trudeau this or Trudeau that, and who, for that very reason, have up to now deemed it appropriate to approve abortion, will in the end endorse our opinion.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said earlier about the resignation of the French president that politicians' careers were short-lived.

[Mr. Matte.]

It seems that a political career is not so short-lived! For him a 10 year period is short, because he expects himself to remain in office for at least 10 years. Mr. Speaker, I do not think he will do so because, before 10 years, we shall already have noticed the disastrous effects of the decisions we are about to take in the house. It will take much less time to realize we were mistaken in legalizing abortion, on which we did not have enough information, and in failing to follow the advice of great scientists.

That is why we will be accused of playing politics, of filibustering and of making a political football of this issue. They are all wrong because, in fact, all our arguments are based on medical science. Let us stop shifting the problem and considering only its social aspect. By legalizing abortion it is sought to safeguard the practitioners' prerogatives, rather than discuss the social aspect of the problem.

It is sad to see a young girl pregnant. It is not very interesting either to find that a mother with too many children has not enough money to raise them properly. Such considerations are reasonable but they have nothing to do with the subject now under discussion.

• (4:00 p.m.)

What we want to determine now is, whether abortion is something normal or whether it is homicide. In our opinion, of course, it is homicide. We did not consider exclusively, however, our religious beliefs. We wanted to find out what the greatest authorities had to say and we know now that medicine and science are entirely on our side.

According to the present teaching of the medical science, the foetus is a living human being which has the right to live, like every other human being. Even from the legal point of view, the foetus is already considered as a full human being, since it can become an heir and since the State still considers non therapeutic abortion as a crime punishable by life imprisonment.

It is admitted by all serious gynaecologists that the cases where therapeutic abortion would really save the life of the mother have become extremely rare thanks to the progress of science in this field.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, as I understand the principle of this amendment, it is to protect the position of people who may be involved with a request for an abortion, and to protect the position of those people who have a conscientious objection to carrying out abortions.

Amendment No. 21, which is before us at the present time, deals with the position of hospitals as institutions and also with the position of medical practitioners. On the basis of the rulings handed down by Your Honour on Friday, as set out in the Special Notice Paper, I note that consideration of amendment 21 will dispose of amendments 22, 23, 31, 39, 40 and 41. Several of these amendments which will be covered by amendment 21 make reference to the position of hospital staff and personnel and make some attempt to protect them. The point was noted on Friday when the procedural ruling was under discussion that in effect amendment 21 did not cover the hospital staff and personnel who were referred to, particularly in amendments 31, 41 and one other.

I am sorry that I did not hear all of the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) with respect to why he maintained that there is no need for this amendment No. 21. I am not in a position to comment on his remarks with regard to this point. While there may be some cause for protecting hospitals as institutions and also medical practitioners who may have conscientious objections to carrying out a therapeutic abortion, there is a third class of people who are in a more vulnerable position than either hospitals or medical practitioners. I refer, of course, to hospital staff. These people have no protection under the law, either in terms of professional status or employment, if they have a conscientious objection to participating in a therapeutic abortion. I feel that complete coverage should be provided to all groups of people under the proposed law. And that there should also be reference to hospital staff. Consequently I move the following amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Surrey (Mr. Mather), who has agreed to second this amendment as a courtesy:

That the proposed subsection (8) be amended by adding thereto the following words: "or any member of a hospital staff to assist in procuring such miscarriage."

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I would like to make a few remarks regarding the admissibility of this amendment, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct your attention to the new Standing Order. I think it is important for the house to receive some guidance from Your Honour, particularly since this constitutes the first real test for the Standing Order affecting the report stage of a bill. I draw your attention to Standing Order 75 (5) which appears at page 80 of the new Standing Orders. It reads as follows:

If, not later than twenty-four hours prior to the consideration of a report stage, written notice is given of any motion to amend, delete, insert or restore any clause in a bill, it shall be printed on a notice paper.

• (4:10 p.m.)

It is in accordance with that rule that 44 amendments were set out on the notice paper. Then if we go on to Standing Order 75(8) we see that it reads as follows:

When the order of the day for the consideration of a report stage is called, any amendment of which notice has been given in accordance with section (5) of this order shall be open to debate and amendment.

As I read this Standing Order its purpose would seem to be to limit debate to those amendments of which notice has been properly given in accordance with Standing Order 75(5). I recognize that 75(8) says, "shall be open to debate and amendment". This seems to imply that an amendment to an amendment under 75(5), of which notice has been given and which has been placed on the order paper, may be in order. I would submit to Your Honour, however, that there is another part to this Standing Order, 75(7), which contemplates an amendment as to form only. It reads as follows:

An amendment, in relation to form only in a government bill, may be proposed by a Minister of the Crown without notice, but debate thereon may not be extended to the provisions of the clause or clauses to be amended.

Then there is the following note:

The purpose of the section is to facilitate the incorporation into a bill of amendments of a strictly consequential nature flowing from the acceptance of other amendments. No waiver of notice would be permitted in relation to any amendment which would change the intent of the bill, no matter how slightly, beyond the effect of the initial amendment.

My submission to Your Honour is that that note underlines the purpose of Standing Order 75, namely, that once all relevant amendments have been placed on the order paper, once the debate has begun under Standing Order 75(8), and once the Speaker has listened to argument in respect of admissibility and relevancy, the house is precluded from going beyond the scope of those amendments. The obvious reason is it would be open to hon.

members to move subamendments and thereby escape the provisions of Standing Order 75(5).

I would urge Your Honour to interpret this rule strictly. Otherwise the full import and purpose of the rule could be circumvented and amendments made on the floor of the house to any amendments which Your Honour has already seen on the notice paper. I would think the only freedom the house and, with respect, the Speaker have, is to look at consequential amendments as to form resulting from a prior amendment.

For these reasons I would urge Your Honour to refuse this amendment and hold it to be out of order. Otherwise it will be open to hon. members to speak to every subamendment of every amendment. If that were to be the case I suggest that the desire to proceed on an orderly basis would be defeated.

**Mr. Woolliams:** May I speak to this point, Mr. Speaker. I think the difficulty Your Honour may have is in respect of Standing Order 75(8) which states:

When the order of the day for the consideration of a report stage is called, any amendment of which notice has been given in accordance with section (5) of this order shall be open to debate and amendment.

The interpretation of this would seem to be that an amendment may be amended without notice, but if we look at what is before us it is an amendment that proposed section 8 be amended by adding thereto certain words. This is one occasion when I am on the side of the Minister of Justice in respect of the interpretation of the rules. This is not a motion that the amendment be amended but that subsection 8 be amended. It would be like bringing in an amendment to any clause at this stage.

If the hon. member had wished to move that amendment 21 be amended, he would have to move a substantive amendment to the amendment, but at this time he is seeking to amend a clause of the bill. I do not believe the rules were ever intended to be interpreted in this manner. I think Your Honour would be stretching the point very far if you permitted this. In fact, if you did I believe that by changing a few words I could move the amendment which was ruled out the other day.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one of those who do not think that either the main amendment now before the house or the subamendment that has been moved is really necessary. I do contend, however, that the hon. member for Regina East has the right to move an amendment at this time and that the amendment he has proposed is in order under the rules. I would point out the fact that on Friday of last week, when the whole question of procedure was debated at some length, the hon. member for Regina East specifically asked His Honour whether it would be possible to move an amendment at this stage and was told by the Speaker that provided amendments were in order they could be moved.

Although the relevant citations have all been read I think they should be emphasized. I draw attention in particular to section 8 of Standing Order 75, which is very clear and very explicit. It states:

When the order of the day for the consideration of a report stage is called, any amendment of which notice has been given in accordance with section (5) of this order shall be open to debate and amendment.

What is before Your Honour at this point is the consideration of amendment No. 21 of which notice was given as called for under section 5 of Standing Order 75. What the hon. member for Regina East is endeavouring to do is to amend amendment No. 21.

**Mr. Woolliams:** He does not say that.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It is perfectly true he could have added a few words. He could have said that the amendment be amended by adding words to the proposal section 8 which is set out in the amendment, but surely it is not always necessary to multiply words when the meaning is clear. There is not before us something simply called section 8. There is before us an amendment which happens to have in it a proposed new section 8. The wording of my hon. friend's amendment proposes that the proposed new section 8, which is part of amendment 21 that we are now debating, be amended by adding certain words to it. I submit that is completely in line with the provisions and requirements of section 8 of Standing Order 75.

May I say to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice that I think he is on thin ice when he tries to rely on section 7. Section 7 does not relate to amendments that are on the order paper. It relates to a possible amendment to the bill itself made necessary because of something that has been done on the floor of the house in relation to other clauses. I do not like trading on the fact that I was on the committee and therefore know how much we went over all of this, but I may say we did

feel that if we did not put in something like section 7 a situation could develop whereby amendments could be moved to various clauses of a bill, one of which might pass—it would be a red letter day if it did—and then it would be clear that certain other clauses in the bill would have to be changed slightly in consequence of the first change. If we did not provide for that situation I think we would be stuck with the impossibility of doing this because we have a rule which says that at the report stage we cannot debate or discuss any clauses except those concerning which notice of amendment has been given.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The purpose of section 7 of Standing Order 75 is simply to permit consequential amendments to other parts of a bill. It has nothing to do with the rule set out in section 8, namely, the right when an amendment is properly before the house, as amendment No. 21 is, to move an amendment to the amendment. That is what my friend the hon. member for Regina East has done, and I submit his amendment is in order.

I sympathize warmly with the Minister of Justice when he says that if this kind of thing can be done we will probably be here until August or September, but that does not invalidate the rule. Let me say to the minister that under the new rules there could have been a dozen amendments put down at the report stage to every one of the 120 clauses in this bill. This would mean something like 14,000 amendments and we might be here for a very long time.

**Mr. McCleave:** It would amount to 1,400.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It would be 1,400, I am sorry. I did my arithmetic very quickly.

**Mr. McCleave:** It sounds better.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It seems to me this is clearly what we provided in the rules. The rule of relevancy must also apply. My hon. friend's amendment has to be relevant to what has been proposed in the main amendment before us, but certainly his right to move an amendment is something we anticipated when we drew up these rules, and I think they are quite clear on that point.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** If you will recognize me again on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The minister has already spoken. If he wishes to add further arguments I think he would have to do so by consent. I see one or two others who wish to enlighten the Chair. Perhaps the minister feels his remarks have been misunderstood. There is provision for an explanation on that ground.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Apparently there is agreement on the part of the house to allow the minister to speak.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for that agreement, but I do not want this taken as meaning I waive the right of an hon. member to speak more than once on a point of order. I accept the agreement on the part of the house and thank hon. members.

On this point of order I have three short arguments. Let me first underline what the hon. member for Calgary North said so ably. Even with a liberal interpretation of Standing Order 75(8), surely by the wording of the amendment it must be clearly an amendment to the amendment, in this case to amendment No. 21. What this subamendment tends to do is to amend the bill itself. It goes beyond amendment No. 21 even on a liberal interpretation of Standing Order 75(8), which suggests that the amendment must be an amendment to amendment No. 21. This is an amendment to section 8 as proposed in the bill, and it goes well beyond the scope of the Standing Order.

The second point I wish to draw to the attention of Your Honour is the seriousness of the ruling you will have to make. Standing Order 75(5) taken together with 75(8) limits the debate to any amendment printed in the order paper and submitted 24 hours before the debate begins. If amendments to amendments are to be allowed, then the limiting effect of Standing Order 75(5) and 75(8) would be completely bypassed. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has admitted, we would then be completely out of control. I suggest to Your Honour that Standing Order 75(5) is restrictive and taken together with 75(8) must limit the debate to those amendments on the notice paper.

My third argument is that if you look at the wording of the hon. member's subamendment you will see it really proposes to include the members of hospital staffs. These words are in fact included in some of the other amendments which have been grouped by

Your Honour for disposition at the same time. You will notice that amendments Nos. 21, 22, 23, 31, 39, 40 and 41 are grouped together. On reading them you will see that what the hon. member is trying to do by tacking on this amendment is already proposed in several of these amendments grouped together with amendment No. 21 for discussion and voting purposes. I would think it is redundant on this ground.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the point of order concerning the amendment moved by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) and, with his approval, I would like to point out that six amendments have been put together for the purpose of the discussion dealing with the amendment No. 21 moved by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave).

But if we read carefully the amendment moved by the latter, we realize that the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina East is not included in the amendment No. 21 which we are discussing at the present time. This is one of the reasons which, I think, justify the amendment proposed by the member for Regina East.

Now I should like to raise another point. There is no subsection (8) in clause 18 of Bill C-150. Therefore neither the hon. member for Regina East nor any other member could move a subamendment thereto.

Mr. Speaker, one can read the following in Standing Order 75(8), and I quote:

> When the order of the day for the consideration of a report stage is called, any amendment of which notice has been given in accordance with section (5) of this order shall be open to debate and amendment.

The hon. member's subamendment is therefore quite in order in my opinion and so as to allay the fears of the Minister of Justice, who denies the right to move that subamendment, I would say that he seems to want to have his bill passed as soon as possible, at any cost and without accepting any amendment. And what he fears the most is to see a filibuster, as he precisely said when he spoke the first time.

Mr. Speaker, I had myself moved a similar amendment, which I quote:

> —any member of the hospital staff of a hospital who has refused to take part in an abortion on purely medical grounds or on any other grounds, so that no judicial proceedings may be instituted against them.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

As a matter of fact, among the six amendments we are studying at the same time, I have one which includes hospital staff, but the same cannot be said of the amendment before us.

That is why I believe the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Regina East is in order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia):** Mr. Speaker, I feel that what I am really doing is reiterating the third argument put forward by the Minister of Justice. It is important that we should look at Standing Order 75 (10) because in relation to this specific amendment it states:

> Mr. Speaker shall have power to select or combine amendments or clauses to be proposed at the report stage and may, if he thinks fit, call upon any member who has given notice of an amendment to give such explanation of the subject of the amendment—

I suggest that in essence this determination has already been made by Mr. Speaker in that he has grouped amendment No. 21 with, among others, amendment No. 31 which contains the specific wording referred to by the hon. member for Regina East. I suggest, with respect, that so far as this amendment is concerned Mr. Speaker has already made a ruling under Standing Order 75(10).

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, I want to support the proposals of the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) who intend to propose a subamendment to sub-section (8) that the government wants to add to section 18 of the bill now under study.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the reasons referred to by the hon. minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) are not valid as far as procedure is concerned and the reason is quite simple. It is because we have to discuss a bill which contains 120 clauses and we have come to the report stage of the committee.

Like several other members, we moved amendments to modify the bill and make it acceptable. However, Mr. Speaker, as the debate proceeds, we can see the facts in their true light, at least on this side of the house, and that enabled the hon. member for Regina East to see that there is still a gap even in the amendments designed to improve the bill.

Consequently, in the light of the debate, the hon. member for Regina East, pursuant to standing order 75(8), moved an amendment to improve the bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, it belongs to you to take a most important decision since the minister wants to speed up the debate, not caring what the members of the opposition have to say, rejecting any amendment and referring to clause which have nothing to do with the amendment. However, Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With respect, I do not want to allow that remark to go unchallenged on the record. My purpose in intervening was not to limit debate in any way but to ask for an interpretation of the rules of the house. I would appreciate it if the hon. member would stay on the point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I would like to say at this point that I think we should limit the discussion to the specific point of order raised by the Minister of Justice, which has subsequently been commented on by other hon. members. I think that as much as possible we should avoid going beyond that point of order and the reasons why it should or should not have been raised. An important point is now before the house. I might point out to hon. members that I have given this matter a great deal of thought and am almost on the verge of giving a ruling. I do not want to curtail discussion, but I think any discussion we have should relate to the point of order originally raised.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for being so lenient. I was just coming to this, in order to explain our point of view.

On the one hand, we can see the minister's position and, on the other, Standing Order 75(8) clearly states the bill shall be open to debate and amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there are about 44 amendments before us—that was foreseen—it seems to me that we were free to move a motion under Standing Order 75(5) which reads:

—any motion to amend, delete, insert or restore any clause in a bill, it shall be printed on a notice paper.

Now, Standing Orders do not indicate that once the motions have been presented, and a twenty-four hours written notice has been given and put on the Order paper, that any amendment may be accepted. I think that on the contrary sub-section (8) specifies that it is permissible to move amendments in the light of the debate.

Therefore I think, Mr. Speaker, for this reason among others, that this amendment is most acceptable and will be approved by the house.

[*English*]

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I say just a brief word with respect to two points that have been made from the other side of the house. First, may I deal with the point emphasized by the hon. member for Sarnia when he argued that Mr. Speaker's grouping of a number of amendments, as he did on Friday, ruled out this kind of subamendment. May I point out that on Friday, as recorded in *Hansard* on page 7972, at the very time when Mr. Speaker said that amendments Nos. 21, 22, 23, 31, 39, 40 and 41 were being grouped and marshalled, the hon. member for Regina East rose and asked Mr. Speaker a question on this very point. As a matter of fact, he said that these amendments deal with the position of medical practitioners, staff and other personnel who may be involved in abortions. In other words, at that very point, when it was relevant, he asked Mr. Speaker whether it would be possible to move an amendment to deal with one of these points. Mr. Speaker's reply was:

Of course, this will have to be considered when the hon. member suggests these changes to the house. It may be possible to move subamendments provided that they are in order.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** "It may be possible", and it is decided when the question is raised. Mr. Speaker did not decide it.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Of course he did not decide it, because the amendment had not been drafted; he did not have it in his hands. My point is that it is in order generally, because of what Mr. Speaker said, to decide that a particular amendment, because of its form, may or may not be in order. But to assert that it is not in order is, I suggest, quite false. I submit that the hon. member for Regina East protected himself by making that point on Friday.

The other point is that the Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Calgary North said two or three times that the hon. member is trying to go behind the bill amending the Criminal Code by seeking to amend subclause 8 of the bill. There is no subclause 8 in the

bill. Clause 18 of the bill has only seven subclauses. Amendment No. 21 has been ruled in order, which permits the attempt to add a subclause 8 to the clause that is in the bill. The hon. member for Regina East is not trying to go behind the amendment or the bill; he is not trying to get something into the Criminal Code through the back door; he is dealing specifically with an amendment that is before the house under the provisions of section 5 of Standing Order 75. The hon. member is claiming his right under section 8 of Standing Order 75 to propose an amendment. I think his right to propose an amendment at this stage is beyond question. The only question that has to be decided is whether the form and the substance of his amendment are in order, and in particular whether his amendment is relevant. I for one think it is.

**Mr. Burton:** Mr. Speaker, without adding to the discussion needlessly, I would just like to note—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I was just going to recognize the hon. member for Champlain. I will then recognize the hon. member for Regina East.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss briefly, the usefulness and the wisdom of sub-section (8) now under discussion.

Indeed, amendment No. 21 might not be entirely acceptable to the minister unless it were slightly amended. Therefore, I believe that the possibility of amending the bill has been considered, as pointed out a while ago by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin).

In the past, I have seen the house clarify some particular matter. An amendment has been moved; it was slightly amended and the government agreed to it. So it was quite appropriate to consider the possibility of slightly amending an amendment under subsection (8), in order to make it perhaps more acceptable.

In my opinion, we should not make the mistake of creating a factual situation for the duration of the debate on this bill, whereas standing orders provide that any amendment, and I quote:

—shall be open to debate and amendment.

The rules could not be any clearer.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, if I may, I should like to mention one point.

As recorded on page 7963 of the official report for Friday last, April 25, Your Honour suggested a slight change to amendment No. 28 in order to improve it, and it was agreed to.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. That point has already been raised.

**Mr. Burton:** Mr. Speaker, in drafting this subamendment I attempted to keep the wording as simple as possible in order to concentrate on the purpose of the subamendment. However, if weight is given to the proposition of the hon. member for Calgary North that this is in fact an amendment rather than a subamendment, I would certainly be prepared, with the permission of the house and the consent of my seconder, to add a preamble to my subamendment so that it would read:

I move that amendment 21 be amended by adding the following words to proposed subsection (8)—

I would be prepared to do that if that is in fact the difficulty involved in accepting the subamendment I have moved.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. If there are no further submissions to be made I think I can deal with this question. I have considered the two points raised, the original point of order raised by the Minister of Justice whether or not an amendment to a motion moved under the provisions of Standing Order 75 is admissible, and the point raised by the hon. member for Calgary North whether in fact this amendment meets the criteria long established for the admissibility of amendments, namely, whether it is consistent with and relevant to the motions. My ruling on whether or not the amendment is admissible as an amendment, namely, whether it is consistent and relevant to the motion, is that it is. On those grounds I do not think it would be necessary to make any changes in its wording.

On the other point, I realize the importance of the point raised by the Minister of Justice. It seems to me that Standing Order 75 is very specific. It does provide for debate and amendment. I listened to the Minister of Justice with a great deal of care, as I always do, but I feel that this Standing Order is declaratory and is perfectly clear. Under the circumstances I am bound to rule that the amendment is admissible. Is the house ready for the question?

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Perhaps I could say a few words on my amendment and the subamendment just accepted by Your Honour. First, I should like to thank the hon. member for Calgary North for filling in for me with an explanatory speech when I was not able to be here at the time when this amendment was called. My concern arises out of the fact that a good many of the witnesses who appeared before the committee or who made submissions had raised the point in committee or in correspondence with the members of the committee. They expressed a fear that since abortions will become legal under certain circumstances, some duty will lie upon hospitals or medical personnel to carry out abortions.

I heard the minister's argument in committee and I have been given the gist of his argument earlier this afternoon. But an ounce of caution is sometimes worth a ton of cure, and I believe that the words I have suggested will allay these fears and make it absolutely clear that these institutions and doctors cannot in any way be forced to perform abortions. I think the strongest argument I have in that regard is the definition of the word "board" in new subsection (6) (c) at page 43 of Bill C-150. It reads as follows:

> "board" means the board of governors, management or directors, or the trustees, commission or other person or group of persons having the control and management of an accredited or approved hospital;

This debate has so far proceeded on the assumption that control and management would be vested in local hands, people aware of the conditions in the community. But I suggest that the definition of "board" as proposed in this legislation is broad enough so that a provincial body such as a hospital commission could assume control of all hospitals in a province. Therefore my fear is that while we have tried to put in the legislation some safeguard against hospitals being required to carry out therapeutic abortions if it is against the beliefs of those who have established or are running the hospitals, it could be circumvented by the definition of the word "board". I suggest that it would be perfectly possible for any provincial government, through a hospital commission, to assume over-all direction of accredited or approved hospitals. I think this fear can be overcome by the house adopting the subamendment proposed by the hon. member for Regina East and my own amendment.

One of the facts of life regarding Canadian hospitals is that many of these institutions are established by groups whose religious principles are very firmly against abortion. I would not want to see them in any way inhibited from establishing even more hospitals as our nation develops and our northern areas are opened up. In the past they have been very good in sending religious groups to provide services that it was otherwise impossible to provide. But unless we adopt some safeguard such as I am suggesting the future development of hospitals, particularly in our northern areas, might be inhibited.

I believe generally in the principle of abortion because I think an individual should be free to choose whether or not she wishes an abortion to be performed on her. If by spiritual inclination she is opposed to it, then the remedy is entirely within the hands of the unfortunate woman. But when we move to the broader field involving hospitals, doctors and medical personnel, we have to add something to the legislation to establish clearly that a person cannot knock at the door of a hospital or at the door of a doctor asking that an abortion be performed.

Finally, when I drafted the amendment I made it parallel to new subsection 7 as it appears in the legislation before us. I also think the constitutional aspect is not affected. Subsection 7 does not eliminate any other steps that would have to be taken before an abortion could be procured. I am carrying it a step farther and ensuring that no hospital or medical person can be put in the position of being legally required to carry out or procure the abortion of a woman. For these reasons I have presented the amendment, and I gladly welcome the subamendment proposed by the hon. member for Regina East.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to support the proposed amendment to the clause on abortion.

In my opinion, any measure to promote the family deserves careful consideration. I know that there are nowadays a great number of wives who accept their role as a mother and who endeavour by all possible means to preserve the life of their unborn child.

Now, as the family is the foundation of society, some special action should be taken to help it, because in my opinion, human beings, human resources, are the greatest wealth of our country.

So much so that we rightly ask ourselves what would be the value of any other material resources of the country, if there were no human beings to use it.

Society spends huge sums in order to save and protect human life. In universities, scientists are carrying out research to discover some ways to cure fatal diseases.

Mr. Speaker, a man can conceive all sorts of projects in all kinds of fields, but he will never succeed by himself in reviving a dead person. And if we are here as human beings, it is not on account of our own power, but as the result of the respect which our parents have shown for life, in spite of the difficulties and hardships which they experienced.

Mr. Speaker, if we become conscious of the material advantages which science makes available to the nation, it is obvious that clause 18 of Bill C-150 now before us is based on wickedness or falsehoods.

It is true that families and children have less and less place in modern society, but I am convinced that life has an exceptional value, one that cannot be measured, and that all necessary means must be taken to preserve it even for those who cannot be seen but who are known to exist.

And I must congratulate the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) who proposes the following amendment:

Nothing in this section shall be construed as obliging any hospital to establish a therapeutic abortion committee or any qualified medical practitioner to procure the miscarriage of a female person.

Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 21, proposed on April 14, 1969, is most appropriate, if we refer to some excerpts of the 880 pages of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the standing Committee on Health and Welfare.

From page 46, we refer to an article of Dr. Isabelle, on the inefficiency of therapeutic abortions.

Dr. Gaston Isabelle: —Those committees (for the study of abortion cases) were tested in the United States in the last four or five years.

And Dr. Isabelle quotes:

A few years ago, a number of hospitals set up Abortion Review Committees which were normally composed of specialists, in order to examine such requests of abortion. Generally, the committees produced unsatisfactory results for the following reasons:

In the same line of thought, Dr. Patrick Beirne, states at page 504, and I quote:

Just as individuals may have liberal or conservative views on assistance, the same applies in the case of abortion committees. And the general public quickly perceives the difference between liberal and conservative committees.

In New York, two hospitals, a few streets away from one another, have abortion committees. In the first one, there is one therapeutic abortion per 16,000 deliveries. In the other, there is one abortion per 20 births. So committees are not guaranteeing us that our own interpretation of what seems a step for the public weal will be respected. One committee is not enough. I think that clearer information should be given.

Mr. Speaker, here is a text we received in January 1968 from the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards regarding the bill under consideration. It is not recent, as can be seen. I quote:

At our inquiry we noted that most of the medical offices and boards of directors of hospitals in Quebec officially and formally protested against the establishment of therapeutic abortion committees in their own hospitals. Because of professional ethics and of the tendency constantly recorded in their profession, hospital doctors are greatly reluctant to belong to such committees and moreover they refuse themselves to make any therapeutic abortion.

It must be noted that such legislation does not take into account religious and moral convictions of a great many doctors and hospitals afraid of becoming liable to legal prosecution for not having committeed what they consider a crime against their professional ethics. But are doctors not always trying to save their patients from death?

And on page 2 of the same report, one can read:

—any abortion purporting to improve the health or the well-being of the mother or to prevent the birth of a malformed baby becomes a social act of mercy killing. If it is permitted to kill such a baby when he is in his mother's bosom, why should it not be allowed when he is out of it. However, if abortion is performed when the life of the mother is endangered by pregnancy, it can then be considered not as euthanasia but as a case of self-defence. Self-defence does not imply necessarily the presence of an unjust aggressor. To warrant self-defence, however, there must be some proportion between the method of defence and the act of aggression, and the offensive act must be the only possible method of defending oneself. But specific medical information pertaining to cases when, in order to save the mother's life, it is obviously necessary to kill the foetus is extremely rare, according to all medical practitioners. Since such cases are unfrequent, one can even wonder whether a permissible legislation is warranted.

A further excerpt on page 3 of the same brief reads as follows:

Because this legislation may lead to abuse, the Association of Hospital Medical Boards of the province of Quebec objects to the legalization of therapeutic abortion when the only ground is the health or well-being of the mother.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Moreover, the Association is unreservedly against Bill C-150 on abortion as introduced by the government.

On page 4, among the reasons given, we find this one, and I quote:

Psychiatric symptoms

Psychiatric symptoms justifying abortion are rejected by the majority of medical practitioners and psychiatrists; however, some psychiatrists find some limited indications. The effects of abortion on a woman are often nefarious and may cause feelings of guilt and hostility. We should ask ourselves if by trying to solve one problem we are not creating another.

The conclusion of the submission says; and I quote:

Faced by these considerations the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards still has the impression that the federal government wanted to solve this complex problem by quick legislation which seems to solve everything but which in fact aggravates the problem of illegal abortion.

The Q.A.H.M.B. considers that this problem must be studied from a medical point of view and finds it necessary to approach the abortion question only after careful scientific studies ... and before any other government proposal is introduced.

In their view only a royal commission of inquiry could make an adequate study.

Dr. Robert Lavigne, 1010 Tassé Street, Ville St-Laurent.

Mr. Speaker, the medical profession of the province of Quebec has clearly taken a very careful stand in this regard. I hope that having heard the opinion submitted by the Association all hon. members will decide in favour of this amendment which I gladly approve without reservation.

**Mr. Romuald Rodrigue (Beauce):** Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment moved by the member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) as well as amendments Nos. 22, 23, 29, 31, 39, 40 and 41 on the same subject.

In an article published in *L'Action* on April 19, one could read the following:

Under the amendments proposed by Bill C-150 known as the omnibus bill, abortions will be allowed when the medical board of a State approved hospital feels that the physical or mental health of the mother is endangered unless the operation is performed.

The argument of pluralism is often put forward. Throughout those countries where abortion has recently been discussed, whether it be in England, in the United States, in France or in Canada, the arguments are much the same. Those who favour relaxing the law do so in the name of the pluralism of the given society and of social convenience.

I am not against giving as much freedom as possible to everyone, against respecting all creeds, and the conscience of everyone, but it seems to me some consideration should be given to respecting the conscience of doctors, their religious and moral beliefs, for there are still doctors who work in hospitals who have professional conscience.

To my mind, the purpose of this section would be to protect the doctors, and other persons who work in hospitals and help the doctors perform their operations, who refuse to participate in abortions.

Because of professional ethics and the constant orientation of their profession, many doctors will refuse to perform that type of operation for several reasons. Many doctors are afraid to be exposed to legal proceedings for having refused to perform what they consider as murder and contrary to their professional ethics.

It should also be noted that the bill does not take into account the personal convictions of many doctors and hospitals. We believe all doctors always strive to protect the life of their patients. It is no secret that doctors constantly receive requests which, very often, are contrary to professional ethics and the constant orientation of their profession.

By legalizing therapeutic abortion in those cases where the pregnancy might endanger the health of the mother, the government gives the impression that one can procure an abortion for any personal reason.

In any case, applications will increase.

Psychiatric symptoms as a ground for abortion are vetoed by most doctors and psychiatrists. A few of the latter, however, have accepted them on a limited basis. The after-effects of abortion on a woman are very often harmful and arouse in her mind feelings of guilt and hostility. By alleviating one problem are we not simply giving birth to another one?

Such are the reasons for which a great number of doctors are against abortion.

There is also another aspect to consider: what will be the approach of the doctors toward the committees established in hospitals? Will they have to abide by the decisions of the committee to comply with cases where application should be made with a social purpose in mind?

I believe that doctors as well as all those whose duties are of a medical nature should be protected against any prosecution, for the sake of the society and for the advancement of medical science.

Incidentally, I would like to quote an excerpt of a file concerning therapeutic abortion, and drafted by the organized medical staff of the Laval Hospital, one of the most famous hospitals in Canada, formerly specialized in treating tuberculosis and now dealing with heart disease and others. There is the quotation:

> On the other hand, Mr. Roy Hefferman, a famous American obstetrician declares that doctors who perform a therapeutic abortion are either ignoring the modern methods of treating pregnancy complications or do not bother to waste their time applying them. The inefficiency of therapeutic abortion is demonstrated, besides, by an American study which shows that out of 1,600,000 deliveries, the mortality rate is of 0.98 for 1,000 in hospitals where it is performed and of 0.87 for 1,000 in the hospitals where it is forbidden.

Considering the progress of science for the past decade, the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code are not justified, in my opinion. Today we are in a better position to treat some diseases. In the next few years, we shall witness even more important developments in science and the cases where it might be necessary to perform a therapeutic abortion will seldom occur.

**Mr. Fortin:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it is my duty to take part in this debate on abortion on which deal amendments Nos. 21, 22, 23, 31, 39, 40 and 41, that the Chair has grouped together for a more orderly discussion.

Mr. Speaker, having read the amendments which I have just listed as well as the omnibus bill itself, especially clauses 14 and 15 which deal with abortion, we find the bill very "weak".

When one takes the time to go carefully over the very few speeches made in favour of abortion, one realize the weakness of the reasoning which tends to legalize abortion as proposed in this bill.

I think we are forgetting some basic facts while discussing this famous omnibus bill and more particularly the clause on abortion.

Mr. Speaker, it is clearly established one cannot put aside this basic principle, this great truth, that birth is not the beginning of a human life but one of its stages.

Mr. Speaker, it is clearly acknowledged by every intelligent being that birth is only the answer to nine long months of expectation. Birth is really but a coming out into the world which has been prepared by the mother, the father and the child in the womb of his mother during nine months.

Everybody admits, Mr. Speaker, that the foetus in the womb of his mother has got life.

[Mr. Rodrigue.]

The scientific knowledge available to us in 1969 allows us to believe that foetal life exists. The fact is of course recognized by everybody.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, childbirth is not the beginning of life but only a stage in life. This stage is really minor importance really, since what is most important is precisely the birth or the progress of life in the mother's womb.

[*English*]

• (5:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I recognize the Minister of Justice on a point of order.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect to the hon. member who has the floor, we are debating a fairly narrow amendment which is related to whether a hospital shall be obliged to establish a therapeutic abortion committee, etc. The general philosophy of the subject should be left to amendment No. 19 which deals with the deletion of clause 18. Here we are dealing with a specific point and perhaps Your Honour might suggest that the hon. member should confine his remarks to that point.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. As the Minister of Justice suggests, we are dealing with a specific amendment and subamendment, and the debate ought to be confined as much as possible to that amendment and subamendment. I may also say that sometimes it is difficult for the Chair to restrict debate. It is impossible sometimes to prevent hon. members from expressing opinions or viewpoints which may go beyond the strict framework of the amendment being considered. Nevertheless I suggest to the hon. member for Lotbinière that he should try as much as possible to confine his remarks to the amendment and subamendment now before us.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, with all respect, this time I cannot accept the remarks addressed to me through you by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). I think he is going too far.

Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing with trucks, asphalt, etc. but with the life or death of a child who will decide about that? A therapeutic committee. Now before knowing whether to be for or against an amendment, or for or against a therapeutic committee, one must know first on what we legislate. I feel,

from the remarks just made by the Minister of Justice, that he is completely unaware of it. I should like to tell him that we are not legislating about trucks but about human beings, who do not grow like mushrooms and that there is no such thing as spontaneous generation. We are deciding about their life: grow or die, or die or live, according to the decision of the Minister of Justice.

It is not a question of starting or stopping a truck. Since we are discussing life itself, I do not mind being called to order, but there are limits. When we talk of abortion, I agree that we should stick to the subject. However, we should at least be given the chance to speak on the amendment itself.

I was saying that birth is not the beginning of life, but only a stage. Therefore, when we want to establish therapeutic committees in the hospitals, impose no restriction and adopt a law which will oblige the doctors to practice abortion with the approval of this famous therapeutic committee, not only do we contribute to the murder of a human being but we also violate the freedom of the individuals who will have to commit that crime.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious situation. The Medical Association of the province of Quebec spoke categorically against the bill, not as a whole, but on that particular point. The Canadian Medical Association also spoke against it, all of it. The medical practitioners want to practice freely. I feel it is obvious that nothing more is being proposed in this amendment. But, on the other hand, since we must consider the subject itself, I feel I was not out of order when I said that birth was not the beginning of life, but a stage.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many things we could say that I do not know where to begin.

A statement on abortion made by the Canadian episcopate and published in *L'Église de Montréal* reads as follows:

Consequences of the proposed amendment

The proposed amendment is well known. According to it, those who will perform an abortion will be, as in the past, liable to life imprisonment, but a qualified medical practitioner will be able to perform an abortion when the continuation of the pregnancy of a woman would or would be likely to endanger her life or health, provided it is performed in an accredited hospital and provided a certificate in writing has been obtained from the therapeutic abortion committee of that hospital. This proposed amendment urges us to make the following remarks.

Not only does this amendment allow for a direct and voluntary interference with an innocent's life, but it opens the door to the broadest interpretations.

This is exactly the purpose of this amendment and amendments Nos. 22, 23, 31, 39, 40 and 41, which are meant to clarify this legislation, and not to object to it, so as to enable any qualified medical practitioner of an accredited hospital to perform or not to perform abortion as he decides. I quote again the same article:

As can be noticed in the press and on the air, our people are already expressing opinions which reveal an obvious and alarming decline in the respect due to a child's life before his birth.

For instance, some merely see in the proposed amendment now under consideration a first step towards the official recognition of the "right to abortion" at will. Others see already in the amendment itself the possibility of making abortion available in a great many cases.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal separately with two points.

First, "the official recognition of the right to abortion at will."

The bill, according to clauses 14, 15 and others dealing with abortion, do not specify in which case abortion should be authorized.

There are a great many cases that can be foreseen, after discussing the matter with several doctors. I think we cannot pass a legislation to allow abortion in all cases, or every woman who requests it.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we are going to pass must be restricted to certain cases where abortion is necessary, since, according to briefs submitted by the Canadian Medical Association and by the Quebec Medical Association, such cases are becoming increasingly scarce, due to the scientific progress of medicine.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, the bill is only a first step towards the right to abortion at will. In other words, if a mother asks a doctor for an abortion, the doctor procures it.

If another mother who does not have the same illness as the first and whose pregnancy does not have any ill effects on her health asks the doctor for an abortion, the doctor will have to do the abortion whatever the motives the patient may have in asking for it.

Another mother may tell a doctor, she is sick, when actually her sickness is psychological and temporary, and ask for an abortion even if neither her health nor her life are in any way endangered. The doctor will then have to do the abortion.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The minister will say: There is always the hospital's therapeutic abortion committee. If that is so, then that committee should be free

to use its discretion otherwise I shall have to conclude that the therapeutic abortion committee also, in accordance with the Act, would be compelled to allow the abortion.

In other words, if a mother or a pregnant woman asks a doctor for an abortion, whatever her reasons, the doctor does not have to consider those reasons. He can only make a note of that person's name and say: Madam, we shall have to submit your case to the therapeutic abortion committee. The only course open to the latter would then be to give its consent.

Now, what about the study of special cases? What about psychological troubles? What happens if there is no illness? Indeed, pregnancy—everyone admits it—is not an illness. It is merely a natural condition peculiar to women. The mother bears her child and is delivered nine months later. It is a privilege granted to women by nature itself.

Incidentally, a pregnant woman is not sick. It is suggested by this bill that pregnancy is an illness. In addition, the physician is considered as a robot or an abortion machine. It is apparently believed that he is unable to think, to consider, to reason and that he will be compelled to perform an abortion.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the minister to rise and prove to me on the basis of the bill itself and not with a far-fetched argument that the physician is free to perform an abortion and that the therapeutic committee enjoys as much freedon in this connection. I challenge him to prove it to me, not by stating an obscure argument as lawyers alone can put forward, but by clearly telling me so. If the Canadian Medical Association, the Canadian episcopate and most Canadians have failed to find out that the bill grants such freedom to physicians, I feel that the minister himself will be unable to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with another aspect of this problem. For some people, the clause of the bill proposed by the minister will make abortion possible in a great number of cases. It is not necessary to develop that aspect, since it supplements the first, in the sense that here again no distinctions are made.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible not to grab this opportunity to plead in favour of doctors and their freedom. The amendments were introduced not because we are against the principle of therapeutic abortions, but rather because we want the law to state that a doctor will be free to perform abortions or not.



At this stage, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read something very interesting to the house. It is a letter from Mrs. Marjorie Ruwald, Secretary of the Ottawa Committee for the Protection of Unborn Children, dated February 19, 1969. It reads as follows:

Dear Sir:

Now is the time to honestly face the facts regarding the amendments to the abortion legislation that are proposed by the government.

Is the government really anxious to protect the life and the health of women?

I shall only read part of it, Mr. Speaker. Since there is only a limited number of women in the house, it may be interesting to know their viewpoint on this subject, since they seem to know something about medical matters. And it goes on:

If such is the case, what evidence do we have that the proposed changes would achieve that aim in any way?

This is more or less what I asked the minister a short while ago.

Never has the health of Canadian women got as much protection as today.

I then wonder on what grounds could a woman want to be aborted?

Canada has one of the lowest rates of mortality in the world for expectant mothers—about three deaths per 10,000 births. Is it really possible to believe that the proposed changes could bring about an even greater improvement?

She ask questions. I now come to what is more particularly related to the amendment, and I quote:

We must sympathize with the liberal M.P. who lost his wife because he turned down the abortion alternative.

She now refers to a former speech:

Such a tragedy cannot be blamed on the Canadian legislation. And the tremendous advance of medicine since then must also be kept in mind. The mortality rate of expectant mothers has been reduced from 10 to 1 in one generation.

Since medicine has advanced to such a degree that the rate of maternal mortality has been greatly reduced, why then compel a doctor to make abortions whereas, by his knowledge and the technical facilities at his disposal, he could save that child, give him a right to live, allow him to live?

Instead of forcing a doctor to kill a human being, let us make it a right and a duty for him to save that human being—

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—Combines—drugs—price fixing by B.C. pharmacists; the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Schreyer)—Air Canada—Winnipeg—transfer of base to Northwest Industries Ltd.; the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert)—Air Canada—strike of mechanics—inquiry as to matters in dispute.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice, and Legal Affairs, and amendment No. 21, Mr. Woolliams (for Mr. McCleave), and the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Burton).

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, we are faced with abstract realities.

The bill under consideration should never have been introduced as a logical, human bill that is likely to fit in our human and democratic society.

This bill is illogical and contains provisions that are not only beyond our grasp but go much further than what is permitted to advocate. Consequently, I believe that we are not sufficiently qualified to impose such a bill on the Canadian people, because it has to do with the very essence of life which is something divine and so great that we do not have the right to tamper with it. The procreation act is so sublime, so noble, that we would not be able to find adequate words to describe it.

We have in hand several reports that have been sent to us by the Canadian episcopate. The bishops are not taking a stand from the Roman Catholic point of view, but from a Christian point of view, and we support wholeheartedly the amendment moved by the hon. member, because this amendment fills—

**Mr. Laprise:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that a count of hon. members present would indicate there is not a quorum, and that the house cannot continue to sit.

[*English*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** On this point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether it is proper for a member on the other side to bring this matter to the attention of Your Honour in such a remarkable way and interrupt so abruptly one of his confrères who is making a particularly conscientious and serious speech.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I must advise that it is the right of the hon. member to rise and request a count. I shall proceed to ask the Clerk to take a count.

(On the count being made, 21 members were declared to be present.)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** A quorum is present; the sitting will proceed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

When I raised my point of order, there were only 16 members in the house, but the minister's speech prompted others to return.

[*English*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** With the greatest respect, I think that is a slur on the integrity of the Chair. Perhaps the hon. member would like to reflect on that.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Possibly we could listen to the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe).

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Latulippe:** Mr. Speaker, here I should like to quote a statement on abortion made by Canadian bishops:

> The bishops devoted the second part of their statement to the legal aspects of abortion and more precisely to the proposed amendment to the Criminal Code by the government. First of all, they lay down the principle that to the State, the guardian of the common good falls the "sovereign duty of protecting effectively the human lives and in particular the weaker ones." At the present

time, the role of the State is all the more necessary since the "complexity of modern life", in a world that is dominated by organization and techniques, makes the individuals live under heavy threats and since, under the guise of progress, some are ready to relax the laws to the point where they would no longer ensure life the thoughtful respect and the effective protection it deserves.

Let us say firmly that the progress of civilization resides in the ever increasing recognition, both theoretical and practical, of the dignity of the human being, of its sacred character and its absolute inviolability.

Besides, in the field of ethics, all things hold together; evil breeds evil; it is the first step which is most painful. We were discussing contraception yesterday; today we are talking about abortion; tomorrow it will be sterilization, euthanasia, infanticide. Every battle lost is fraught with a still worst defeat. Between civilization and barbarism the road is shorter and the slope is even more slippery than one could imagine. Another step, one step too many, and it is the Fall, and as Pascal wrote, "Earth is rented to the very depth of the abyss".

According to the bishops, the government bill, in its present form, should be rejected as a whole for three main reasons.

The first one deals with the very purpose of the legislation. According to the proposed amendment, the therapeutic abortion becomes legal every time that, upon the experts' advice, the mother's life or health are endangered or liable to be endangered by pregnancy. The legislation aims therefore at permitting "direct and voluntary attempt against the life of an innocent child", and that is immoral. Inasmuch as morality must affect legality, the government project, at the very outset and in its essential content, is therefore vitiated. In denying the principle of absolute inviolability of an innocent life, it strikes a blow to the core of civilization, it shakes it right to its foundations.

The government legislation, under its present form, opens the door to serious abuses.

I think that those who have a little sense of justice and humanity, are conscious of what they can achieve, who are aware of the dignity of human life and who know to whom this life belongs, will ask themselves the right questions on this very essential legislation. I quote further:

• (5:40 p.m.)

If the bill is so imprecise, it is perhaps because the government was not quite ready to legislate. "The parliamentary committee on this question recognized in its report of December 1967 the inadequacy of the studies and inquiries on which the new legislation should have been normally based. Why is it then that its decision was so prompt on the substance of the debate and why has it submitted to the government preliminary recommendations, binding our whole future? Above all, why was the government so quick to include in the bill conclusions which, according to the committee itself, could only be hypothetical and premature? Have they both given in to the pressures of the so-called Liberal opinion? Did they want to stay one jump ahead of their opponents, and specially of the Roman Catholics? The bishops, it goes without saying, are not accusing anybody. They are even careful not to point out that the parliamentary committee and the government saw fit to introduce their amendment proposals before having heard those who on the religious level are supposed to speak on behalf of 50 per cent of the Canadian people. They are simply wondering if, in this hour of decision, the Canadian people have really before them all the necessary information and if parliament has the right to venture into new legislation of such significance. "For people and for civilization", without weighing by means of appropriate research the moral, psychological and sociological consequences". That is also the question we are asking ourselves and that, when the day comes, we shall ask the government.

**[Mr. Latulippe.]**

The new legislation will not solve the problem of secret abortions and death caused by childbirth.

Mr. Speaker, according to those logical warnings approved by very competent lawyers, I believe once again that we even have no right to legislate on this matter the way we are doing it today and I ask the minister to withdraw from Bill C-150 the subsection dealing with abortion and to postpone the consideration of that matter until the time we have the necessary information and are sure of acting for the common good, according to a Christian point of view and in a logical way.

Then we may perhaps introduce a similar bill, provided full freedom is granted every member to vote according to his conscience, his common sense and his sense of justice.

The Department of Justice must live up to its name. In fact, its function is not to pass unjust legislations. Now I believe the legislation we are getting ready to pass is one of the most unjust we have ever brought out in Canada, and we have no right to pass unjust laws that go against the will of most people.

I go on quoting the statement of the bishops:

Does that mean that the Church, at this very moment and for that sole case, is going beyond the limits of the role to which, following the last council, it had consigned itself by announcing that, from now on, it would only interfere in temporal matters when public interest was at stake? Certainly not. We need only point out, in this respect, that the statement makes a very clear distinction between the moral and the legal aspects of abortion. When, dealing with the latter, it rejects the government approach, it does not do so on behalf of catholic morality as such, that is clear enough, but just in the name of morality itself, for the sake of the dignity of the human person, that is, once again, for the sake of the common

weal which it has undeniably the right, as well as any other group of citizens, to conceive and to defend according to its own views.

The bishops, in the present case, are deliberately addressing the catholics. If they feel they should abide by their views, the latter have henceforth to trace the line, where abortion is concerned, between moral and civil law. As in any temporal matter, and whether they support or oppose the intentions of the government, they should, as citizens, trust their own conscience, trust their own private judgment on what they feel the common good requires according to their experience and inner thinking, and not necessarily according to whatever wording the bishops have deemed advisable to draft.

In practice, the foetus should be always considered as a human person; abortion, from the standpoint of morality, is always the murder of an innocent being.

Mr. Speaker, we would yet have many a thing to say on the subject. There were, for instance, lively discussions in the committee; but the members who sat on it did not adopt a stand directly. Highly competent men come before the committee as witnesses, among others, Dr. Benoît Légaré, a gynaecologist from the Saint-François d'Assise Hospital in Quebec City. He appeared before the committee. He expressed his point of view; he spoke as a Christian and spoke conscientiously. He did not stake his conscience; he entrusted it to the Almighty and spoke laconically, logically, humanely and like a Christian on that situation;

We have not come here as Catholic doctors. We would, indeed, be ill-advised to try, through legislation, to impose our moral code on those who do not share our religious beliefs. Any argument based on those principles would weaken our plea considerably.

We have come here this morning as doctors concerned with helping our legislators to formulate a law that is just and respectful of human life. Accordingly, we will remain strictly on the level of natural law. We therefore intend to convince you that the foetus, from the instant of its conception, is a human being, albeit imperfect. If we achieve this, I feel that our testimony will have been very useful.

Doctor René Jutras, pediatrist, basing himself on genetics, will take care of the technical aspect of what we have to say to you.

I admit that doctors and biologists have yet to agree unanimously on this point.

I know that there are some who will maintain that at the start the foetus matter is too imperfect to be classified in the category of human beings. But, where is the one so learned he can decide whether this perfection appears in the eighth or twelfth week of life?

Mr. Speaker, all the evidence given by serious, competent and responsible men who want the good of the nation, who understand the very essence of life shows clearly that they oppose the clause now before us and that they do not think it should be agreed to for any reason whatever because it runs contrary to the respect that every person in his right mind should have for human life.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on this particular clause. It is interesting to note that while I may not confine myself strictly to legal interpretations, I am glad to adopt that course because there are certain moral and social principles involved in a bill like this. The situation could not be otherwise.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Why we do not practise preventive medicine in this field, rather than draw up clauses that pretend to treat the problem after it has been created? Sex used to be taboo; now it is a consumer item. Books by the score are written on sex. Television portrays sex almost every night. I am sure the Minister of Justice watches television and must have seen this program the other day on which a lady was introduced who was not even wearing coloured glasses—

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I turn that kind of stuff off now.

**Mr. Rynard:** The minister says he turns that kind of stuff off now. I think that by the introduction of this bill the minister is giving encouragement to the publicizing of sex. This is the sad part of it. I have a very high regard for the minister and did not think he would be led into the position of not protecting the public better than he is. All the minister is doing by means of this bill is an indirect way, by permissiveness of stimulating the rapaciousness of the sexual appetite, when he should be preventing it. Why ask the doctor to murder? Why not prevent this situation from arising?

The promotion of sex goes on and on. Let us stop and take a good, clean look at this question. Knowledge and science have arrived at the point where almost complete birth control is possible. Why should the medical profession be put in the position of treating something which can be prevented? The minister talks about hospitals in this regard. I am sure that many hospitals will not want to

carry out this type of operation. When this bill passes, perhaps they will have to do it. How does the minister propose getting around this? I can name hospitals that will not carry out abortions. It is only fair and proper that the minister tell us how he proposes to get around that problem.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, under the rules I can only answer that question by asking the hon. member a question. Will the hon. member accept a question?

**Mr. Rynard:** I am always glad to receive a question from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Was the hon. member here earlier in the day when I spoke directly on this question and assured the house that, within the terms of what I said, there was no criminal obligation or responsibility on the medical profession to force them to participate in or perform a therapeutic abortion? I also said that in so far as there was any civil obligation or liability, this did not arise in any way from clause 18. In other words, the bill does not purport to encroach in any way upon the relationship between the hospital and the doctor, the doctor in a hospital and the patient, the nurse and the doctor, doctor and the nurse, and so on. Is the hon. member aware of the fairly full treatment I gave to that question earlier in the day?

**Mr. Rynard:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am also aware of the abortion cases that are sent from one hospital to another. It is in this respect that I think the minister is closing the door. I ask, what is he going to do about it? Does the minister propose that this be paid out of medicare hospitalization? In Russia, only about 4 per cent of these cases are eligible for that type of treatment. The next thing will be the licensing of prostitution.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Oh, no.

**Mr. Rynard:** The minister does not believe that. Would the minister like me to tell him what the score is in England? I do not think he has read what the situation is there. I will put it on the record so he will understand the problem. The extract I shall read to the house illustrates very effectively what the problem is in this regard.

This article was written by Dr. Lewis and is to be found in the British Medical Journal for January 25, at page 241. Dr. Lewis writes about an angry lady who wanted a hysterectomy for prolapses and could not get one. There is no exaggerating, she could not get a hysterectomy because the hospitals were filled with patients requiring abortions. This article reads:

> Lewis points out that when the abortion law was changed the gynecologists did not expect a very great change in their practice. They thought that there would be a slightly more liberal attitude to the problem. He continues: "How wrong we were. I am afraid that we did not allow for the attitude of, firstly, the general public, and, secondly, the general practitioners."

I suggest to the Minister of Justice that he, also, can be awfully wrong in this respect. The article continues:

> In 1958, 1,600 abortions were notified in England and Wales; the estimated number for 1968 is 35,000.

I hope the minister listened to those statistics.

> One curious feature of the present pattern is that only 45 per cent of the patients are married. Since far more married women become pregnant than single ones, it is hard to see why medical indications should be so much more frequent in the unmarried.

That is the type of permissiveness to which the minister is opening the door by this bill.

> The whole character of the gynecologist's work in outpatients has changed, says the author, because he has to deal with two, three or four requests at every session; often it takes longer to refuse than to grant the request. "And I have made no mention of the large numbers of pregnancies that are being terminated in registered nursing homes for reasons of convenience and financial gain, masquerading as legal operations under the new act." He feels that this state of affairs will continue, and that it is unrealistic to expect a small section of the community, the gynecologists, to adopt a moral attitude completely at variance with that of society as a whole.

This is the area in which society is sick. That is why I point out to the minister that we should be dealing with prevention rather than trying to cope with the problem after it has been created.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but it is six o'clock. Prior to calling it six o'clock, in view of the fact that the hon. member will be continuing his remarks after the dinner adjournment I might remind him that we are dealing with a specific amendment and subamendment which ask that no hospital be obliged to establish a therapeutic abortion committee. I invite the hon. member to restrict his remarks as much as possible to that specific matter. It being six o'clock, the sitting stands suspended until eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. Rynard:** I was saying when the house rose at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, that the pressure which will be brought to bear on hospitals and on the abortion committees of those hospitals—if they have one and they likely will have—will be great, indeed. If any arguments are needed to substantiate this assertion they will be found clearly set out in the report of Dr. Lewis on B.M.J. which I placed on record.

This is what will happen: a certain clause of this bill, once adopted and passed into law, will gradually be the subject of wider interpretation. This is what has happened elsewhere. Today, in Europe, I believe probably less than 4 per cent of abortions performed there are carried out for valid medical reasons. In the long run, the pressure of the affluent society, or of the just society—which, in effect, means "do what you want to do whether it is morally right or not"—may be great enough to break down the moral conscience of abortion committees and hospitals. This is what I fear. Where they have not had abortion committees on religious grounds, they will be made to create them.

If proof of this is required, hon. members need only look at today's Ottawa *Citizen* where an article appears by Karl E. Meyer concerning social conditions in the Baltic countries. He says:

> Moralists would become discouraged in visiting Denmark, Sweden and the Netherlands. Not only are these countries allowing permissiveness to become a way of life, but nearly everybody seems incorrigibly relaxed about it, even those who may have their doubts . . . The sky is the limit as long as nobody gets hurt. Or, as Irene van der Weetering, who holds the Provo seat on the city council, complains: "They smother us with tolerance."

This seems definitely the trend in Europe today. I wonder whether the Minister of Justice would continue to follow his present course if he felt he was setting a similar trend in motion here in Canada. They certainly did not set out with that intention in Europe, and I warn hon. members that with the permissiveness contemplated here we might well be starting on the same road.

I am one who feels that television can be singled out as a primary agent of change. The author of the article I mentioned quotes a Swedish journalist as saying "Television has the power of legitimizing things." The article goes on to say:

> As a result of all these factors . . . the Dutch, Danes and Swedes are on the way to creating societies where anything goes.

These things go on in communist countries, but these are atheistic in their thinking.

• (8:10 p.m.)

In Denmark and Sweden, there are new forms of marriage, social acceptance of homosexuality, abolition of censorship, permission to use soft drugs, compulsory sex education and easy access to contraceptives. All of these things exist in one or other of these countries. It may be that when the limits of permissiveness are reached the Dutch, the Danes and the Swedes will find that they have not solved any of the age old moral problems but have simply transferred them to a different plane. Their experience has a certain fascination for the rest of the world, and they should not complain, as some of them do, when we curiously peer and prod.

I intend to speak on some other clauses, Mr. Speaker, but I will conclude now by saying that anything that denigrates the spiritual and moral forces of a nation destroys the power of that nation to choose between right and wrong. This could very well happen to the abortion committees and our hospitals when the pressure is on.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, we are studying amendment No. 21 which reads as follows:

> Nothing in this section shall be construed as obliging any hospital to establish a therapeutic abortion committee or any qualified medical practitioner to procure the miscarriage of a female person.

However, Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks I would like to point out to the house, if other hon. members have not done so already—for I have not had the opportunity to listen to all the speeches delivered on that important matter—that the end of the text of the amendment refers to "the miscarriage of a female person".

During the debate of the committee on justice and legal affairs, when Bill C-150 was under study, I had the opportunity to remind the minister who, with much patience, sponsors the bill, that several pages of the bill, in particular pages 42 and 43, and a score of other pages, are devoted to "the miscarriage of a female person". I asked him whether, as

far as he knew, persons of another sex could undergo abortion?

I see that the bill was reported without any amendment and I find it strange to want to amend at this stage by making it clear that abortion should be practised only on a female person.

I would like to know whether according to the scientists of the Liberal party, there exists a third, a fourth or even fifth sex that we do not know. To the best of my knowledge, the house has not had the privilege of meeting any worthy specimen of those various sexes. To my knowledge, we have only known in this house two sexes: the male sex and the female sex. In fact there is only one person of the female sex here. We do not know people of the third, fourth, of fifth sex.

Therefore, why make a bill even more ridiculous by inserting the words: "the abortion of a person of the female sex"? What other sex can undergo abortion apart from the female sex? I find that absolutely stupid and ridiculous, and I demand why the legal advisors, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the experts who drafted this bill tried, through the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), to get the Canadian people to swallow it? How is it that in a text of law, reputedly serious, we read that we are to procure the miscarriage of a female person only?

Mr. Speaker, I find in at least twenty different places in the bill these terms: "miscarriage of a female person".

However, the minister has not yet answered this question: How many sexes are there in Canada?

Mr. Speaker, at least the spirit of this amendment is in keeping with our beliefs when it provides that an hospital should not be obliged to establish a therapeutic abortion committee. In the name of the freedom which some members want to preach in the house so that a woman may feel free to have an abortion if she so wishes. We should ensure to hospitals and doctors unwilling to perform abortion the same liberty not to have to submit, for some reason or other, to the legislation which they do not want to be part of our statutes.

Mr. Speaker, in expressing my opposition to the provisions of Bill C-150 regarding abortion, I shall not deal tonight with the moral problems involved in abortion.

We have merely brought in arguments based on common sense or provided by medical authorities condemning abortion, even therapeutic abortion, a practice that this bill is trying to impose on our hospitals and medical practitioners.

The main argument against abortion is that this small being, as such, has the right to live. Consequently, society must do every possible thing to ensure him this right.

Mr. Eugene Quay, an American professor, wrote a study which was published in the Georgetown Law Journal. Here is what he said:

> The protection of the life of an unborn child has always been a major concern in the oldest laws known. This matter has continued to form the subject of laws in all civilizations right through to the present time, because this thought springs from a universal sentiment that foresees the decline of civilization when this right is no longer protected.

Unfortunately, we have to realize that at the present time Canada's civilization is decadent, for rather than protecting the right to life, we do everything possible to eliminate such a right.

Section 3 of the United Nations Universal declaration of human rights, passed in 1948, stipulates that, and I quote:

> Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Paragraph (a) of section 1 of the Canadian Bill of Rights, passed in 1960, recognizes that:

> —the right of the individual to life—

—exists in Canada and will continue to exist. However, in 1969, we are already willing to question that principle and to pass legislation to abolish it.

The convention to protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, signed in Rome in 1950 by the members of the European Council, states the following in paragraph (1) of section 2, and I quote:

> The right of the individual to life is protected by law. Death cannot be inflicted intentionally, except in the carrying out of a death sentence passed by a court of justice in the case of an offence punishable by death under the law.

In his book entitled "The Right to Live" Mr. Norman St. John-Stevas wrote in New York in 1964:

> Respect for human life is part of the moral consensus of western civilization—such consensus emanating from intuitive wisdom of a really human society.

It then appears that the right to life is universally recognized and the voluntary and intentional destruction of a living foetus in the body of its mother, or of a child at its birth, constitutes a practice which is universally prohibited.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Whatever the authors of the Criminal Code may say, life begins before the birth of the child and the severance of the umbilical cord.

The physicians who came to testify before the standing committee on justice and legal affairs, on March 25—and others before them—especially Drs. Légaré and Justras proved, without doubt, that life exists well before birth.

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Wooliams) asked the following question of Dr. Légaré, a gynecologist at the St-François d'Assise Hospital, in Quebec City:

From the medical point of view, do you agree with the definition given in the Criminal Code?

And the physician replied:

From the medical point of view, no... but the unborn child is definitely a human being. The slides of Dr. Jutras—

—will give you a medical proof.

Doctor Jutras, head of the Pediatrics Department of the Arthabasca hospital, showed a series of slides which proved beyond doubt that life exists, imperfect maybe but real none the less, because when the fœtus is 24 days old its heart starts to beat. Some Swedish physicians have ascertained that a fœtal heart was still beating one or two hours after an abortion.

Thanks to the transparencies of Dr. Jutras, it was possible to observe that on the twelfth week, a fœtus sucks his thumb.

Mr. Speaker, there are even some members who have been doing the same since they have been here and who continue to do so.

On the sixteenth week, the eyes of the fœtus are developed and on the twenty-sixth week, it is viable.

Life is by then so well established that in the Model Penal Code approved by The American Law Institute, paragraph 3 of section 230, dealing with abortion, it is stipulated, and I quote:

When the abortion is performed after the 26th week of pregnancy, it is murder in the second degree.

This referred to illegal abortions.

What shall we think now of therapeutic abortion. This is what I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker. It is precisely the problem that we study tonight. What shall we think now, I say, of medical abortion which the Minister of Justice wants to include in the Criminal Code in order to justify abortion?

This is what was said on this subject by Dr. R. Gordon Douglas, professor of obstetrics and gynecologist at the Medical College of Cornell University in the United States. This is no idle talk; we are not dealing here with back-street butchers or with blue-stocking gossips:

If we make use of all our therapeutic armamentarium, we can put an end to all the troubles that can arise, for a mother, from the birth of a child.

In other words, thanks to medical knowledge in this field, the life of the mother is no longer in danger when she is bearing a child or when she gives birth to a child.

Professor Quay, in the book which I quoted a while ago, proves, from pages 181 to 220, that appropriate prenatal care and attention can practically always save the life of the mother without resorting to therapeutic abortion.

At this stage, I should like to say to the supporters of abortion that it is almost an insult to medicine to try and make believe that doctors are incapable to cure illness except by killing the foetus, while doctors have proved in the committee that therapeutic abortion is futile today, because treatment can help to cure the diseases that can sometimes attend pregnancy.

On the other hand, Dr. K. P. Russell, from the county hospital of Los Angeles, writes in the Journal of the American Medical Association and I quote:

For the past ten years, we have grown more and more aware of the fact that several indications—

—and here, he is of the same opinion as Dr. Légaré who was a witness to the committee of justice and legal affairs—

—we have grown every day more aware of the fact that many an indication in favour of therapeutic abortion is no longer valid... in the light of continuing improvement in the field of medicine and surgery.

Professor Quay, on the other hand, believes that if therapeutic abortion is to be legalized, it will hamper research in the field of gynaecology, with the purpose of saving human lives and that doctors will do it the easy way by destroying the foetus.

He also makes no bones about stigmatizing the mothers who seek therapeutic abortion.

A mother who sacrifices the life of her child in order to protect her own health is lacking something somewhere... and if there were to be some authority to decide whether to destroy an innocent life for social reasons, the interests of society would command to sacrifice the life of

such a mother rather than that of her child who might one day become extremely useful to society. Some, even, go as far as to say that ... "health of the mother" ... should also cover ... "mental health."

According to doctors who have conducted studies on the problem, the mental troubles about which some women are complaining to justify their application for therapeutic abortion, are just subterfuges in order to get rid of their child.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Moreover, nothing shows that mental disorders are cured by ending pregnancy. And finally, therapeutic abortion could in some cases heighten mental disorders in a pregnant woman, when they give rise to feelings of frustration, hostility and shame.

For instance, Dr. Perlmutter of New York Bellevue Hospital, in his analysis of therapeutic abortion, which appeared in the *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynæcology*, volume 53, 1947, page 1014, said the following:

There does not appear to be a single neurological or psychiatrical condition which could justify ending pregnancy.

Even the threat of suicide resorted to by pregnant women to get an abortion cannot be a valid argument, according to Dr. Lawrence C. Iolb, director of the New York State Psychiatric Institute.

He wrote in 1958, in his book *Abortion in United States* the following:

There is an interesting report from Sweden about 344 women who were refused a therapeutic abortion, 62 of whom had threatened to commit suicide if their request was not granted. So far, none has committed suicide. The threat of suicide is frequently used for intimidation purposes.

As for "eugenic" abortion, designed to prevent the birth of children who are abnormal, crippled or affected by hereditary diseases, or simply to improve the human race, we find it equally unacceptable.

Let us keep in mind that our soldiers fought against Hitler who practised eugenics in order to preserve the integrity of the German race. Would we, today, include such a provision into our Code, or simply allow, because no mention is made of it, doctors to practise eugenics?

Professor Norman St. John-Stevas, on page 16 of the book entitled "The Right To Live" and previously quoted, tells the following story, and I quote:

A doctor is discussing with a colleague: "With regard to terminating a pregnancy, I should like your opinion. The father suffers from syphilis and the mother, from tuberculosis. What would you have done? I should have terminated it, replies the other. In that case, you would have killed Beethoven!

Finally, a few words on the argument raised by the supporters of therapeutic abortion whereby the fact that abortions are common in certain hospitals is an argument in favour of adopting the amendment to the act.

Mr. Speaker, thefts and crimes are increasing in Canada as in every other country in the world. The efforts of the police to check crime are becoming less and less efficient. But who would suggest that our present legislation against crime be abolished? Who would suggest that our police forces, the R.C.M.P., and municipal forces should be abolished?

And last, the arguments whereby therapeutic abortions lead to a decrease in clandestine abortions—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, would the house allow me to continue my remarks for one minute only?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The honourable member is aware that he must have the unanimous consent of the house. Does the house allow the hon. member to go on with his remarks?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, Professor Quay whom I quoted earlier, states the following:

The section on abortion proposed by the American Law Institute corresponds to the 1939 Danish law. Now while the number of legal abortions increased in 12 years to 5,000 per year, the number of criminal abortions, instead of decreasing or of disappearing, increased to 9,000 per year.

For all the reasons I have just listed, I do not think any hon. member, whatever his party—we have only heard from those objecting to the legislation—could put forward any argument supporting the bill because there is none.

I had the opportunity a few weeks ago to visit four western provinces and I was able to realize that opposition to abortion is as strong over there as it is here.

I believe all hon. members regardless of their faith should unite to ask the government to withdraw the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code relating to therapeutic abortion.

Also, I am in favor of the proposed amendment to the effect that hospitals and medical practitioners unwilling to procure a supposedly therapeutic abortion which, doctors say, no longer exists could at least be free not to abide by the provisions of this bill providing for the creation of an abortion committee in hospitals.

[*English*]

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, this part of the debate on this bill is different from that part of the debate that dealt with gross indecency. This is not just, shall we say, a mere truism. The amendments before us come as a result of representations made by various organizations, organized groups, pressure groups and individuals. They have been discussed in the public press, on radio and on television, and there has been a good deal of public debate on this matter. Therefore, even though I may not agree with these amendments, I feel they are much more legitimate than the ones contained in clause 7, for which there was no call from the public. They were not debated by the public, there has been no public demand for relaxations on gross indecency and therefore they seem to be a gratuitous offering on the part of the original author of the bill to some factions in the public interested in that type of activity.

Representations made favouring the adoption of clauses in this bill dealing with abortion have been made first of all, I suppose, by a lot of social workers and well meaning people. Many of them were naïve do-gooders to the extent that they believed adoption of this provision would reduce illegitimacy as the result of conception by young unmarried women or by married women who participate in extramarital affairs. It is thought that if such a young woman can go along to a hospital very quietly and have an abortion, this would eliminate the number of illegitimate children. Mr. Speaker, I do not think for a moment that that will be the case. It will be known when a woman goes to hospital. Women resort to the back street quack or to what is known as the abortion butcher because of the moral stigma attached to a woman carrying a child as a result of an illicit sexual connection. This is the reason for resorting to the quack and no amount of, shall we say, making abortions easier will reduce the immorality of the initial act and the immoral stigma. We will have to change society and say that a woman can conceive a child from whomsoever she wishes, and bear it. But society will not accept that. Society does not say that, nor does society pretend at any time to sanction illicit sexual connections which may result in a pregnancy. Therefore, I think the argument that adoption of this provision will reduce illegitimacy is sheer fantasy.

Furthermore, I doubt that it will reduce the number of so-called butchers. Why do I say that? I say it because there is that social stigma attached to an illicit pregnancy. Here again, I think there are naïve do-gooders who suggest that liberalizing the abortion provisions in our Criminal Code will reduce illegitimacy and drive the abortion butcher out of his back room.

On another occasion, I think I shall have the opportunity to speak on the principle of abortion at will or on request, or on proposals which would make abortion much more permissive than at present. At this time I should like to limit my remarks to the purpose of this amendment. I am pleased to see this amendment being put forward. Anything said to me by medical practitioners about the government proposals dealing with abortion has been said in an endeavour to protect practitioners who would refuse to perform an abortion on instruction from any therapeutic abortion committee. The medical practitioner might be either on the staff of the hospital or be connected with the hospital and be entitled to practice in that hospital. Also, many of those doctors who have had a great deal to say to me limit their practice to some of the hospitals within the city of Edmonton where abortions will not be carried out. There will not be an abortion committee in those hospitals as long as the directing staff and the doctors of those hospitals maintain the same view. It is their freedom of practice that we are attacking.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I say it is absolutely wrong. It will be failing morally. I trust the provinces will take some appropriate action to prohibit any undue pressure, either on a hospital or a doctor practising in a hospital, to carry out a therapeutic abortion against their will. Hospitals today have no freedom with regard to their financing. They are directly controlled by the provincial authorities. If it is the view of a provincial hospital authority that all hospitals, regardless of the persuasion by the board of management or directing staff, shall carry out therapeutic abortions under penalty of some financial or other type of restriction,

that will be wrong. It has been suggested the remedy does not lie in the Criminal Code. Now, is the time to speak out against any undue pressure.

It is the government's proposed amendment to the Criminal Code which sets up the therapeutic abortion committee. Bill C-150 will entitle a doctor to perform a therapeutic abortion under certain conditions, therefore it is now that we must raise the protest against any undue pressure being exerted. If the abortion committee is not set up or if a doctor does not wish to carry out a therapeutic abortion. There may have to be accompanying legislation from the provinces because no hospital may be able to found a claim in contract or otherwise under these sections against any provincial hospital authority that brought undue pressure. There might be a possibility of a claim for damages, but I think the grounds might be rather tenuous.

When dealing with this bill, we in this house cannot provide that there shall be a civil remedy against any provincial hospital authority that brings undue pressure on either a hospital authority or practising physician or any legal action being brought against either or both of them because of their refusal. I support the spirit of the amendment. I think it has its place at this point.

As my colleague the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) stated, this is the point where we, as legislators, should indicate there must be no penalty on any hospital or physician refusing to carry out a therapeutic abortion as may be permitted under this act. I wish to reiterate the therapeutic abortion committee will be a creation of this act now before us. If there are to be any consequences arising out of the conduct of this potential committee, they should be expressed in the Criminal Code.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, my comments will be similar to those made by the previous speaker on the amendment before us, which reads as follows:

"Nothing in this section shall be construed as obliging any hospital to establish a therapeutic abortion committee or any qualified medical practitioner to procure the miscarriage of a female person."

The hon. minister of Justice, Mr. Turner, has probably received some time ago a written memorandum from the Medical Association of the province of Quebec, stating the clear opposition of its members to the obligation for the medical committee of a hospital to procure what is called a therapeutic abortion.

Like the hon. minister and other members, I have received a request from the medical doctors asking that we oppose that provision in the bill. To date, the hon. minister has not heeded the appeal made by the Medical Association of the province of Quebec. I wonder whether all the doctors making this appeal to the hon. minister and to the members of this House can be wrong.

According to the bill, doctors refusing to procure therapeutic abortion would be penalized. I do not believe that such is the intention of the hon. minister. His Parliamentary Secretary (Mr. Cantin), signals that it is not. I would like the parliamentary secretary or the hon. minister himself to give the house a clear and definite answer about the intentions of the legislators with regard to the provisions of this act.

If a person goes to the hospital for a abortion and if the hospital or the doctors there refuse to grant the request, will they be punishable under the act? That was not explained and that is why I am speaking about the Medical Association of the province of Quebec this evening. I ask the hon. minister to clarify the bill for us.

• (8:50 p.m.)

It is obvious that Catholic hospitals in the province of Quebec did not allow abortions until now. Even when the mother's life was endangered. I do not believe the law can established a criterion, permitting to determine whether the life of a pregnant woman is in danger because her pregnancy does not progress normally. I say the minister fails to do his duty by refusing to give on this bill clarifications that could protect doctors in Catholic hospitals who would refuse to perform an abortion.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I am completely opposed to the party in power legislating on what concerns the mother's health in the case of a difficult pregnancy or premature birth. I believe legislators have no right neither on life nor on the effects of a difficult abortion. They must not substitute themselves to Providence.

The object of my contribution in this debate is to tell the Minister of Justice that the provision concerning abortion is so complex, entails so many after effects and creates so many difficulties that the legislator is

wrong in my opinion by interfering with the plans of Providence.

The hon. members opposite may gloat over my references to the Canadian bishops who recently vigorously denounced those provisions of the legislation. They asked the Minister of Justice to clarify the legislation so that doctors who refuse to perform an abortion will not be liable to prosecution.

We know that recently, in the United States, certain doctors were prosecuted by hospitals for having refused to perform abortions. We would not want, especially in the province of Quebec, that such proceedings be instituted against doctors. I insist on that point.

I beg the Minister of Justice to look at me. He is talking at present with one of his colleagues. I beg him to clear up the matter. I know the minister is taking advice from his parliamentary secretary and that he could not follow my speech. His parliamentary secretary will give him the message as usual. I say to the minister that he should make the legislation more explicit.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I am closely watching what the hon. member says. It is impossible to ignore him.

**Mr. Asselin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I did not hear what the minister said. Could he, please, repeat it?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I said, Mr. Speaker, that "I was closely watching what the hon. member was saying because it is impossible to ignore him."

**Mr. Asselin:** I thank the Minister of Justice for giving so much importance to my remarks, but before we vote on this amendment, I should like to know whether the Minister of Justice is going to comply with the request of the Association of doctors and also of the bishops who have asked him whether these doctors would be subject to prosecution or to penalties under the Criminal Code.

I think the question is very ticklish and very important and the hon. Minister should at least give the members of the province of Quebec the assurance that doctors will not be prosecuted under the section on abortion.

On April 23, 1969, Claude Ryan published in *Le Devoir* an article under the heading "*Conscience, médecine et avortement*" in which he warned the hon. Minister of Justice against all the possible consequences of his bill on abortion. The minister must have read that article. I do not claim that Mr. Ryan is an authority on abortion and medicine. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Gervais) and the whip of the Liberal party are shaking their heads...

**Mr. Gervais:** All depends on the subject.

**Mr. Asselin:** The fact remains that this editorial of *Le Devoir* raises, in my opinion, a very important question and I fail to see how the minister can reject amendment No. 21, without giving the Quebec Medical Association some safeguard to the effect that its members will not be subject to legal proceedings under the law when they refuse to perform abortion.

I greatly admire the minister's courage and eagerness. He accepted to sponsor the legislation of the former Minister of Justice, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). We know that when the minister introduced this legislation in the house he felt—and I think that he was right—that the bill should be divided in order to enable—

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** No.

**Mr. Asselin:** The minister says no! But he did say that the bill should be divided in order to enable the members to express their views freely and according to their conscience. At that time, I think the hon. minister was quite right and, some time after the Prime Minister turned him down and told him that the bill would not be divided but would be considered as a whole, and that the members would have to vote only once.

We know that it was made into a vote of confidence for the government, and we noticed it on the last vote. Indeed, not one member from Quebec, not even the hon. member for Sherbrooke, voted against the government. Thus, on the 54 or 55 members from Quebec who think like those of the opposition and do not favour the omnibus bill, nor would want—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member at this time, but I would like to ask him to confine his remarks strictly to the amendment now under consideration.

• (9:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Asselin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I shall heed your advice.

With regard to the possible consequences of the amendment now under study, I think that I have a right to ask the members from Quebec—but not you, since you are Deputy Chairman of committees and Deputy Speaker—to follow the dictates of their conscience on the matters of abortion and homosexuality.

Finally, we have not heard any Quebec member oppose this bill, and yet, I know that in their inner conscience, some of them wished they belonged to the opposition so that they could vote freely, as was proposed by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield).

Before this amendment comes up for a vote, I should like the Minister of Justice to explain clearly what the situation of the government is with regard to the request of the bishops that doctors and hospitals not be required to procure abortion or to set up abortion committees. I should like the Minister of Justice to give us specific information and commit himself with regard to this problem, so that the doctors who refuse to procure abortions for reasons of conscience and professional ethics can be protected against resulting legal proceedings.

The Minister of Justice cannot, to my mind, go against the designs of Providence. When one fights nature, nature fights back.

At times, pregnancies are difficult; but doctors have from time to time met the difficulty by performing an operation to relieve the mother.

In closing, I therefore ask the Minister of Justice to clarify the situation and give hon. members some information, so that when the time comes to vote they will know how best to protect natural laws.

I trust the Minister of Justice can give us some details within a few moments and also tell us whether he has replied to the doctors of the province of Quebec who have requested that the act on abortion be amended. I am convinced that the minister of Justice will set forth for us the position of the government, after which I shall be able to decide on how I must vote on the proposed amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is the house ready for the question?

**Mr. Asselin:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I asked the Minister of Justice whether he could give us some further information on the question I put tonight and that was put by other members. I want to direct it again to the minister. Will the doctors who refuse to procure miscarriages, as provided by the law, be liable to prosecution? Even if I alone in the house tonight, I am going to object to the debate being carried on before the minister answers my question.



**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I must say to the hon. member that I am not allowed to repeat my remarks of this afternoon, in which I sincerely answered all the questions he asked this evening. If he reads *Hansard,* he will find there the answers to all his questions. As for me, I am not permitted to repeat my remarks.

**Mr. Asselin:** Is the minister of the opinion that amendment No. 21 now before us answers the request of the doctors of Quebec and Canada that they not be liable to prosecution after refusing to procure an abortion?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I have already answered that question, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The question is on the motion Mr. Woolliams (for Mr. McCleave) No. 21 which reads:

That Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by inserting in clause 18 after sub-section 7 of Section 237 on page 44 the following sub-section:

"(8) Nothing in this section shall be construed as obliging any hospital to establish a therapeutic abortion committee or any qualified medical practitioner to procure the miscarriage of a female person."

And the amendment to the motion (Mr. Burton):

That the proposed subsection (8) be amended by adding thereto the following words:

"or any member of a hospital staff to assist in procuring such miscarriage."

All those in favour of the amendment to the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

The house divided on the amendment to the motion (No. 21), (Mr. Burton) which was negatived on the following division:

• (9:10 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Bell
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Flemming
Forrestall
Fortin
Gleave
Godin
Hales
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
La Salle
Latulippe
MacEwan
MacInnis
McCleave
McIntosh
Marshall
Mather
Matte
Mazankowski
Monteith
Nystrom
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rynard
Schreyer
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Skoberg
Southam
Woolliams—40.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Anderson
Badanai
Baldwin
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Brown
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chrétien
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Cullen
Davis
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Fairweather
Forest
Forget
Foster
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harding
Honey
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Laing
Lang
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
Mahoney
Major
Marchand (Langelier)
Morison
Munro
Noël
O'Connell
Orlikow
Ouellet
Pelletier
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richardson
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Serré
Sharp
Stafford
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
Sulatycky
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomson
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Whicher
Winch
Yanakis—91.

*Division*

• (9:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost. The question is on the main motion. Is it the wish of hon. members that we ring the bells?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**An hon. Member:** On division.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. McCleave) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Bell
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Flemming
Forrestall
Fortin
Godin
Hales
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
La Salle
Latulippe
MacEwan
MacInnis
McCleave
McIntosh
Marshall
Mather
Matte
Mazankowski
Monteith
Paproski
Peddle
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rynard
Schreyer
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Southam
Woolliams—36.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Anderson
Badanai
Baldwin
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Brown
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chrétien
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Cullen
Davis
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Fairweather
Forest
Forget
Foster
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Gleave
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harding
Honey
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen

*Division*

| | |
|---|---|
| Isabelle | Peters |
| Jamieson | Pilon |
| Laing | Portelance |
| Lang | Pringle |
| Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) | Prud'homme |
| Laniel | Richardson |
| Leblanc (Laurier) | Roy (Laval) |
| Lefebvre | Saltsman |
| Legault | Serré |
| Lessard (LaSalle) | Sharp |
| Macdonald (Rosedale) | Skoberg |
| MacEachen | Stafford |
| MacGuigan | Stewart (Cochrane) |
| MacInnis (Mrs.) | Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay) |
| Mackasey | Sulatycky |
| Mahoney | Thomas (Maisonneuve) |
| Major | Thomson |
| Marchand (Langelier) | Trudeau |
| Morison | Trudel |
| Munro | Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) |
| Noël | Whicher |
| O'Connell | Winch |
| Orlikow | Yanakis—94. |
| Ouellet | |
| Pelletier | |

**Mr. Woolliams (for Mr. Valade)** moved amendment No. 24, as follows:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatory Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the word "and" on line five on page 43 and the "period" after the word "practitioner" on line 8 on page 43 and inserting the following words: "and,

(e) that those means are employed before the period of implantation."

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I hear some hon. members calling for an explanation of this motion which I am moving on behalf of my hon. friend. Judging by the way so many of them have voted on the other clauses and amendments, I can understand why they believe these things should be explained to them.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Seriously, as I understand my hon. friend's motion the effect is to change certain words in clause 18 and add a provision for the setting up of a therapeutic abortion committee in accredited hospitals. According to the Criminal Code amendment, if the committee gives a certificate, then any medical practitioner can go ahead and perform an abortion providing it is to preserve the life or health of the mother. This brings me to the point I want to argue in dealing with this section. I want to try to explain what Professor Mewett recommended to the committee, though Your Honour, with the greatest respect, ruled out

[Mr. Speaker.]

the word "unlawfully" that I wanted to add to section 237 which is being amended by this bill.

First of all, and despite what the minister has said, I ask the house to consider section 209. Section 209 of the Code which is in two parts, commences:

Every one who causes the death of a child that has not become a human being, in such a manner that, if the child were a human being, he would be guilty of murder, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life.

That is subsection (1) of section 209. My good friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) says that this has nothing to do with abortion. Mr. Speaker, it is beyond me how he makes that deduction. The minister says he has consulted the law officers in this regard.

Let us see what section 195 of the Criminal Code has to say about when a person becomes a human being. That section provides:

A child becomes a human being within the meaning of this Act when it has completely proceeded, in a living state, from the body of its mother whether or not

(a) it has breathed,

(b) it has an independent circulation, or

(c) the navel string is severed.

I ask the house to keep that section in mind and to go back to the provisions of section 209 to which I have just referred. In other words, an abortion of the foetus at that stage would be a criminal offence under section 209. However, there is an exception made in subsection (2), which reads:

This section does not apply to a person who, by means that, in good faith, he considers necessary to preserve the life of the mother of a child that has not become a human being, causes the death of the child.

Yet, the Minister of Justice and his officers claim that section has nothing to do with miscarriage or abortion. Their definition of miscarriage or abortion must be far different from that of the House of Lords.

I should like to know why this exception is made if the section has nothing to do with abortion. If it has nothing to do with abortion, all I can say is that for the last 25 years lawyers have argued this section in defending abortion cases when they should not have done so.

Let us see what Professor Mewett has to say. I cannot believe that a person like Professor Mewett, who teaches criminal law at the University of Toronto, would not understand what is meant by a miscarriage or a simple abortion within the definition in the Criminal Code. I should like to put on record

a quotation from the "Criminal Law Quarterly". I don't mind saying that although the government added another eight clauses, I was not allowed to add one word, the word "unlawfully', to section 237. My amendment was ruled out of order. This is beyond my comprehension, and not only beyond my comprehension but the comprehension of many professors teaching criminal law in universities in Canada.

I should like to refer the house to page 385 of the Criminal Law Quarterly, volume 10, for 1967-68:

> Under section 209 of the Code (with the proposed amendment) causing the death of a child that has not become a human being in the act of birth is not illegal if the person causing the death considers it necessary in good faith to preserve the life of the mother.

Surely, those words refer to miscarriages and abortions.

> The Bourne principle clearly applies, allowing the medical practitioner to exercise his own judgment in the act of birth. If, however, the pregnancy is to be terminated prior to the act of birth, apparently totally different, incredibly complex and dubiously constitutional provisions apply.

Then, Professor Mewett goes on to deal with section 209, the section that my good friend the Minister of Justice and the law officers of the crown say has nothing to do with a miscarriage or an abortion. We are dealing here with doing away with the foetus prior to its becoming a human being. If that is not a miscarriage, then there never was a miscarriage. He says:

> Procuring a miscarriage (or, to be precise, using any means with that intent) will be lawful if a therapeutic abortion committee, by a majority, certifies that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy would be likely to endanger the mother's life or health. Apparently the miscarriage is lawful with or without the consent of the mother, though subsection (8) states "Nothing in subsection (4) shall be construed as making unnecessary the obtaining of any ... consent that ... may be required, otherwise than under this Act ..." I assume that that means, if it means anything at all, which I doubt, that the doctor is guilty of assault but not of procuring a miscarriage. This hardly scratches the surface of the abortion problem, and probably makes no difference to the present situation (apart from complicating it) in which most doctors will already perform therapeutic abortions, on the understanding that the Bourne principle applies not only to section 209 but also to section 237.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, to understand what the Criminal Code means by an abortion and by a miscarriage ,sections 209 and 237 must be read together. Then, Professor Mewett goes on to say this:

> It will leave entirely untouched the problem of an unmarried pregnant woman, the victim of rape, or the respectable married woman who just doesn't want a child. If that is all that it really does, a pregnant woman would be advised to wait until the onset of labour and have the child disposed of under section 209 without the rigmarole provided for by section 237.

What is the Professor talking about, Mr. Speaker? Very simply this. He says that section 209 makes an exception. When in their great wisdom the minister and his officers added the words "in the act of birth", it enabled a doctor in good faith to cause the miscarriage of an unborn child only after the onset of labour pains. I want to be fair to the law officers and say the amendment to section 237 was made in light of the fact that the abortion committee would have to give a certificate for the performing of an abortion. The committee would recommend that a doctor in an accredited hospital perform a miscarriage after the onset of labour pains.

What would be the position if doctors were really ruthless about this? My good friend—and others apparently agree with him—says that the section does not apply to a miscarriage or an abortion. But what would happen in fact? If a woman wanted an abortion she would forget about the abortion committee, the accredited hospital and the committee's certificate. She would wait until she experienced labour pains, then the unborn child could be destroyed and that would be a miscarriage. This was the very reason section 209 was amended. I had suggested removal of the words "in the act of birth" from section 209 and the insertion of the word "unlawfully" in section 237. In that way, the public and the doctors would have been protected.

This party was elected, so it says, in order to bring in this legislation. Hon. members opposite say they have a mandate to introduce amendments concerning homosexuality and abortion, and that no one will stop them from doing so.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Section 209 is applicable only to the death of a child in the act of birth. Where would you be left if you take out the words, "in the act of birth", from section 209 and add the word "unlawfully" to section 237? Perhaps I should put it this way. If you added the word "unlawfully" to section 237, you might then have some protection under our law. When amending the Criminal Code in 1953 another

Liberal minister of justice, Mr. Garson, said that the changes he was proposing would protect the public and the doctors. Doctors must be protected. It must be presumed they are acting in good faith. As a matter of fact, the crown must prove in any prosecution that a doctor has not acted in good faith. If you added the word "unlawfully" to section 237 and removed the words "in the act of birth" from section 209, you might have a reasonable abortion law in this country.

Really, the government has put some beautiful drapes over windows here to satisfy those people in Canada who want wholesale abortions and to satisfy those who, because of various convictions and religious scruples, do not want abortions at all. You see here the same old Liberal practice of pointing in both directions; the government is using both arms to point in different directions to satisfy all the people. I know that people will not like me for saying this, but this must be said. It is time we exposed this great fiction of double talk. Whether it is dealing with a language bill or the Criminal Code, this Liberal government manages to talk out of both sides of its mouth at the same time.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Some people in this country want wholesale abortions, and others want no abortions at all. Each group thinks this bill is the answer. Some think that anyone wanting an abortion simply has to go to a committee, obtain a certificate and have the abortion performed. This bill does not mean that at all.

**An hon. Member:** I hope you are right.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I hope I am, too. The only thing we need to be worried about is if doctors become so ruthless that they interpret the law to mean that any action they take may be considered necessary to protect the health of the woman. If they interpret the wording of the law ruthlessly we shall see wholesale abortions in this country. I know the hon. member is intelligent and understands what I mean.

Naturally, any young girl who gets pregnant will be upset. But I do not think doctors and the courts will say that such a young woman must have an abortion because the abortion is necessary to protect her health or to preserve her life. I do not think the doctors of this country will go that far.

**Mr. Flemming:** But it only takes the opinion of one doctor, does it not?

[Mr. Woolliams.]

**Mr. Woolliams:** I agree. We are developing into a permissive society and cannot see what is ahead of us.

**An hon. Member:** Be careful, or we shall be having some resignations.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I would not wish to see that. Basically, this law does nothing for girls who have been raped and do not want to bear the child resulting from that offence. That is, unless it is shown that bearing the child will in some way endanger the life or the health of the mother, the girl will have her child. I do not think the courts will go so far as to say that if a girl is pregnant as a result of being raped that that endangers her life or health. So, basically, the act in this regard is left alone. One can say that the law has not been changed. Certainly, if the courts interpret the law as they have been interpreting it since 1953 in this regard, one could well say that the present provisions do not change the law.

Clearly this government is talking out of both sides of its mouth. To those who want abortions it is saying, "Look at what a great reform party we are," and to those who do not want abortions it is saying, "We are really not that kind of party after all, we just want to be very careful in this area." I suggest that if we had left section 209 alone and added the word "unlawfully" to section 237, we should have arrived at basically the same sort of the law the government proposes to have. In addition, our doctors would have been afforded a little protection.

If my suggestion were adopted, doctors would be protected. Abortions would be performed to preserve the life or health of the mother. Also, the law would be more realistic, and we should not wind up playing games, as we are here.

May I now read some questions and answers given before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. I am reading from page 349 of volume No. 10 of those proceedings. This is what I asked Professor Mewett, as reported at page 348:

> May I ask you to pause there, so that this is on record? You are dealing with the Canadian Section 209. I think it should be read in at this time.

I will not read section 209 at this time. Having read it, I went on to say, as reported at page 349:

> And I take it from conversations I had with you this morning, that you feel that the Bourne case principle that interprets the preservation of the life has been applied in Ontario, and I

believe it has been applied elsewhere in Canada. It does not mean to save her from violent death, but it means to preserve her life, in a case where she might otherwise be left impaired physically or emotionally. Then, of course the doctor in good faith who performs such a therapeutic abortion would fall into the saving and exception clause of Section 209.

Speaking of the saving and exception clause of section 209, there is no indication as to whether it applies to miscarriages and abortions. That is, there is no indication that it does not apply to miscarriages and abortions. At any rate, that is my understanding of the matter. I continued to ask:

—with the strength of section 237, if the word "unlawfully" were put in you would be obtaining the same result basically—

I said in so many words that the law would remain the same, with the added proviso that you would have some protection under it. And what did the professor say to that? He agreed. That is why we have moved this amendment. It is basically relevant to what we are talking about.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It being ten o'clock, the house will proceed, pursuant to the provisions of standing order No. 40, to debate certain questions to be raised.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### COMBINES—DRUGS—PRICE FIXING BY B.C. PHARMACISTS

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, on April 16 I drew to the attention of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) a situation in which, as from April 15, the British Columbia Professional Pharmacists' Society was charging each welfare patient $1 for a prescription. I asked what action the minister proposed to deal with this matter and, specifically, if such apparent price fixing would be referred to the investigation branch for combines investigation.

It seems to me that the Minister's answer contradicted itself. On the one hand, he said that the practice of pharmacy comes under provincial jurisdiction, inferring he could do nothing about the situation; then, he added that such apparent price fixing in respect of professional fees has for some time been before the Combines Investigation Branch.

Since then quite a lot of water has gone under the bridge. On April 24 my colleague, the hon. member for Surrey (Mr. Mather) asked the minister whether the Combines Investigation Act was being used in this instance. The minister replied that he had no knowledge of any request from the government of British Columbia for an investigation but that he might have received it without knowing about it. Since the provincial Minister of Welfare on April 21 wrote to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, asking for an inquiry under the Combines Investigation Act and since he called a press conference two days later, on April 23, to talk about it, there is only one possible explanation about this state of affairs. The explanation lies with our new mail service. The letter sent on the 21st did not manage to arrive on the 24th.

**An hon. Member:** That is a disservice.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** Yes, as a colleague has said, that is a disservice. In British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, 65,000 people are on welfare who are classed as unemployable. This means that 65,000 breadwinners are now classified as being medically unfit to work and dependent for their living on welfare. These are the people who get optical and dental care under welfare as well as drugs. The people are unable to pay for those services. In 1967-68, the latest year for which such figures are available, there were 820,000 prescriptions filled for these patients. These are the people who are now being told they must pay a $1 surcharge if they want a prescription filled. How can they pay this $1?

• (10:00 p.m.)

A single person on welfare in British Columbia receives $75 a month, from which $30 is deducted for rent. This leaves a balance of $45 for food, clothing, bus fare, etc. A couple receives $125 of which $45 is paid out in rent, leaving $40 for each of them to live on for a month. Of course, they do not live, they only exist. A couple with two children receives $191, minus $55 for rent, leaving the magnificent sum of $136 a month for four people to exist on, $34 each.

These are the people who will be affected by this $1 prescription surcharge. They are the helpless hostages in a war the pharmacists society is waging against the government of British Columbia. The pharmacists want more money from the government with respect to welfare patients. The government

says no. Therefore, the pharmacists are fastening themselves like leeches on the helpless bodies of the poor. I realize recent reports indicate that some pharmacists say they will not carry out the direction from their association, but the direction is there.

On April 24 the Pharmacists Society wrote to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. They presented a brief to him which includes all the facts from their point of view. At the same time, the British Columbia Minister of Welfare drew to the attention of the minister the serious implications of federal and provincial sponsored drug programs. This was as a result of the decision of the British Columbia Professional Pharmacist Society to make a $1 surcharge on prescriptions to welfare patients. The provincial minister stated that druggists already receive no less than a 66⅔ per cent mark-up on drugs dispensed to welfare patients. This is precisely the reason I am raising this question tonight.

The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has been trying, in some respects, to achieve co-operation with the relevant provincial authorities. He has been trying hard. I urge him, personally, to take a hand in this matter as it is his job to protect consumers. Those who are ill and on welfare need his help most of all.

Less than two weeks ago the minister presided over the first federal-provincial conference of ministers of consumer affairs in Ottawa. It appears this was a very successful conference. Cabinet Minister without Portfolio, Mrs. Patricia Jordan represented the British Columbia government. I suggest that the federal minister should now profit from this contact and discuss with the provincial government ways and means of dealing with this drug situation in order to protect those who are completely dependent on welfare payments for their supply of drugs.

The minister must face the situation that if these people are forced to pay this $1 surcharge from their meagre welfare allowances, they simply will not be able to get their prescriptions filled. They will not get the drugs they require. I appeal to the minister, in his capacity as champion of the consumer, to take a hand himself in this matter, together with the provincial minister of welfare of British Columbia, which involves so many helpless consumers.

**Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of

[Mrs. MacInnis.]

the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) with respect to the high cost and availability of drugs and proper medical care for these people who need it most. That is why the government has introduced the Canada Assistance Plan and, in this session, Bill C-102 to meet these problems.

In the present case, as my minister indicated to the hon. member on April 16, the department is aware of the British Columbia situation. Since then, the minister has received a letter from the Hon. Dan Campbell, minister of social welfare for British Columbia, asking for a combines investigation. This has been referred to the combines branch. The director has the matter under review at the present moment to ascertain whether it provides reason to believe that the act has been violated. The minister also stated that the practice of pharmacy is within provincial jurisdiction under their provincial licensing authority. When Bill C-102 was introduced in the house last October, the minister informed the house of our five point program to tackle the high cost of drugs. The fifth step in that program involves discussions with the province designed to tackle the problem of the high cost of the retail distribution of drugs, important aspects of which are within provincial jurisdiction. Arrangements have already been initiated to bring the provinces and our department together for the purpose of these discussions.

The minister has already outlined to the house a very clear and cogent program for dealing with the high cost of drugs, and I can assure the house that any supplementary measures which are available to him will be given full consideration. Certainly any infractions of the Combines Investigation Act will be dealt with firmly. I should like to add also that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) has been informed by the Director of the Investigation and Research Branch under the Combines Investigation Act that many reports have been received over the past several years about the adoption of some kind of formula pricing by druggists, usually by way of relationship to cost plus prescription fees. Whenever such reports have come to his attention he has been in touch with the pharmaceutical associations concerned and has indicated to them that the adoption of such a system by agreement would give rise to a question under the Combines Investigation Act, unless the system has been adopted pursuant to valid provincial legislation.

AIR CANADA—WINNIPEG—TRANSFER OF BASE TO NORTHWEST INDUSTRIES LTD.

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, many people probably have the impression that the people of Winnipeg are resentful and jealous of the people of Montreal because Montreal has had the good luck to have Air Canada expand its jet overhaul facilities at Dorval and also has succeeded in obtaining an effective international airport at Ste. Scholastique just a few miles away. If people have that impression, I suggest they have missed the point. What the people of Winnipeg resent very much is not that something has been taken from Winnipeg and placed in Montreal; what is resented above all is the fact that in all the inquiries that have been made over the past years in an attempt to find justification for Air Canada taking its jet overhaul plant out of Winnipeg there has been a long and sad history of deception.

The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler), who is a colleague of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) who I presume will be answering, has himself used words to the effect that the executives of Air Canada in testifying at the Thompson inquiry, for example, were lying—I repeat "lying". It is precisely the use of that kind of word that I want to endorse. I want the minister, or whoever is responsible for his department at the present time, to give some good reason why there should not be an inquiry into the testimony given by the Air Canada officials in an attempt to find out whether their testimony was accurate and truthfully given. I wish to state, as categorically and as truthfully as I can, that after going through the evidence of the Thompson inquiry and after having received from the Department of Transport an order for return only a few weeks ago, I find there is a contradiction between the words used by the executives of Air Canada before the inquiry commission and the information received through the order for return.

• (10:10 p.m.)

This is a clear indication that there has been a deception perpetrated on the people of Canada, the people of Winnipeg and the people of Manitoba by those officers who hold positions of responsibility with this Crown corporation, namely Air Canada.

In addition to the economic effect all this has had on Winnipeg and the western part of Canada, there is something equally important and sinister about it. It is indeed foreboding if we cannot, as members of parliament, be absolutely confident in the high-ranking civil servants we employ. Let me suggest that no administrative official in the United States would dare give the kind of misinformation to members of Congress that has been given to members of parliament in Canada by officials of Air Canada.

What I should like to hear from whoever is in a responsible position in the Department of Transport at this time is an indication as to why there should not be some kind of full inquiry into this whole sorry episode resulting from the testimony given by Air Canada officials to the Thompson commission. Some explanation should be given to reconcile this testimony with the information included in the order for return tabled in this house a few weeks ago.

In concluding, I want to say that all these charges of deception revolve around certain facts, given in 1964 when Air Canada spokesmen were testifying before the Thompson inquiry. At that time they said the main reason the jet overhaul base should be pulled out of Winnipeg and transferred to Montreal was that the Dorval facilities were not being utilized, and that it was uneconomic to maintain the two plants. Within a very short period of time steps were being taken to ask the Treasury Board to approve amounts to institute a multi-million dollar extension of the facilities at Dorval. This request amounted to some $20 million to $30 million. That was the magnitude of the extension to the jet overhaul plant facilities at Dorval.

A few short months before Air Canada asked for money to extend the facilities, officials of this corporation were saying to this inquiry commission that the plant in Montreal was being utilized to half its capability and was therefore uneconomical; that it was necessary to close down the plant at Winnipeg. It is impossible to reconcile that testimony with what has transpired since then.

Even though it is easy to say in retrospect that this was not the case, there is sufficient evidence to convince many of my colleagues including the hon. members for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler), Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) and anybody else from almost any other part of Canada, that we cannot be completely confident of the evidence given by these officials to the committee. There is sufficient evidence to raise a doubt as to the veracity of the statements made by these senior officials of this Crown corporation.

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

**Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to reply to this question on behalf of the Minister of Transport. I can certainly understand the concern of the hon. member and I shall make certain that his eloquent remarks are drawn to the attention of the minister and to the attention of the management of Air Canada. I suggest that this is a matter the hon. member may well wish to pursue when the senior management of Air Canada again appears before the transport committee of this house.

## AIR CANADA—STRIKE OF MECHANICS—INQUIRY AS TO MATTERS IN DISPUTE

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, the point I wish to discuss this evening relates to a question I raised initially on April 23 and again on April 24 with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey). It arose as a result of the strike of machinists with Air Canada. My question was reported at page 7858 of *Hansard*. At that time I asked the minister directly to tell the house in general terms what might be the issues. The minister's reply was a simple "no". In other words, the minister refused to give the house any indication of what, in general terms, might be the issues in this dispute. I had asked whether it was a matter of seniority, fringe benefits—and fringe benefits cover all sorts of sins of omission and commission—or wages. The minister said that the hon. member, meaning myself, had described the problems.

I wanted the minister to take the house into his confidence a little more than that. After all, the minister said today that the country is undergoing grave inconvenience because of this strike. Therefore, we should know why we are being put to this grave inconvenience. For the second time this union has struck Air Canada, which has an unblemished record in regard to labour relations. We want to know why these people are holding this country to ransom. This is not a case of their trying to get more money out of Air Canada; this is a hold-up of the country. This is a small union, an international union, and there is no indication that they are not taking instructions from elsewhere. As I say, they are holding the country to ransom.

My complaint is not so much about the actions of the union, but the fact that the minister has given us a clear example of what he and his colleagues have been doing in respect of answering serious questions in the

[Mr. Schreyer.]

house. First of all, there is the notorious roster system which means that members cannot ask questions on certain days because the minister concerned is not here. There is a very moot point as to whether the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is empowered, under the rules of the house, to have a minister deliberately stay away from the house. Standing Order 5 says that members shall attend this house. Members do excuse themselves from the house, but if they do it is not because the leader of the party has said: You shall not appear in the house. I think this practice is wrong.

Also, Mr. Speaker, on many occasions questions and grievances have been raised about the practice of ministers saying one thing in the house and then running out into the foyer and saying something different into a microphone. This is precisely what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) did the other day. After his categorical refusal to tell us what were the issues, other than a vague reference to those matters which I had enumerated as casual examples—and there are more—the minister went outside the chamber and said something that was entirely different. I have seen the transcript of what he said. I do not have it with me, but I can tell the house that it makes interesting reading. The minister went into considerable detail outside the house, so much so that members of the press who were present at that interview called me later in the afternoon and said: Did you hear what the Minister of Labour had to say outside the chamber? He gave us the answers that he refused to give you inside the chamber.

I do not think we should put up with this sort of thing. This is what we are complaining about. I have had many instances, starting with the Prime Minister who is one of the worst offenders, of ministers giving no answer, or a partial answer, and then going outside the chamber and adding to or glossing the answer given in the chamber. Ministers are human; they suffer from foot-and-mouth disease. They go outside the house and correct what they have said inside it, after one of their executive assistants or advisers have told them what sort of fools they have been. This happens. The minister then corrects outside the house the answer that he gave inside the house, and to the public and he looks like a well-informed, intelligent individual. No one is in the foyer to question him; no one is there to bring him up short. He can make any sort of misrepresentation, innocent or otherwise, in that interview.

• (10:20 p.m.)

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a bad practice, and the only way we can get it curbed is by protesting with any means at our disposal. I myself, raised the point very briefly having been Speaker, so that I wonder if this practice outside the chamber should not be overseen and proper facilities made available for interviews instead of this catch-as-catch-can practice which we see outside these quarters.

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** I will refrain from discussing the roster system which the hon. gentleman has raised in his seven minutes. I must also refrain from endorsing or rejecting his suggestion that the machinists union is responsible for the breakdown in labour relations with Air Canada. This is a matter of opinion to which the hon. gentleman is entitled. If he feels that labour is to blame, he is entitled to that opinion. However, I, as Minister of Labour, am not in a position to state who is to blame until this very disruptive strike comes to an end.

I do not think the hon. gentleman would expect me to get up here and blame the unions any more than he would expect me to blame Air Canada. But I might say that there is a pattern of labour unrest in Air Canada. I do not think this is an isolated case. It is an isolated case only in the sense that there has been strike action. But after having been involved in negotiations of this nature, let me tell you that the relations between Air Canada and unions in general leave much to be desired.

In so far as making statements outside the house is concerned, I must plead as guilty to it as are other ministers. In all honesty, I think I was rather short in my answer the other day, but this is a welcome change because I am usually accused of and constantly being admonished by the Speaker for making my answers into statements.

With regard to television facilities outside the chamber, may I say that I think the hon. gentleman, being a fair individual, will admit that the use of television is not restricted to cabinet ministers, Liberal backbenchers or members of the government in particular. If he were to review the time spent before television cameras in the centre block or outside these doors he would find, I am sure, that the time is justly apportioned between all parties. I am sure that when the hon. gentleman has something of importance to say he is always welcome before the television cameras and, I am sure, takes full opportunity to express his words of wisdom over television. I am sure that most Canadians, knowing the hon. gentleman's reputation as former Speaker and a seasoned member of the House of Commons, always listen to his television interventions with a great degree of interest, certainly greater than to anything the Minister of Labour would say.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** May I say, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Mackasey:** But as former Speaker of the House of Commons, he also knows he is not supposed to interrupt the speaker at this particular time. I will also say that the next time he asks a question in the House of Commons I will be as expansive as possible.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. As the existing Speaker I must interrupt the minister. The motion to adjourn the house is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this house stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Tuesday, April 29, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Third report of Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, in English and in French—Mr. Legault (Nipissing).

[*English*]

Second report of Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization—Mr. Blair.

[*Editor's Note: For reports of Committees above referred to, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*Translation*]

### DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

REPORT OF SECOND MEETING OF CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies in English and in French of the report of the second meeting of the Constitutional Conference held in Ottawa in February last.

[*English*]

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### AIR CANADA

STRIKE OF MECHANICS—INQUIRY AS TO PROGRESS IN NEGOTIATIONS

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister, in connection with the Air Canada strike which continues to cause increasing inconvenience to Canadians, whether the government proposes to take any steps to encourage a settlement of this strike, and whether there have been any developments today or yesterday which encourage the government to believe that the parties can be brought together to continue the discussions.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, there are no developments or steps beyond those which were reported to the house yesterday by the Minister of Labour.

**Mr. Stanfield:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are we to assume from the statements of the Minister of Labour yesterday that the government has abandoned the guideline which was laid down by the Prime Minister in the house prior to the strike taking place?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that the supplementary question is argumentative in nature.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I am seeking confirmation or otherwise of an impression created by the Minister of Labour yesterday, and with respect I suggest that the Prime Minister might confirm or deny the impression that has been created.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's understanding is exactly contrary to that which was said in the house. When asked a few weeks ago about guidelines, I said there were no guidelines, and I went on to add other things. The hon. member is implying that there are guidelines. Of course there are none.

### AIR TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED HALIFAX LANDING TO ACCOMMODATE ATLANTIC AREA PASSENGERS

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Transport, if there is a Minister of Transport in the house. Due to the inconvenience and hardship caused by the Air Canada strike to certain people on the Atlantic side of this nation, would the minister check with his officials or with the officials of the Canadian Transport Commission to explore the possibility of the landing in Halifax of international carriers now taking off from Montreal. I have in mind in particular B.O.A.C., which flies from Montreal. At present people have to journey from Halifax and other parts of the Atlantic area to catch the plane in Montreal, and even so the service between Montreal and Halifax is not good.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** I will be glad to have that suggestion brought to the attention of the Canadian Transport Commission.

## GRAIN

WHEAT—TWO PRICE SYSTEM AND ACREAGE REDUCTION PAYMENTS

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In the light of statements made recently by the minister, will he inform the house if it is the government's intention to institute a two price system for wheat and a program of compensation for acreage reduction on the prairies. Can he also inform the house of the government policy on these two matters.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** In response to the hon. member's question as to the content of statements made recently, what I said, or what I intended to say, was that these proposals had been made to the government by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and by other bodies.

**Mr. Gleave:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure the house that it is not the intention of the government to say to the farmers of western Canada that it is abandoning any real effort to sell or dispose of stocks of western grain?

**Mr. Olson:** As has been indicated positively on a number of occasions, the government intends to do everything possible to be helpful.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. Does the government in this session intend to implement a two price system for wheat?

**Mr. Olson:** The government has received representations from provincial legislatures and a number of farm organizations. What I said last night was that these representations had been received.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** If the minister is not able to give the house any assurance about the two price system, is he able to say whether there will be a just price for farmers?

**Mr. Olson:** Whatever the government does will be just.

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** I suggest to the minister he should go west and find out. He will then get an answer to that suggestion.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Is the right hon. gentleman rising for the purpose of asking a question?

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, it is gratuitous observations such as the minister has just made that result in the necessity of answers being given by the opposition.

What I wish to ask the minister is this: In view of the increasingly calamitous conditions in the prairies—the Minister of Finance bends his head in the negative, is he going to do anything about it—will the government provide emergency legislation to meet the serious situation, or will the minister have to set up himself as a task force to go out west to find out how serious the situation is?

**Mr. Olson:** As I indicated, we have received representations—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Why don't you act?

**Mr. Olson:** —respecting the two price system, and I am sure my right hon. friend would want us to consider them very carefully. This examination ought to include the reasons why his government rejected this proposal on a number of occasions.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That statement is false. But my question is this—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The minister himself used to advocate the two price system; has he changed his mind?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that on television last night I heard him say, not that he had received these representations but that the government was giving serious consideration to a two price system for wheat and acreage reduction payments, can I ask the minister if this is being considered by the government as a matter of policy, and if the government is likely to carry out the commitment it made to the western farmers of a guaranteed price for wheat and a two price system for wheat?

**Mr. Olson:** What I said on television, disregarding the interpretations that were put on

what I said, was that responsible bodies such as the provincial legislatures of the three prairie provinces as well as the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the Farmers Union and a number of other bodies had made these representations to the government. Certainly, if responsible bodies such as these make representations, this government takes them seriously.

**Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie):** I should like to ask the minister whether the government is now in a position to award an acreage payment to western farmers, something which the government headed by my right hon. friend from Prince Albert did.

**Mr. Olson:** That, also, is part of the representations which are under consideration.

[*Translation*]

## AGRICULTURE

SUGGESTION THAT POLICY BE PUBLICIZED

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Since the minister has just said that whatever the government does will be just, does he not think that if the government waits too long before announcing its farm policy, the farmers will be led to believe that whatever the government does will be just for fun?

**Mr. Speaker:** It seems to me the hon. member's question is rather argumentative and, therefore, is out of order.

[*English*]

## HOUSING

AUSTRALIA—SALES OF SUBURBAN HOMES

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** I have a question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Could the Prime Minister have an appropriate member of his government contact the government of Australia and acquaint himself with the housing policies of that government which have made it possible for builders to sell first class three-bedroom suburban homes for $13,000 on a down payment of $1,200 and a mortgage at 5 per cent?

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not think a question in this form is acceptable by the Chair.

**Mr. Hees:** With great deference, on a point of order: If I do not give the Prime Minister the background he will make an awful mess of the answer.

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister any immediate and specific plan for providing summer employment for students who are now leaving our universities in great numbers?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Could the minister tell us what this plan is, and how soon it will come into effect?

**Mr. Speaker:** Before the minister rises, may I point out that the hon. member is asking a question which is very general in nature, and that the type of statement he is inviting the minister to make would normally be made on motions.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Perhaps I could put it this way: Can the minister tell us how soon he will make a statement on motions providing us with this information?

**Mr. MacEachen:** No, Mr. Speaker.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

NATO—NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF CANADIAN FORCES

**Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre):** I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the Canadian government informed our NATO allies, or some of them, that Canada intends to withdraw all its forces from Europe except one battalion?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Not that I know of, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Harkness:** Have the members of the military committee of NATO, who are responsible for military planning, been given information along that line?

**Mr. Trudeau:** I hope not, Mr. Speaker.

CONSULTATION WITH TEACHERS OVERSEAS BEFORE CONTRACT CHANGE

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** I have a question for the Minister of National Defence arising out of a statement made by the Canadian Teachers Federation. Can the minister inform the house whether he has refused to consult teachers, or the federation

of teachers, before changing a contract of employment for teachers under the Department of National Defence, and whether the contract has in fact been changed in the absence of such consultation?

**Hon. Leo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** First of all, the contract has not been changed. In the second place, I hope the hon. member understands that we are not employing these teachers; it is a tripartite contract between the school boards, the teachers and the Department of National Defence.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I do understand, and that is the reason for my question. I should like to ask the minister whether there has been some change along the lines of making it possible for teachers to have a particular period of service extended, without discussion with them but after discussion with the school board concerned. In addition, have there been any changes relative to the provision of medical assistance and the like? If not, are these provisions in fact in the contracts?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** Mr. Speaker, as far as medical services are concerned, the exercise of my ministerial discretion simply indicates that the minister is not responsible for medical services when they are available at the place the teachers serve. There has been no change in the contract regarding prolongation of the stay overseas. Our oversight might have been not to inform the teachers that, in the event of a prolongation required by national defence and the school board, obviously we would also consult the teachers.

**Mr. Lewis:** A further supplementary question. Would the minister inform the house whether the teachers federation, or one of the teachers federations, sought an appointment with him to discuss the matter, and that the minister refused to meet them on the ground that it would serve no purpose? If that happened, or even if it did not happen, would the minister now assure the house that he would be ready to meet with the teachers federation to discuss the whole problem of teachers' contracts for overseas service?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** Mr. Speaker, I have always received with pleasure representatives of the teachers federation. What I did refuse was a visit from Mr. Nason, who wrote me a letter and wanted to explain the letter to me. I can read.

[Mr. Lewis.]

## OIL

### VOLUNTARY REDUCTION OF CRUDE EXPORTS TO U.S.

**Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Has the National Energy Board requested the petroleum industry in western Canada to reduce voluntarily its exports of crude oil to the United States, and further has it indicated that if these reductions are not made voluntarily it will impose export quotas?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I think the strict answer to the question has to be no. However, the National Energy Board has been in touch with various suppliers and buyers of Canadian oil in the light of the existing agreement between the United States and Canada. As I indicated in the house yesterday, no agreement other than that has been reached. Accordingly that agreement stands and we have certain obligations in relation to it.

**Mr. Mahoney:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In fulfilling these obligations, is the National Energy Board or the department indicating that they will impose export quotas?

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, in discussing the whole situation between the United States and Canada in regard to oil exports, needless to say the question of alternative action in the absence of voluntary compliance is always an issue. It was indeed impliedly referred to in the agreement between the two countries.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the minister would now make it clear that in his answer to the hon. member for Calgary South he was saying that what the National Energy Board has done is to implement government policy, which is to reduce the amount of exports to the United States and to introduce quotas.

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I believe my answer in fact dealt with that issue. The hon. member is carrying my answer to the question further, when he asks what in fact government policy is. It is government policy that, as long as an agreement exists between the United States and Canada, we are obligated to honour it.

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON CANADA-U.S. CONTINENTAL POLICY

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In answer to a question that I asked either earlier this week or at the end of last week the minister said he would make a statement in reference to the new agreements that are now being made between Canada and the United States. Is the minister prepared to make this announcement either today or soon?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I did not make any statement about making any statement and I will indeed not do so until there is something specific to say about any new agreement.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, that is the first honest answer we have had. The minister admits that he will make no statement.

ACCESSIBILITY OF WESTERN OIL TO EASTERN MARKET

**Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources take the house into his confidence on the question of the establishment of a national oil policy for Canada under which western Canadian oil may gain access to markets in eastern Canada.

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, the whole question of oil policy both in Canada and in the United States, and the question of the proper handling of oil in North America, is under review. As decisions are made in this regard statements of course will be made to the house. I could, indeed, make a statement at this time or at any time reviewing the tremendous progress that has been made in developing oil resources as a result of existing government policies in this field.

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY FOLLOWING VISIT WITH PRESIDENT NIXON

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** May I address a supplementary question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. As it is more than six weeks since he discussed oil policy with President Nixon and others interested in the subject, can he report on any progress which has been made that would indicate it will be possible for Canada to achieve in the near future a successful national oil policy similar to that introduced by the former government in 1961.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## FORESTRY

LOGS—DENIAL OF EXPORT LICENCES TO MEET DOMESTIC DEMAND

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. It relates to an announcement which he made in the latter part of February concerning a voluntary ban on the export of logs from British Columbia. Since the export of logs from Crofton and Chemainus on Vancouver island has increased sevenfold in March as compared with one year ago, is the minister now willing to consider imposing a ban and denying export licences for export of logs until domestic requirements have been met?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, the figures the hon. member has mentioned are news to me. I will check into the matter and let him know my answer.

[*Translation*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SUGGESTED REPLACEMENT FOR "DON MESSER'S JUBILEE"

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Since the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has removed "Don Messer's Jubilee", the last program devoted to Canadian folklore, from its programming schedule, does the Prime Minister intend to suggest to the Secretary of State, responsible to the house for the C.B.C., to replace that program by another one on Canadian folklore, a tradition dear to millions of Canadians?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** That could be a useful expedient for introducing television in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker. There is quite a lot of folklore around here.

[*English*]

## TRANSPORT

ACTION ON MEASURE RESPECTING MARITIME FREIGHT RATES

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting

Minister of Transport. I hope he has not been too busy with his new duties to provide an answer to my question of April 18 with respect to the future of Bill C-182 and the Maritime Freight Rates Act. I hope the minister can answer the question, in order to alleviate the fears of shippers in the maritimes.

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, the government has introduced legislation in the form of Bill C-182 which has received first reading in the house, the purpose of which is to extend the freeze on rail freight rates until March 23, 1970. Provisions are made in the bill to compensate the railways for extending the freeze on their rates.

**Mr. Bell:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the government house leader indicate when this bill is to come forward. There seemed to be a great rush a few days ago to bring it on.

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I could do that if I had some indication as to when we will finish with Bill C-150.

**Mr. Bell:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We gave an assurance in this house, which is indelibly recorded in *Hansard,* that we will pass this freight rates bill post haste, as soon as it is brought on. The government has held it up on three or four occasions.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

### FARM PRESS RATE INCREASES

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Postmaster General. I welcome him back from his western think-out. My question is based on information that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture has finally been granted an audience with members of the government. Can the minister advise if he or an acting minister gave any assurance that sympathetic consideration would be given to representations made on behalf of the farm press of this country which is now suffering from postal rate increases which are, in some instances, as high as 2,000 per cent.

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I did attend a meeting. I was accompanied by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, and we were able, at that time to discuss the problem quite fully. Since that time I have written a number of letters to individual papers suggesting they do come under a different classification. I understand they are quite happy.

### EXTENSION OF SECOND CLASS RATE TO COMMUNIST PUBLICATIONS

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Can the Postmaster General explain why the department has lifted the second class mailing privileges of the Canadian Legion magazine?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General):** Because it represents the interests of a very important, but still a particular group.

**Mr. McIntosh:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister explain why his department, while lifting second class privileges from legitimate labour union publications, has granted such privileges to a whole string of communist and subversive publications, such as *Canadian Tribune, Communist Viewpoint, Combat, American Exile in Canada*?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is asking a question—

**Some hon. Members:** Shame!

**Mr. Woolliams:** What about *Playboy*?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## PUBLIC SERVICE

### SUPERANNUATED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR INCREASED PENSIONS

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that within the past few days the International Nickel Company of Canada and Imperial Oil Limited have announced plans for increasing the pensions of their retired employees, will the Prime Minister, as head of the government, expedite the cabinet's consideration of the question of increasing the pensions of retired public servants?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** We are proceeding according to plan, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact the President of the Treasury Board indicated on January 8 to an organization representing these people that there would be a report within a few weeks, can the Prime Minister say when there will be a statement as to the progress that has been made?

**Mr. Trudeau:** The plan is secret, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

## HOUSING

THOMPSON, MAN.—AVAILABILITY OF MORTGAGE MONEY

**Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Housing. Is the minister in a position today to answer a question I directed to him on Friday? I asked him if he would look into the matter of precedence in the making available of C.M.H.C. mortgage money for high rise apartment construction at Thompson, Manitoba?

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** No, Mr. Speaker. I do not have a specific answer to that question.

## AGRICULTURE

FEED GRAIN—REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF POLICY

**Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova):** I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister advise if he received representations from the various federations of agriculture and other organizations in the Atlantic area stressing the need for the continuation of the present feed grain policy in that area? If so, what reply was given?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** We have received such representations, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. MacEwan:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise as to what reply he has made or what action he intends to take on this very important matter to the feeders and others in that area?

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, we have indicated to them that this program, which has been in effect for a number of years, is under review, and that any adjustments which seem to be reasonable and positive will be part of that review.

**Mr. MacEwan:** A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise whether he endorses the apparent policy of the task force to the effect that these subsidies should be discontinued?

**Mr. Olson:** The views of the task force are completely independent of the government's views. I would like to advise my hon. friend that, when we have completed the review of this and a number of other programs, government policy will be announced.

## FARM CREDIT ACT

ONE YEAR ADVANCE FOR LOAN REPAYMENTS

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether, in view of the serious situation in which western farmers find themselves, resulting from diminished revenues arising from reduced wheat sales, he will consider advancing farm credit repayments by one year as is done in the case of farm improvement loans, since these loans are always adequately secured?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** I have announced on several occasions in this house that if an individual who has a loan from the Farm Credit Corporation would make application, along with substantial evidence that it is difficult or impossible to make the payments, they will be given consideration.

**Mr. McIntosh:** Could I ask the minister at this time what he will accept as evidence? Will he accept a low quota which is controlled by the Canadian Wheat Board as sufficient evidence that these payments cannot be met?

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, the evidence is an indication of his receipts and expenses.

## ARTS, LETTERS AND SCIENCES

NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE OPERATING DEFICIT

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the fact the National Arts Centre Committee predicts a net operating deficit of between $400,000 and $500,000, depending on interpretation, for the two week opening festival of the arts, can the minister say whether Treasury Board has given approval to any such plans?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I doubt whether the question is acceptable at this time. The hon. member might want to discuss this at the time of adjournment.

**Mr. Schreyer:** May I rephrase the question so that it will be in order? I ask the minister whether he will use his good offices and try to lower the operating deficit, and at the same time give Ottawa high society a treat by having Don Messer appear at the National Arts Centre?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

COURTENAY, B.C.—INAUGURATION OF CARRIER SERVICE

**Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** Mr. Question, I have a speaker for the—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** You are out of practice; you have been away too long!

**Mr. Barnett:** I will try again. I have a question for the Postmaster General. I ask the minister when he intends to inaugurate in the city of Courtenay a letter carrier service, since that city has been qualified under the rules for a number of months?

**Mr. Speaker:** I doubt if the question is in order, but in view of the very special circumstances perhaps the house will allow the minister to answer the question.

**Mr. Barnett:** May I put it down for ten o'clock?

**Mr. Speaker:** Possibly the minister would prefer to answer now.

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, there is a freeze on introducing new letter carrier service. As soon as this is lifted, I think we will be able to give this service to Courtenay.

**Mr. Barnett:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Why this freeze?

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the supplementary might be considered at ten o'clock.

[*Translation*]

## AGRICULTURE

QUEBEC—ASSISTANCE TO PREVENT BANKRUPTCY OF FARMERS

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

In view of the deplorable and disturbed economic situation now prevailing in agriculture, would the minister inform the house if he expects new tendencies and an adequate policy so as to give practical assistance to the Quebec farmers and prevent a great many of them from going bankrupt?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is now inviting the minister to make a general statement which should normally be made on motions.

[Mr. Schreyer.]

[*English*]

## EDUCATION

EMPLOYMENT OF CANADIAN SCHOLARS IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration a question on an urgent matter. This is the time of year when many students of Canadian universities are at the stage of making career decisions. Is the minister satisfied in his capacity as Minister of Manpower and Immigration that a sufficient mechanism exists in the country so that our universities are aware of Canadian scholars available for employment in the universities?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly certain of what is meant by mechanism. We in the department, through our manpower centres and other devices, maintain fairly complete information respecting the university labour market. We do assist the universities in recruiting abroad by our retrieval program and I do not believe, unless the hon. gentleman has some specific obstacle in mind, that there is any difficulty in the flow of this information.

**Mr. Stanfield:** As a supplementary question, is there any machinery in the country specially for the purpose of making certain that Canadian universities are aware of the qualifications and availability of Canadian scholars, or is the minister simply relying on the normal machinery of his department in this regard?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, as the main network of service in the country, we have over 300 Canada Manpower Centres. We have over 3,000 counsellors who are informed as to the opportunities in Canadian universities, and we do maintain a close relationship with the Canadian Association of Universities on this and other matters.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask one further supplementary question. Last week the minister indicated that he was conducting some inquiries into difficulties that might be encountered by Canadian scholars seeking teaching employment in this country. Would he include in those inquiries the adequacy of the existing machinery in this country, so that Canadian scholars may have an adequate opportunity to have their services made known, and will his inquiries also include a determination as to whether the proportion of

Canadians teaching in our universities has fallen from roughly 75 per cent a few years ago to less than 50 per cent last year?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The Leader of the Opposition has made a submission to the minister.

## FISHERIES

### SALT COD—SETTING UP OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. It is based upon his new statement of policy concerning the salt cod fish industry. In view of the fact that there is a great deal of doubt as to the efficacy or effectiveness of this new policy, would the minister tell the house when he proposes to set up the advisory committee which was announced in the policy statement?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, we are now in the process of setting up the advisory committee. It is a good scheme and I do not think we will have any difficulty getting it over to the fishermen.

## OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER

### ENTERTAINMENT OF LIBERAL MEMBERS AT 24 SUSSEX DRIVE

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister with respect to the program of dinners he is holding for his backbenchers. Is he going to extend an invitation to the hon. member for Trinity?

## NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

### REQUEST FOR STATEMENT RESPECTING SELF-GOVERNMENT

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. My question relates to the proposal for self-government in the Territories, a subject that has been inquired about over some months now. Has his proposal yet received cabinet approval and when will he be making an announcement about it?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, these proposals have not yet been approved by the cabinet, but I hope that they will be very soon.

## AGRICULTURE

### MEETING BETWEEN FARM ORGANIZATION AND FEDERAL MINISTER

**Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Is it a fact that the Quebec C.F.U. has asked for a meeting with the Prime Minister and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion?

Would the Prime Minister also tell us whether the Minister of Agriculture will be invited to this meeting?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly to what meeting the hon. member is referring. I have met representatives of some agricultural federations yesterday and I shall be seeing another delegation on Monday next. It may be that the C.F.U. will be a member of that delegation.

## NATIONAL PARKS

### GASPÉ—AGREEMENT BETWEEN PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

In view of the fact that the Quebec Public Service Minister and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion were to meet last Friday, could the minister tell the house whether or not such a meeting has taken place?

In addition, since I am interested in the development of this famed national park in the province of Quebec, could he tell us whether an agreement has been reached in this connection?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, there was a meeting last Friday between the Quebec Public Service Minister, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and myself, but we did not make much headway.

[*Later:*]

**Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Has he entered into an agreement with the province of Quebec about Forillon Park, in the Gaspé peninsula?

**Mr. Chrétien:** No, Mr. Speaker.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

[*Later:*]

**Mr. De Bané:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question.

Has the minister received realistic counter-proposals from the province of Quebec?

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, there have been counter-proposals but I am not in a position to talk about them at this time.

## OIL

MARKETING OF PRODUCTION FROM YUKON AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, I would like to answer the question which was put to me last Friday by the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. Thomson).

The answer is no.

[*English*]

## WATER RESOURCES

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Is the minister's proposed water act nearly ready for introduction to the house, and can we expect it this session?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to have the water act ready for introduction before the end of this session.

## INDUSTRY

PARITY BETWEEN CANADIAN AND U.S. AUTOMOBILE PRICES

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I rise for the first time in my new position as a left-wing Conservative. In the absence of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt. In view of the report of all-time high levels reached by shares of the Ford Motor Company on the Toronto Stock Exchange would he request the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to make a statement to the house on the progress he is making with the Ford Motor Company in his attempt to achieve price parity—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

## TRANSPORT

CORNER BROOK, NFLD.—WITHDRAWAL OF PORT FROM COASTAL SERVICE

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Transport. Would he give most urgent consideration to suspending the recent order of the Canadian Transport Commission withdrawing the port of Corner Brook from the coastal service of the Canadian National system, until such time as a full public hearing may be held to establish a true basis for decision?

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, I will convey that representation to the Transport Commission.

[*Later:*]

ACTION ON MEASURE RESPECTING MARITIME FREIGHT RATES

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport supplementary to an earlier question asked by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster, having to do with the freeze on rates in the Atlantic area. Do we understand from the minister's answer that there is also going to be a freeze on transportation policy in the Atlantic area, and when may we expect a statement of policy on that matter, now that the minister has received the opinions of the four premiers on Atlantic transportation problems?

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** The matter is being given very definite consideration, Mr. Speaker. We have still to hear the final report of the Standing Committee on Transportation but the matter is not being unduly delayed.

## TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

INQUIRY AS TO MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN FIFTH REPORT

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Government House Leader. As the government is not prepared to bring forward the legislation to deal with the Maritime Freight Rates Act would it give immediate consideration to bringing forward debate for concurrence in the fifth report of the Committee on Transport and Communications, so that we can get on with the committee's final recommendations, as mentioned by the Acting Minister of Transport?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, we are now going into the 14th day of debate on Bill C-150 and I hope all hon. members will agree to reach an end to that debate as soon as possible so that we can get on with further business.

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** Would the Government House Leader give an assurance to the house that upon completion of the Criminal Code amendments bill the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications would be brought into the house for debate?

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, at the current rate of progress on the Criminal Code bill I cannot give an assurance that we will ever get finished with it.

## HOUSING

THOMPSON, MAN.—AVAILABILITY OF MORTGAGE MONEY

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet might I say that I have checked with the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation concerning the question asked me by the hon. member for Churchill. I cannot give him much more information than I could have had I been briefed before the question period, but C.M.H.C. advises that the application in Thompson to which he referred is under consideration but has not yet been approved.

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

WOODS REPORT—REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION BY STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Has he received representations from yet another veterans organization, in this case the War Amputations of Canada, complaining about or protesting the length of time in getting the Woods Commission report before the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs?

**Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. This morning I received a brief and a covering letter from the War amputees, and I do agree with what the President of the War Amputations of Canada had to say in the covering letter, Padré Lambert, who is a very highly respected veteran. In his letter he said this:

> We do not urge that the government should attempt to rush the preparation of the white paper. The importance of this document justifies that sufficient time be taken to ensure its excellence.

I agree with that.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Did Padré Lambert not also state in that letter that the Woods report should be referred to the committee without waiting for the white paper?

**Mr. Dubé:** Yes, he did. But we believe that it would be an advantage to the veterans associations to appear before the committee with the full knowledge of the government's policy as it will be expressed in the white paper, otherwise they will have to appear twice, once to confirm their support of the Woods report, about which we already know, and again to express their views on the white paper. We believe they should appear only once.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** When will that be?

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## INCOME TAX ACT

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance)** moved:

> That a ways and means motion to amend the Income Tax Act, laid upon the table, Monday, April 28, 1969, be now concurred in.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** On division.

Motion to concur agreed to.

**Mr. Benson** thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill C-191, to amend the Income Tax Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might indicate for the benefit of hon. members that it will not be the government's intention to call this bill for debate before Monday, May 12, barring contingency in the meanwhile, to give hon. members of the house and various professionals the opportunity to examine this proposed legislation.

**An hon. Member:** Another month will not mean much, as this has had six months already.

*Criminal Code*

## CRIMINAL CODE

### REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Monday, April 28, consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 24, Mr. Woolliams (for Mr. Valade).

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, last evening I was discussing the amendment before the house in reference to abortion and had almost concluded my remarks. I want to make one or two further references to this matter.

Before doing so let me say that as a result of the remarks made by the President of the Privy Council in respect of delay during this debate—and I only speak for this party—the minister would surely agree, were he here, that we gave full co-operation during the committee hearings. If anyone looks at the record he will note that the opposition members made very few remarks on this amendment. There was no delay so far as we were concerned. I made it my duty to explain this amendment as it appears on the order paper in the absence of the hon. member who put it on the notice paper.

In my opinion the amendment concerning abortion does not change the law very much. It was worded in the manner it was worded in order to catch two classes of people, those who are absolutely against any extension of the laws on abortion and those who think that abortion should be carried out in a wholesale manner. As far as I am concerned, the law as it is drafted in the new bill does not change the present law in Canada.

The bill proposes an amendment to Section 209, which I dealt with last evening, in that it adds the words "act of birth". This would mean that when a woman was in labour in the delivery room there would be no need for a doctor to go to a committee. If he could in all faith say it was necessary to cause a miscarriage for the purpose of preserving the life of the mother or the health of that mother it would be done without delay.

The second amendment the minister brought in was based on the opinion of the committee that if, in the act of birth, it was necessary to preserve the life or health of the

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

mother a doctor could perform the operation in an accredited hospital. I am at a loss to understand why the minister would suggest that Section 209 has nothing whatsoever to do with abortion. As found on page 333 of Crankshaw's Criminal Code, section 209 refers to the killing of an unborn child. This is the law as defined in Crankshaw or in any other book on criminal law dealing with this section. This is the law as referred to by Professor Mewett of the University of Toronto and other legal opinion. In other words, the killing of an unborn child would be caused by a miscarriage, and under that heading would mean an abortion.

It seems to me to be impossible for the minister or his officers to come to the conclusion that Section 209 has nothing to do with abortion. The killing of a foetus at any stage of development is really what is meant by abortion under the law today. This section has reference to the preservation of the life or health of the mother, and there really has been no change in that regard.

The hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell) probably let the cat out of the bag in respect of the Liberal plan to satisfy everybody. I say the government is speaking out of both sides of its mouth in that it wants to get across to the nation that it is helping those who want whosesale abortion and those who do not want abortion extended. This is a policy adopted in order to get the votes of all these people by putting them in one basket.

I do not think anybody could have put this more clearly than that hon. member did in a letter he sent to a Mr. Edward O'Brien of 95 Roywood Drive, Don Mills. The letter is dated March 14, 1969. I will not read it all, but I think a part of it is of great interest. The hon. member said in the last paragraph:

> Actually the laws of Canada now in respect to abortion and homosexuality are the most archaic in the western world. Although the expression "unborn child" is used by those who oppose the bill, this is not a life and no religion that I know of anywhere in the world recognizes or claims that the foetus has a soul. Rather than turning the clock back 1,000 years, the change will bring us forward from the laws of the middle ages.

I do not know what he means by that because it does not change the law very much. This letter really tells us what is going on in the Liberal caucus. That party embraces all religions and philosophies and it arrives at the same conclusion for everyone. The hon. member states in his letter:

> As I said before, it was supported by all members of the Liberal party including Roman Catholics from every province with the exception of one.

I do not know who that exception is but that letter was signed by the hon. member for Peel South.

What I am really saying is that we should not for one moment believe that the new bill will change the law. The amendment in the bill really is a lot of window-dressing designed to satisfy that group of people who are against abortion while at the same time satisfying those who are in favour of abortion. As Professor Mewett says, this bill really does nothing for the girl who has been raped or for any individual whose case does not fall within the narrow interpretation of health or life.

I do not intend to say anything more on the amendment, but it does not change the law of Canada. It is just a vote-catching part of the bill. There are many other similar parts to which I could refer, but if I did so I would be ruled out of order so I will not go into them this afternoon.

• (3:00 p.m.)

I wish to re-emphasize the co-operation of hon. members during the committee hearings. We co-operated with the Minister of Justice and attempted to state our thoughts to the committee expeditiously. I suggest that the committee members worked in a non-partisan way. Since these amendments were introduced into the house members of the Conserative party have been brief and to the point, and we have co-operated with the minister. In spite of this, the President of the Privy Council has tried to leave the impression that our party has caused delay in the passing of this legislation. Let us have no more of this misrepresentation and fraud on the part of the President of the Privy Council when he talks about this debate or any other. He is always leaving that impression. In this way he creates bad will in the house. That is why he is not a good house leader.

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this amendment in the abortion debate, I am sure that in the future this legislation will be referred to as the long talked of great step forward that resulted in a step backward. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in his election promises stated that abortion would be legalized in line with 20th century thinking, and that our abortion laws would be modernized. What has happened? Nothing. There has been absolutely no progress in this respect. The new legislation is a step backward.

Therapeutic abortion has been practised in Canada for many years. Therapeutic abortions have been condoned by the Bourne case of 1938 when Dr. Alex Bourne, an English surgeon, aborted a 14 year old girl who had been raped by soldiers.

The Criminal Code states that therapeutic abortion may be carried out when the life of the mother is at stake. This provision is open to wide interpretation. What is the rate of therapeutic abortion in Canada? A study of non-Catholic, Canadian hospitals shows that in 1967 there was an average of six abortions per 1,000 deliveries or live births. There is no wholesale abortion there.

How is an abortion carried out in Canadian hospitals? It is carried out by the patient's physician in conjunction with a consultant of his or the patient's choice. Now we are to set up a committee, none of whose members will know the patient or will be likely to interview her or her husband. This effectively removes from the patient and her physician the decision to abort.

If the abortion law has to specify indications for abortion, rather than leave the decision to a woman and her physician, as is done in regard to nearly all decisions to carry out a surgical operation, the indications should include all the physical diseases of the mother that would jeopardize her health or that of the baby should the pregnancy continue. It should include obstetrical indications if carrying the pregnancy to full term would be hazardous to either mother or baby. The law should include psychiatric indications where continuation of the pregnancy may result in psychotic episodes or suicidal thoughts.

The law should include provisions to cover the situation where because of an unwanted pregnancy there would be adverse effects on the emotional health of the mother, the existing child or children. It should include provisions to cover cases of rape or incest. A therapeutic abortion should be permitted if there is a reasonable possibility that the child, if born, would be physically and mentally incapacitated. Does the legislation do any of these things? The answer is no.

Another important factor is the safety of the abortion procedure. With a woman less than eight weeks pregnant, D. and C. carries little risk. Beyond eight weeks of pregnancy the chances of complication increase rapidly, especially after the tenth week, owing to the high risk of hemorrhage or perforation of the uterus. Legislation designed to keep down mortality must ensure that the period

between application and abortion is the shortest possible.

The best way to increase the period is to insist upon mutiple consultations. The legislation will increase the danger and risk involved in the procedure more than has been the case in the past. It will increase the risk and danger to the patient. The committee will probably have a discouraging effect on both the patient and her physician. There is a higher mortality rate when there is an exasperating abortion committee system. Awkward abortion legislation tends to divert patients from orthodox health care systems to self-abortion or criminal abortionists. The morbidity of criminally induced abortions is substantial. Criminal abortions in the United States are estimated to be one million to one and a half million a year, with deaths running from 5,000 to 10,000. The figures for Canada are probably proportional to those of the United States because our laws are essentially the same.

Why is there a cloud over abortion, necessitating an abortion committee in addition to other hospital committees? Abortion is as old as history; it was practised in primitive cultures by the midwives and physicians of Rome and Greece. The definitive edict against abortion is only about 100 years old. Abortion was practised in England up until the early 1900's. It is restrictive legislation of this type that many countries are today attempting to revise.

Abortion should be taken out of the Criminal Code and placed in the hands of qualified medical practitioners. This legislation is not good legislation; it creates barriers of time in respect of patients who would benefit by abortion; it does nothing to define the conditions where an abortion is indicated. People living in sparsely populated areas of Canada will be denied the services of an abortion committee unless they travel great distances, involving time, expense and danger to health. This legislation discriminates against them.

The legislation before us is a great abortion hoax. It does nothing to bring our abortion laws in line with public desire or 20th century needs. It is a step backward into the 19th century; it is not a step forward in the 20th century. Any real change in our abortion laws has yet to come. The minister would be wise to remove from the bill the provision for a therapeutic abortion committee and substitute therefor the practice which has been adopted for many years, that of consultation between the patient's own physician and a colleague.

[Mr. Ritchie.]

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak briefly to amendment No. 24. By the amendment the hon. member is attempting to insist that any means used to procure a therapeutic abortion be employed before the period of implantation. We must reject the amendment. I think the simple way of stating it is that implantation occurs about five days after intercourse. Therefore this amendment would in effect negative the whole aim of clause 18 relating to therapeutic abortions. The woman would not know she was pregnant, and even if that fact could be determined there would not be enough time for the therapeutic abortion committee to consider the case or for the doctor to perform the operation. Therefore I submit to the house that in strict medical terms, and in terms of the facts, it would be impossible to implement this amendment. That is the simple answer to it.

But since certain latitude was allowed the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) to reintroduce the argument he made before the committee as to the relationship between section 209 and section 237 of the Criminal Code, without repeating the legal arguments that I introduced on behalf of the government before the committee I want to state again that there is absolutely no relationship in fact between those two sections. With the greatest respect, Professor Mewett was in error when he suggested that if an abortion could not be legally performed under section 237, one could await the time of birth and obtain a defence under section 209. There are two different factual situations here. I should like to read the first two subsections of section 237 of the Criminal Code. These are the operative sections relating to the factual situation involved.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Every one who, with intent to procure the miscarriage of a female person, whether or not she is pregnant, uses any means for the purpose of carrying out his intention is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life.

Subsection 2 reads:

Every female person who, being pregnant, with intent to procure her own miscarriage, uses any means or permits any means to be used for the purpose of carrying out her intention is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years.

Clause 18 exempts from those two subsections a therapeutic abortion which has been approved by a medical committee in an approved or an accredited hospital where the operation is performed by a qualified medical practitioner for the purpose of protecting the woman where her life or health is in danger. This section obviously relates to any killing of the foetus before natural birth and to a miscarriage or an abortion, which legally are equivalent terms. I introduced an argument to that effect before the committee. A miscarriage or an abortion is any killing of the foetus before natural birth and before the child becomes a human being.

Section 209 is a completely different factual situation. It was before this bill and it certainly will be after the bill because clause 15 adds some clarifying words. Section 209 (1) as amended reads as follows:

Every one who causes death, in the act of birth, of any child that has not become a human being, in such a manner that, if the child were a human being, he would be guilty of murder, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life.

Subsection 2 provides a defence where, in good faith, a person causes the death of the child before it becomes a human being when he considers it necessary to preserve the life of the mother of the child and for that reason causes the death of the child. Therefore section 209 of the Criminal Code relates to any killing of a child who has not yet become a human being at the time of the act of birth.

Section 237 relates to the killing of a foetus before the natural time of the birth. Section 209 relates to the killing at the time of the birth. Section 237 involves a miscarriage or an abortion, and section 209 involves homicide.

There is a third factual situation in the Code to be found in section 195 which is not amended by this bill. Section 195 reads as follows:

(1) A child becomes a human being within the meaning of this Act when it has completely proceeded, in a living state, from the body of its mother whether or not

(a) it has breathed,

(b) it has an independent circulation, or

(c) the navel string is severed.

Subsection 2 sets forth the offence. It reads as follows:

(2) A person commits homicide when he causes injury to a child before or during its birth as a result of which the child dies.

Here we have a third factual situation: Injury caused to a child before or during birth as a result of which the child dies after birth, after the child has become a human being. So in sections 237, 209 and 195 we have three absolutely separate factual situations. It is for this reason that we rejected the argument of the hon. member for Calgary North, supported as he was by Professor Mewett, that the Bourne case in any way applied to section 209 of the Criminal Code. The Bourne factual situation applies to section 237. That being so, I rely merely on the fuller treatment of the subject we introduced before the committee. If hon. members wish to review it, of course the proceedings of the committee are available.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to preface the question I wish to put to the minister by saying that the words of the amended section 209 include the phrase "to preserve the life of the mother". Subsection 2 reads:

This section does not apply to a person who, by means that, in good faith, he considers necessary to preserve the life of the mother of a child, causes the death of such child.

If in fact any person in good faith performs an operation to preserve the life or the health of the mother, is that person not performing a legal abortion? My second question is. If such a person performs a legal abortion, is the foetus not killed?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The simple answer to that is that section 209 does not relate to an abortion at all.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I do not want to harp on this subject, Mr. Speaker, but may I ask the minister one more question. Let me read again subsection 2.

This section does not apply to a person who, by means that, in good faith, he considers necessary to preserve the life of the mother of a child causes the death of such child.

To cause the death of the foetus or of an unborn child would in fact under the law be considered an abortion. The minister said that this section does not apply to abortions, but surely these are indentical words to the ones used in section 237. In spite of what the minister's advisers have told him, I ask him to consider this matter again. When a person is performing an abortion in good faith and takes the life of a foetus he is exempt from a penalty under the law, as stated in section 209(2), because he performs a legal abortion.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I have done a great deal of thinking about this. Section 209 relates to a killing at the time of birth.

When performed at the time of natural birth, it is not an abortion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, I would just like to put a question to the minister on a particuler point before delivering my speech, if the rouse agrees. The minister referred earlier to the famous Bourne case. As far as section 209 is concerned, I would like to ask him, in connection with what the hon. member for Calgary Nroth (Mr. Woolliams) stated, whether it would be fair to say, to clear up the matter, that for several years, Canadian and British courts have been constructing in a broad way this qualification stated in section 209 (2) of the Criminal Code—the minister is speaking of—so that it would be generally accepted that, to save the mother's life, it would not be necessary to wait unit the mother runs an immediate risk of death. In the famous Bourne case, the ruling of the judge was—if I remember well—that the doctor had a right to procure a miscarriage for his patient, if it was his conviction that the pregnancy could probably result in ruining her physical and mental health. Does the minister take into account the proposed amendment to the bill? Is it in keeping with that precedent? Would the Bourne case constitute a legal precedent?

• (3:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, my simple answer is no.

The Bourne case was a case of rape, following which the woman had become pregnant and the doctor had agreed to perform an abortion. The actual facts must be considered in that Bourne case. The rape was committed on April 27, 1938, and the abortion performed on June 14, 1938, which leaves an in-between period of about seven weeks. That is a typical case of abortion.

Section 209 rather applies to an operation; or to actual facts in the natural act of birth of a child. Therefore, the Bourne precedent does not apply to the circumstances as defined in section 209.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question my earlier interpretation which to my mind, constitutes a precedent, was corroborated by the famous *Newton vs. Stongo* case, which is found at page 469 of the Criminal Law Review. In that famous case, it was specified that protection of a woman—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I must remind hon. members that we are not in committee. If the hon. member for Lotbinière wishes to deliver a speech, he has the right to do so, but at this stage, he can only ask a question.

**[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]**

**Mr. Fortin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My argument is borne out by the famous *Newton vs. Stongo,* case, when it was specified that the word "health" meant the physical health as well as the mental health of a woman. Can the minister tell me whether my interpretation of that precedent is correct?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I am in a position at this stage to analyse the entire British jurisprudence. I did my best in an attempt to explain the difference between section 209 and section 237 and I cannot add anything more to the evidence I gave a few weeks ago before the committee on justice and legal affairs.

Now, if the hon. member wants to know my innermost thoughts about this, he will find them there.

[*English*]

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** The semantics of legal affairs leave me somewhat mixed up, Mr. Speaker, and I think it would be as well to look at the medical side for a moment. After all, this is a medical problem and we are dealing with people.

I did not understand the minister clearly, if he was clear, when he spoke about what would be done in the case of an alleged rape reported a month or six weeks after the event when the woman found she was faced with a pregnancy. It is my opinion, and I believe it is the opinion of the medical profession generally, that after five days, once the foetus attaches itself to the uterus, a human life is begun. In the hospitals today doctors are engaged in saving every human life in utero they can, and I can see very little difference between the abandonment of a life in utero and ex utero. We are now able to treat babies in the uterus itself when necessary. We are treating them for the Rh. factor and other conditions, and recently we have discovered a vaccine for the treatment of rubella which, when administered to the mother, will prevent deformation of the new-born infant. We are working to preserve life. Regardless of what the hon. gentleman's opinions are, life starts once the foetus attaches itself to the wall of the uterus.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not get into the question of when life starts or does not start.

**An hon. Member:** Why avoid it?

**Mr. Rynard:** The proposals here will destroy life in utero, completely ignoring the fact that a human being has been started in the uterus with a long life ahead in most cases. Why not destroy older people? The live foetus in the uterus may have a long and successful life ahead. This is what disturbs me. We in the medical profession are doing everything we can to see that every woman is able to carry her baby through to full term. Millions of dollars are being spent on research to prevent deformities and illnesses which may cause trouble for the baby after it has been born. Again, it seems to me that in a country such as ours, with a population of 21 million people living in an affluent society, we should be working to preserve every Canadian baby in utero.

It was not very long ago that a Liberal minister of immigration who later became minister of transport and who, while in that office, created a job he was able to step into after resigning, placed a high value on Canadian babies. If the minister would like the reference in *Hansard* I think I could supply it to him. It is disturbing to note that in Sweden, for instance, in 1939—and at that time they were already on the road we may be embarking on now—there were 439 legal abortions. In 1965 the number was 6,245. I was told not long ago by a doctor from Stockholm that businesswomen were now becoming pregnant and raising children as a result of the creative imbalance between males and females. This is a story we do not want to see repeated in Canada. Canada was not founded on those principles. Doctors work to protect human life from the embryo to the end of the road. This proposition upsets their efforts.

I ask the minister again what he proposes to do in cases of abortion when the woman concerned has alleged rape. He tells us that five days is not enough time in which to set up an abortion committee. How is the law to deal with such a situation?

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to remind hon. members that the rules do not allow the minister to speak a second or a third time.

**Mr. Rynard:** I wonder whether I could ask the question so as to clarify the position.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member might have asked the question while the minister had the floor. However, with the consent of the house he may be allowed to put his question to the minister and have it answered, but certainly we shall get ourselves into difficulty if we disregard the rules. As I pointed out at the beginning, we are not in committee and we should as far as possible keep this in mind. As I say, there may be a disposition on the part of the house to allow the hon. member for Simcoe North to ask a question of the minister and to allow the minister to reply to it if he wishes.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Because of my respect for the hon. member for Simcoe North, who is a medical doctor, may I say that my opposition to this particular amendment which would restrict the performance of a therapeutic abortion in the sense that it would have to be performed before the period of implantation, which, as I understand it, is about five days after conception, derives from the fact that it would render the clause inoperable. In most cases a woman does not know she is pregnant so early, and even if she did it would be impossible for the therapeutic abortion committee to meet and judge the case. This is a very technical amendment and I am replying to it on these specific grounds. When we are discussing clause 18 as a whole perhaps I shall be able to deal with the general question the hon. member has raised, and I may do so at that time.

**Mr. Rynard:** I ask the minister whether he would not make some statement on a later occasion covering the case I mentioned a few moments ago, that the woman concerned must lay a charge alleging she was raped, before the expiration of the five days, or file a legal complaint.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** If I may continue the liberty which was extended to me before Mr. Speaker's alter ego took the chair, let me say that when we are dealing with amendment 19 covering the whole aspect of clause 18 I shall certainly include that question in my statement.

• (3:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the statement of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) who moved the amendment No. 24 on behalf of the hon. member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade).

I was very much amazed by that statement, and what strikes me most is to see how the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), who is alone to defend his bill, is losing no time in refusing all the measures proposed by the opposition.

He said more or less that the hon. member for Simcoe-North (Mr. Rynard) was all mixed up, because he does not want to accept the assertions of this eminent doctor.

He said, at the beginning of the statement he made earlier, that the professor Mewett was wrong.

If the Minister of Justice is the only one who knows the conseqences of the amendments to the Criminal Code, I think we should simply close the debate, go home and let the Minister of Justice take care of all this.

However, it seems to me that such is not the case. We were not elected to fully endorse all the proposals of the government, but rather to defend the views of our constituents, of the medical associations, of the hospitals and of the clergy, whether Catholic or not.

It is disconcerting to notice how unanimously the members of the Liberal party support Bill C-150 now under study.

I find it strange that the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who first sponsored Bill C-195 which has now become Bill C-150, used to blame the right honourable Lester B. Pearson about his way to deal with the members of the house. Indeed, as we can read in an issue of *Cité Libre* of 1963, he said, and I quote:

The Pope had spoken—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but at this point the house is really not discussing Bill C-150 but a specific amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary North for the hon. member for Ste.-Marie, seconded by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster. The Standing Orders are very specific on this point. They require hon. members to restrict their remarks to the amendment under discussion. Under the circumstances I would invite the hon. member for Abitibi, who knows the rules better than I, to try to confine his remarks as much as possible to the specific amendment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Laprise:** Thank you for your explanations, Mr. Speaker but I do not accept the statement that I know the rules better than you do for I do not boast of being a specialist in matters of procedure. I do believe, however, that the rules allow me to support or to oppose a bill and to do so I have to offer some kind of clarifications. That is why I want to be specific about my reasons for supporting the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and to say why it does, indeed, seem strange to me that all the amendments we have so far suggested would always be defeated in the same way, as if everybody were wrong on this side of the house and the government members the only ones to be right.



I shall have the opportunity, in some further debate, maybe in the debate on the motion for third reading, to speak out my mind on the present leadership of the Liberal party.

The amendment now before us is quite acceptable for it also tends to clarify Bill No. C-150. Mr. Speaker, the fact that we are considering amendments tending to amend section 18 of the Criminal Code does not necessarily mean that we do accept section 18.

I would like to stress the fact that it was one of my colleagues who first presented an amendment for deleting section 18 from the aforesaid bill. Had we considered the section and had the house accepted amendment No. 19 as suggested by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), there would have been no need for debating section 18. Such is not the case, however, and were section 18 to be retained in Bill No. C-150, we would be bound to introduce amendments in order to improve the wording of this section and to make it less harmful to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an article published in the Quebec *L'Action* dated March 18, 1969, in which the Organized Medical Staff of the Laval Hospital of Quebec states for the second time for the guidance of the government and the public that its point of view had not changed.

Here is the statement of the Staff, of which Paul-Émile Gareau is chairman and Claude-D. Hébert, secretary. I quote:

The Medical Staff of the Laval Hospital studied carefully the bill on abortion introduced in the House of Commons by the Minister of Justice.

It has pronounced itself unanimously against this bill for the following reasons:

Mr. Speaker, those doctors could not have made this public statement without having given it serious thought.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. The hon. Minister of Justice has raised a point of order.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member explain to the house in what way his remarks are relevant to the amendment now before us?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The point is well taken, and I thank the Minister of Justice for raising it.

The hon. member for Abitibi should confine his remarks to the amendment under consideration.

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, the amendment needs no clarification as it states "that those means are employed before the period of implantation".

So, if I confine my remarks to that matter I would simply have to state that I am for or against the amendment, and it seems to me that I am allowed by the rules to give some explanations. That is why I want to express the views of the medical board of Laval hospital.

So, Mr. Speaker, whether abortion is allowed during the period of implantation or a few hours, a few weeks or a few months before or after, it remains an abortion. Regardless of when the abortion takes place, it remains an homicide because there is life from the moment of implantation.

The doctors of Laval hospital, like the great majority of doctors, are against abortion because, in their view, any abortion is an homicide, the foetus being a human being.

At this point I would like to quote the following:

> Some say that the foetus is not a human being until it becomes viable. The notion of viability of the foetus, outside the womb, is a matter of medical opinion. Today, the foetus is not considered to be viable outside the womb of the mother before the twenty-eighth week of gestation, ... but this period will perhaps be reduced with the acquisition of new data and the development of proper techniques.

This is exactly what Doctor Jutras said when he appeared before the committee on justice and legal affairs.

And I continue:

> Whether or not the foetus will be viable outside the mother's womb depends on the degree of maturity of the foetus. But is it possible to define a human being on the basis of the obvious maturity it has reached, especially since this maturity is attained after many years only?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is generally agreed among gynecologists that the foetus is a human being right from the beginning. And the period between conception and delivery of a viable foetus is but one stage in the life of that human being.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) is perfectly valid and should be inserted into clause 18, so as to avoid any mistakes. It was with this in mind that the hon. member for Calgary North moved this amendment and it is my intention to support it.

• (3:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, upon reading the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), which states:

> —that those means are employed before the period of implantation.

—we realize that, in essence, it seeks to restrict abortion, because the intent of the legislation before us is to legalize abortion without any medical or scientific restrictions.

The amendment establishes that the period of implantation is the time when life appears in a mass of cells and, in my opinion, it is important to specify at what moment life appears and when according to the law it does not exist, not necessarily from a scientific point of view but from a legal one.

The legislation introduced by the minister aims to specify that life begins only once the foetus has completely proceeded, in a living state, from the body of the mother. According to the law, that would be the definition of a human being: a foetus that has completely proceeded, in a living state, from the body of the mother.

The proposed amendment is to the effect that abortion could not be legalized before the period of implantation. Under the present bill, abortion would be legalized if it is performed before or after implantation, until the foetus has completely proceeded from the mother's womb.

We can see the difference between the two wordings. The government party supposes life does not exist while the foetus is still inside the womb.

As for us, we have a strong, sincere, honest and scientific conviction that life exists during the period the foetus is inside the mother's womb.

I would hardly see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) rising to deny that statement, because he is aware of the fact. He knows that a foetus is alive.

We want the law to be more specific, in order that abortion be allowed, but before the implantation period.

In support of my assertion, I will quote an excerpt of the interesting, scientific and conclusive testimony of Dr. René Jutras, who lives in my constituency, since he is a member of the pediatrics service of the Hôtel-Dieu of Arthabaska. Several members apparently have this next on hand.

This is why I am pleased to make use of his knowledge, in order to give fuller details.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with the life of the unborn child before and after implantation. But let us see rather what science says in that connection. Dr. Jutras stated on March 25, and I quote:

The chromosome contains in itself all the genes. There are 46 chromosomes and in the deoxyribonucleic acid there is a complete code which is the code of heredity. This code contains, according to present research, about 100,000 special characteristics, descriptions or connotations determined in advance which will lead the impregnated cell to its final state of man at the age of 20.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this merely means that there is an evolution from the time of sexual intercourse to the time of birth and even up to 20, 30, 50 and even 70 years of age. That evolution at the various stages of life will only stop at the time of death.

Mr. Speaker, we are now discussing a bill which seeks to establish as a fact that there is no life during the time the foetus is in the woman's womb, while science states positively the contrary. In fact, science says that not only there is life then, but that as soon as implantation takes place the chromosomes are perfectly arranged and the deoxyribonucleic acid contains already all the genetic information regarding the future physiological and biological characteristics of the man at 20.

Some members, the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) for instance, if I am correct, do not speak often, not to say never. Well, at the time of his conception, it was already settled that the hon. member for Mercier would never say a word. The die was cast.

Now, let us go back to serious business. I think there is continuity and this fact has been established scientifically.

Dr. Jutras says and I am quoting:

This is to tell you that we are facing a real challenge. It is more than a negative.



This is what the person I referred to earlier had to say on this subject, and I quote:

It is more than a negative. Everything is codified and sealed in advance. And what is fantastic in all this is to see that before impregnation—

Mr. Speaker, I hope I am not out of order. I continue the quotation:

—there is a phase of immeasurable hazard.

More than 400 million spermatozoa are participating in a frantic race to reach the ovule. Only one reaches it, and thus the foetus begins to take form. Therefore, it is a race to the finish.

In examining the bill introduced by the minister, it is useless to wonder why the spermatozoa are racing, Mr. Speaker. They do not want to be overtaken by the omnibus bill.

Dr. Jutras went on to say, and I quote:

But there is one thing about which human beings do not often think. It is that once the head of the spermatozoon has penetrated into the ovule—

At this stage, I ask the hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Pilon) to listen carefully—

—the hazard has ended.

Well, Mr. Speaker, from then on, it is scientifically possible to foresee what the future human being will be like. It is possible to know what his defects, even the smallest ones, will be, his qualities, the colour of his eyes, the shape of his ears and of his nose, etc. It is possible to foresee everything, even his mental or physical deficiencies. Biologists and scientists are saying so, not me.

—there is no more chance happening.

Dr. Jutras states, and he says so on the basis of studies he has been conducting on the subject for eight years, particularly in the United States. And I continue:

After that, the setting into motion is extraordinary, if one reflects on it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this question can be treated lightly, for this is a matter of life or death. Ultimately, we have to know whether after implantation the foetus can be considered as a human being. If not, abortion raises no problem, but otherwise, the problem is immense.

I said a moment ago that there was continuity from the moment of fecundation until the human being reaches the age of 20. This continuity will only end at death.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are to-day at the age of 20, 30, 40 and 50 years could be found not only as a mere potentiality, but in an

embryonic stage, within the ovule and the spermatozoon when they met, and combined to create the outstanding features of the new human being.

I shall illustrate this by a very simple example. Let us suppose that the hon. member for Chambly is thirty years old—this must certainly flatter him—that he is trying to remember what happened in his life, ten years ago. He will be able to remember certain things. Ten years seems a very long and a very short span of time. We feel that if we can remember what happened ten or twenty years ago, we can also remember what we were doing at the age of three, four or five. Anybody can.

These memories are vague and remote though at the same time precise. Nevertheless, the most fantastic and extraordinary thing, is that we feel we have not really changed from the time we were five years old.

No hon. member could rise and say that evolution stopped abruptly between the time he was five years old and today. Everybody realizes that there is so much continuity that the individual does not feel he has changed.

In other words Mr. Speaker, the fœtus in the womb of his mother is a potential human being. It is just as clear if we follow this reasoning that birth, as I said yesterday, is not the beginning of life as the Minister of Justice would have us believe, but a stage in this life which took a nine-month long preparation and scientific "alignment"; the mother fed the embryo for nine months. She took care of him. He is entirely dependent at that time both of the mother and the father.

He is totally dependent and right from the moment of his birth, his mother is giving him all he needed to become a human being.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the fact of performing abortion without any serious reason is, in my view, a homicide.

And I say again, Mr. Speaker that I simply cannot believe the Minister of Justice dares to suggest, together with his colleagues, that life is absent from the fœtus in the mother's womb.

And if he admits that life is indeed present, he must also admit that it is a crime to kill this fœtus.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I give on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The Minister of Justice on a point of order.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I never said life was absent from the fœtus and therefore the remark of the hon. member has nothing to do with my argument. I said nothing at all because, to defeat the amendment, it was not necessary.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice so far, did not tell us whether life was present or not in the foetus. He says he never said it, but he never said the contrary. I would like him to be more specific about facts. The point is to have a bill that become law would allow a committee of qualified doctors to jeopardize the normal development of the fœtus after implantation.

It is therefore important to know if the surgical operation will be performed on a human being or just on a cluster of cells. There is a difference. If one considers the foetus just as a cluster of cells, there is no problem; we are wasting our time discussing it, since bringing about abortion would not be a homicide but simply eliminating a cluster of cells.

But if it is definitely not a cluster of cells, every scientific conclusions leads us to believe it is a foetus.

Let us go further. Let us suppose that we are not quite sure whether it is a cluster of cells or a foetus, whether it can live or not. In the light of those considerations, are we authorized, from the legal as well as the human point of view, to legalize abortion when there is some doubt?

If we have doubts whether we are dealing with a viable foetus, it is impossible to legislate as clearly as the minister would have us, because abortion is dangerous, since the doctor himself cannot determine whether or not he is interfering with the normal development of the foetus.

Since some risk is involved, the wisest attitude would be to abstain from doing so until science has dissipated all doubts and abortion can be allowed because, then, it will not entail moral consequences.

But, if we are sure to be dealing with a viable foetus, we do not have the right to interfere by the artificial means that therapeutic abortion constitutes: there would then be homicide.

Mr. Speaker, to my mind it is extremely important that we should clear up this matter. The minister does not tell us whether he considers the foetus as a human being or as a group of cells but, really, that is the question.

If we are dealing with a mass of cells, there is no problem; but if we are dealing

with a human being, the minister must recognize with us—for this is not stated in the text of the legislation—that he is forcing the doctors, the therapeutic abortion committees and hospitals concerned, to practise homicide, no less.

The situation is all the more serious as the foetus, from the stage of implantation, is a human being, and is not only completely dependent on his mother and on her psychic and physical behaviour, but is also innocent and defenceless.

This is why, if one follows this argumentation, one will admit that the minister is unable to show up its weakness—and I tell him clearly—without running the risk of making himself ridiculous and contradicting everything the Prime Minister might have said, because he knows as well as we do that the foetus is a human being and that to destroy it after the period of implantation would be nothing short of compulsory murder if the bill proposed by the minister were passed.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) said that the passing of such a law in other countries had increased the number of abortions. I think that in view of the foreseeable consequences—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I must ask him first to restrict his remarks to the amendment under study and secondly remind him that his time has expired.

**Mr. Fortin:** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect, I would like to tell you that you would find it very difficult to show the house that I am out of order because if I am, other hon. members have been so for a long time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The last words of the hon. member were in fact out of order.

• (4:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this amendment but having listened to the arguments for or against from the hon. minister, I suggest they failed to convince me and I find this amendment perfectly logical.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my opinion on the amendment which reads as follows:

—that those means are employed before the period of implantation.

[Mr. Fortin.]

This amendment, which allows abortion "before the period of implantation", will inevitably lead—as pointed out by the hon. minister and on this I agree with him—to the avoiding of abortion. It is precisely for those reasons that we are in favour of applying "those means before the period of implantation".

I said in my remarks yesterday before the committee on justice and legal affairs that 12 weeks after the period of implantation a baby could suck its thumb. Now I know government members who have been in this house for twelve years and have done nothing else yet than sucking their thumbs.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a statement from a doctor, which impressed me very much and describes an abortion performed after the period of implantation. I refer to Professor Ian Donald, professor of gynecology at the Queen Mary hospital of Glasgow University in Scotland, who is not Catholic but Anglican. In the 1967 July edition of WAY magazine, he describes the killing of a foetus, perpetrated "after the period of implantation".

Here is a doctor who takes us to a hospital in order to witness an abortion practised "after the period of implantation". This is what he says:

I must resist describing the disgusting details of an operation designed to put an end to a pregnancy. Within a few minutes, you would feel sick and go out vomiting.

An abortion can be performed through a tiny Caesarian section—

—that is to say "after the period of implantation".

However, you have a baby alive in your hands, a baby who stirs, who kicks and who wants to live. But you have to kill it... you hide it from the nurse... it is a depressing sight. There is no mistake about it, it is a murder in slow motion. Besides, the baby can be killed while still in his mother's womb.

Is there such a big difference? The intention is still the same: to destroy the child.

Mr. Speaker, if we are in favour of that amendment, it means that we approve of abortion induced "before the period of implantation", that is to say before life begins.

In the *Way Catholic Viewpoints*, July 1967 issue, Dr. Edward Cossel, a biologist, says, and I quote:

In my opinion, scientific evidence shows conclusively that every human life begins at the time of fertilization of the ovule by a spermatozoon to form the child at his primary stage. At that stage, according to biologists, the individuality (character, qualities, shortcomings) is created in animals.

The same is true for human beings.

**Failure to apply the same principle to the development of the human being would not be scientific. Therefore, destroying a child at that stage, that is from his conception to his birth, is contributing to destroy a human life.**

It is precisely because we do not want to destroy human lives that, in our opinion, these means should be employed before the period of implantation.

We were given several reasons why we should object to the legalization of abortion, and why means of abortion should be employed before the period of implantation. In that connection, there is no consensus among medical practitioners and biologists. We are convinced that the foetus is a human being, however imperfect it may be, from the moment of conception.

As the human being is the most valuable creature of any organized society, it has undeniable rights to temporal property which must be fully respected and protected.

Now, natural rights involve duties because natural law, even though it confers rights, imposes corresponding duties.

In fact, we recognize and favour the right to life. We want these amendments to be accepted, and abortion means employed before the period of implantation.

For instance, the right to life entails the right to maintain it. The right to a decent existence entails the duty to act with dignity. Moreover, if the right to start a family derives from the natural right of man to choose freely his state in life, members of parliament then have an obligation to take financial, social, cultural and ethical measures to consolidate the general stability of man's environment and facilitate the uneasy role that rests with him.

Mr. Speaker, we favour the use of such abortion methods before the period of implantation, and we say so in the house as we have been requested to by the physicians of the province of Quebec and the Association of French-speaking medical practitioners. Indeed, immediately after implantation, life exists. Doctors do not wish to have to procure abortion contrary to the basic aim of medicine, to wit, the protection of the human being, of the individual and of the foetus inside or outside the uterus.

Also on the basis of those very principles of the protection of life and of the right to life, of the human being or of the foetus, the government must be at the service of man. Therefore it is incumbent on us to pass legislation likely to protect the weakest. We should protect the most dispossessed and without the means to defend themselves. We should protect the human being still in the mother's womb, the foetus.

Some time ago, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) made recommendations to the house concerning the killing of baby seals. The baby seals, he said, cannot see. To insure their protection and the survival of their species, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry introduced legislation to that effect. He showed much solicitude for the baby seals that cannot see; and yet he displayed flagrant inhumanity towards the foetus that does not see and is unable to defend itself.

• (4:10 p.m.)

It is the government's duty to comply with the people's wishes, provided it is physically possible and morally desirable to do so. It must therefore find and retain a truly democratic formula of life in society, based upon just laws. This is why we are opposing the bill.

We want those abortion methods to be applied before implantation because we are in favour of fair legislation based on fair principles which will permit every individual to enjoy social, economic, political and religious freedom.

Through a collective effort, prosperity, security and cultural progress will be assured.

Mr. Speaker, I could quote several other doctors who have submitted briefs to us, as well as to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), but it seems he does not want to take them into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, we are certainly in favour of applying those methods before the period of implantation, since I have in hand an article about the life of a foetus. It is a note appearing in an article written by Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, and I quote:

**This story was issued by Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski as a pastoral aid to help resist pressure from the Red Polish government for abandonment of the church's stand against abortion.**

The Communist government of Poland was then exerting all kinds of pressures on the Church in order to prevent the government from opposing the abortion law. In Canada, unfortunately, a so-called Liberal government which advocates the establishment of a just society wants to force on us what the Communist government wanted to force on Poland.

Here is what Cardinal Wyszynski wrote about the life of a foetus:

[*English*]

October 5: Today my life began. My parents do not know it yet. I am as small as a seed of an apple, but it is I already. And I am to be a girl. I shall have blond hair and azure eyes. Just about everything is settled though. Even the fact that I shall love flowers.

October 19: I have grown a little, but I am still too small to do anything by myself. My mother does just about everything for me. And what is odd—she still doesn't even know that she is carrying me here under her heart, and that she is helping me already, that she is even feeding me with her own blood. She is so good.

Some say that I am not a real person yet, that only my mother exists. But I am a real person, just as a small crumb of bread is yet truly bread. My mother is. And I am.

October 23: My mouth is just beginning to open now. Just think in a year or so I shall be laughing, and later talking. I know that my first word shall be—mama.

October 28: My heart began to beat today all by itself. From now on it shall gently beat for the rest of my life. Without ever stopping to rest. And after many years it will tire. It will stop, and then I shall die.

November 2: I am growing a bit every day. My arms and legs are beginning to take shape. But I have to wait a long time yet before those little legs will raise me to my mother's arms, before those little arms will be able to gather flowers and embrace my father.

November 12: Tiny fingers are beginning to form on my hands. Funny how small they are, I shall be able to stroke my mother's hair with them. And I shall take her hair to my mouth and she will probably say: "Oh, nasty!"

November 20: It wasn't until today that the doctor told mom that I am living here under her heart. Oh, how happy she must be! Are you happy, mom?

November 25: My mom and dad are probably thinking about a name for me. But they don't even know that I am a little girl. They are probably saying Andy. But I want to be called Cathy. I am getting so big already.

December 10: My hair is growing. It is smooth and bright and shiny. I wonder what kind of hair mom has?

December 13: I am just about able to see. It is dark around me. When mom brings me into the world, it will be full of sunshine and flowers. I have never seen a flower, you know. But what I want more than anything is to see my mom. How do you look, mom?

December 24: I wonder if mom hears the whispering beat of my heart? Some children come into the world a little sick. And then the delicate hands of the doctor perform miracles to bring them to health. But my heart is strong and healthy. It beats so evenly—tup-tup, tup-tup ... You'll have a healthy little daughter, mom!

December 28: Today my mother killed me.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is precisely to prevent such atrocities that we ask that amendment No. 24 be adopted, because it says:

—that those means are employed before the period of implantation.

This is in order to prevent such murders by unscrupulous people who would be allowed by the act to do as they please without any consideration for life, or for the principles any sound society needs to perpetuate itself.

• (4:20 p.m.)

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, we have before us another important amendment to Bill C-150, which seeks to add the following words to clause 18:

—that those means are employed before the period of implantation.

I have not heard the remarks made by hon. members on this subject, but nevertheless I wish to make a few comments on the importance of considering human life as a whole, and more particularly at the time when it begins, according to scientific evidence.

It must be recognized that a certain period of time may elapse before the fertilized ovum is really implanted. That is the basis of the amendment that I find most logical. Even if impregnation takes place, if there is no environment propitions to the development of the embryo, of course there can be no human life. If necessary, one could boil down the question to some experiments made recently, when scientists succeeded in reproducing the phenomenon of fecundation in laboratories. Can the result of such experiments be considered as a real human being? I doubt it very much.

Therefore, in the days following fecundation, it may happen that implantation does not take place and I believe that in such a case it would only be fair to consider the possibility of adopting an amendment which would specify that before such methods are used, nobody can be accused of having performed an illegal abortion.

Mr. Speaker the matter now under study deserves our full attention. It is not a question of taking only religious beliefs into consideration. In fact, there are unfortunately too many members who believe that those who oppose abortion are only doing so on religious grounds, because if religious factors are one aspect of our argumentation, it remains that they are only secondary. What we are considering first and foremost is the scientific viewpoint.

The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) has spoken at length on the report submitted by Dr. Jutras to the committee on justice and legal affairs. This report demonstrates most eloquently the merits of our arguments.

I can well remember that after hearing Dr. Jutras' evidence, all the members of the committee were dumbfounded. They were all left gaping and no one put a question to the man who had just given us such an extraordinary demonstration of what life is.

I am of the opinion that we would make a serious mistake if we admitted that the human being exists only after he comes out of his mother's womb. This demonstration left us dumbfounded and I wish that all those who were present would attempt to deny it. I wish they would express their views or ask the questions they were unable to ask at that time.

Mr. Speaker, it is normal that we, who are only laymen in the matter, should rely on experts.

The experts prove that there is perhaps less difference between a child of five or six and a man of 21 than between the foetus at the moment of fertilization and at the end of pregnancy. There is less transformation before than after birth.

As stated by Dr. Jutras, we remember quite well part of the events which occurred when we were five or six years old. However, most cells from that stage have been renewed many many times, even if essentially the individual has remained exactly the same, because the human soul, the essential principle of individuality, cannot undergo any transformation. This is exactly what happens at birth. As many changes occur during adult life as from conception to birth.

• (4:30 p.m.)

This explains the importance of human life. When the amendment under consideration states that "those means are employed before the period of implantation", it is entirely normal since before that implantation it is impossible to speak of development.

As I see it, it is the reason for the amendment and that is why we should support it.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, too many members are not interested in this matter, and it is a disappointment to those who take their responsibilities seriously and would like the law to be well thought out so that they would not incur reproaches later on.

Let us really consider each of the amendments and the possible consequences if adoption of the bill or rejection of the proposed amendments in a few years from now, led to complete chaos.

It is in a way what is happening in countries where, under the pretense of being in the van, abortion was authorized. In Japan, where abortion is obtainable on resquest for only a few dollars, the government is beginning to realize it made a mistake.

According to what a newspaper, wrote last week, the Japanese population is steadily dropping off and there will be no Japanese left within a century.

What is happening in England is hardly more encouraging. According to an article, in last week's issue of *Le Droit*, a doctor is supposed to have performed 62 abortions in one day, which is an unprecedented occurrence.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. In all kindness, I would like to remind the hon. member that he is not allowed to deal in a general way with section 18 of Bill No. C-150; he should confine his remarks to the amendment under consideration, introduced by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) which reads partially as follows:

—page 43, the "period" after the word "practitioner" on line 8 on page 43 and inserting the following words: "and",

(e) that those means are employed before the period of implantation."

The hon. member, together with a number of others, has been indulging in generalities on clause 18 and I would like him to confine his remarks to the amendment before the house.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you have taken the trouble to consider the question thoroughly, but I can tell you it is not just a matter of a period and—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The question is not to remind the hon. member the rules for the sake of a period but to ask him to confine his remarks to the amendment before us.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the proposed amendment would be to prevent people from being prosecuted for having procured abortion, this being, in fact, was impossible, since the impregnated ovule was not implanted.

This is a very technical matter that would require thorough consideration, but if the hon. members did not bother about scrutinizing it, considering it throughly—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I think the hon. member cannot impute any motives to any member I ask him once again to limit his remarks to the amendment before us.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that whenever we speak in the house, it should not be merely to enlighten chairs and desks, but to try to convince our hon. colleagues of the need of an amendment. If such is not our function, I wonder what it could be.

Our business is to try and state our case as well as we possibly can, in order to reach a clear understanding of the matter in hand. And as a good number of people turn a deaf ear, we try to wake them up and make them understand what those amendments are all about.

Mr. Speaker, if we thoroughly examine the matter, we have to acknowledge that it is logical and based on scientific grounds and I wonder whether every member should not make some efforts to vote in favour of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I know that sometimes we indulge in digressions but I can assure you that it is not out of ill-will. The point is merely to deal with amendments in depth and to convince the house to vote seriously on a matter which will have repercussions on the future.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is the house ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No, no.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Pursuant to Standing Order 75 (11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau)** moved amendment No. 26:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or would be likely to" on line 4 on page 43.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are at least three schools of thought on abortion.

According to one of them, abortion could be secured at will, and the right to abortion should be a matter between the pregnant woman and her doctor.

A second school of thought would not allow abortion on any ground whatever, and a third contends that it should very seldom be permitted, as is proposed in clause 18 of Bill C-150.

I think that clause 18 (4) (c) of this bill is too important for us to pass it right away because if it contains obscure wording it could be given a meaning much beyond the one intended by its proponents.

Mr. Speaker, clause 18 (4) (c) reads as follows:

—has by certificate in writing stated that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health, and—

Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to follow the argumentation of clause 18 (4) (c) when I read it and I confine myself strictly to the French text of Bill C-150—

—would or would be likely to endanger her life or health, and—

I think there is a contradiction here. I was asked why I recommend deleting the words "or would be likely". In my opinion, the expression: "would be likely to endanger" is too vague and would leave wide open the interpretation of this legislation.

And if I refer to the Petit Dictionnaire Larousse, I can read that the word "certainement" means "assurément", (certainly) "indubitablement" (indubitably). As for the

expression "assurément", (assuredly), it means "certainement", (certainly) "sûrement" (surely); as for the word "probablement" (probably), the Petit Larousse gives it the meaning of "vraisemblablement" (likely). As for the word "vraisemblablement" (likely), its meaning is "avec vraisemblance" "selon la vraisemblance" (with all likelihood).

This is why I proposed the amendment to delete the words "or would be likely to".

Another aspect of clause 18 (4) (c) on which I would like to comment is the word "health". And, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that one did not include in clause 18 a paragraph allowing the governor in council to enact regulations in order to define what is meant by the word "health".

Indeed, I would like to have an answer to the following question: What is health? Where does it begin? Where does it end? Still, we must admit that we are dealing here with a sector of medicine that lends itself more easily than others to individual interpretation. Consequently, psychiatrists are far from unanimous on this point.

Mr. Speaker, some remarks have been made concerning the word "health". I refer to volume No. 16 of the proceedings and evidence of the standing committee on justice and legal affairs at its March 27, 1969 sitting.

On page 801, to a question put to him on the word "health", Mr. D. H. Christie assistant deputy attorney general replied, and I quote:

> So far as we are aware there is no legal definition of the word, and presumably it would be interpreted in accordance with its ordinary dictionary meaning.

To another question put to him on the same page, on the same topic, his reply was as follows:

> Once the courts define the word it will take on the aspect of a judicial definition.
>
> Presumably, in accordance with the ordinary rules, they will apply the ordinary dictionary meaning to the word.

On page 802, in reply to a question on the definition of the word "health", Mr. J. A. Scollin, director of the criminal law section of the Department of Justice, made the following comment:

> At the meetings which took place between representatives of... the Canadian Medical Association, the advice of the representatives of the Canadian Medical Association was that from a medical point of view they preferred the word "health", treating mental and physical health as a whole; and that the word "health", from a medical point of view—from their point of view—

On page 803, giving his own definition of the word "health", Mr. Scollin said, and I quote:

> I really have no difficulty myself... "Health" means just what it means: mental and physical—the total health of the being. It would not give me any difficulty at all.

If I refer to No. 16 of the proceedings of the committee on justice and legal affairs of March 27, 1969, I see that my colleague the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) made a few comments based on what had been said before the committee on health and social welfare, when studying the first draft of Bill C-195, and I quote:

> The committee in its consideration intended health to mean physical and mental health and not the wider definition given to it by the World Health Organization.

I continue my quotation:

> The committee feels that a simple amendment to the proposed legislation should establish that a clear and direct serious threat to the mother's health must be present.

In my opinion, the door is left open, because persons wishing to get an abortion will give psychological and social reasons.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I proposed amendment No. 26 to delete the expression "or would be likely" which appear on page 43 of Bill C-150.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I hope that this time the hon. member will excuse me if I speak in English. I have to be very specific. The terms he referred to are rather specific also. I find three distinct parts in his argumentation. I want to deal with each one of them.

He said first that there might be a difference between the French version and the English version of the section.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

We have already received an opinion that the two versions relating to the words on page 43, line 4, "would or would be likely", which come in the larger context of "in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health", and the French version "mettrait certainement ou probablement en danger la vie ou la santé de cette dernière", do correspond. However, I have asked the department to look into this matter again.

I also understand that it is the practice, if there is a subtle difference between the two

versions, to bring them into accord in the sense of the English version "would or would be likely" by way of clerical correction by parliamentary counsel. I want to assure the hon. member that I will look into it again, but it would merely involve a clerical comparison of both versions.

As to the substance of the amendment, which in the English version seeks to delete the words "or would be likely to", and which in the French version seeks to eliminate the words "ou probablement", I would have to recommend to the house the rejection of the amendment. If the words were removed, the therapeutic abortion committee would be restricted to the prognostication of certainty only. We would be asking for an opinion of medical certainty from a committee of doctors that the life and health of the mother would be in danger. Such certainty would be virtually impossible to achieve.

I recall the speech on second reading of the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle), who is a medical doctor and who dealt with this very point. The most that can reasonably be required of a professional medical judgment is an honest and competent prognosis of the likely or probable medical consequences. I do not think we could expect anything more from a medical judgment, and I think we could expect less from a legal opinion. The realm of certainty is beyond the limitation of professional judgment, which is what the hon. member is asking from the medical profession if those words are eliminated.

There is one final point which the hon. member made that is not quite pertinent to his amendment and which has to do with the definition of "health". The earlier house committee on health and welfare, the committee on justice and legal affairs, the Canadian Medical Association when it appeared before the earlier committee, and the Canadian Bar Association were all unable to arrive at a satisfactory definition of health. This is a question that is left to medical judgment. Certainly it has to be taken in a global sense. You cannot isolate physical from mental health; they interact and react each upon the other. In that sense health is incapable of definition, and this will be left to the good professional judgment of medical practitioners to decide.

For these reasons and subject to the clerical problem that I outlined, which is clerical only and can be remedied by parliamentary counsel if that is necessary, I would have to recommend to the house that it reject the amendment.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton.]

[*Translation*]

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are the following:

[*English*]

The hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—Transport; the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis)—Industry; the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski)—Agriculture.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 26, Mr. Clermont.

**Mr. Rynard:** Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to hear the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) admit that there had been an error in the drafting.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I did not admit that at all. I said that we would look into the matter again and that if it were a mistake the two versions could be reconciled clerically.

**Mr. Rynard:** There certainly is an error because there is no certainty. A doctor could not be certain.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I admitted that.

**Mr. Rynard:** Then there is an error in clarification, if you want to put it in that way.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I think we are talking about two different

things. There is the question of the drafting of the words, and there is the question of medical judgment. I admit that there is no such thing as a medical judgment that is certain, which is the reason I have to reject the amendment.

**Mr. Rynard:** The point I am making concerns the drafting of the words that would be legally applied. A doctor could not be certain. He could use the best judgment and the best equipment that is available, and we do have great diagnostic equipment today. All who practice medicine have seen people get better who they felt would not get better. On the other hand, they have seen people die who they felt should not have died. There is always the unexpected, though this does not happen very often. I was very glad to hear the minister admit that there is a problem here and that he will look into it. There will be more objections if the matter is not corrected and made very plain to the house.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Montmorency):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Justice.

I ask him to clarify the French and the English versions, since there is apparently a strong tendency to stick to the English version, which says:

Would or would be likely to—

I wonder whether it would not be desirable, in order to simplify both versions, to come back to the original version which read as follows:

—likely to endanger her life or her health—

This is the question I put to the minister.

As long as that has not been clarified, I will be inclined to support the motion of the hon. member of Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) because I cannot see how the words "would" and "would be likely to" can be reconciled in the same text, as those are two contradictory terms.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

• (5:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Romuald Rodrigue (Beauce):** I endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme) regarding the words "or would be likely". Sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph (4) reads as follows:

c) has by certificate in writing stated that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health;

Of course, I also agree with the member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) when he says that he finds it hard to understand the grouping of these words. Not only did I have difficulty to understand this phrase but, it is somewhat difficult for me to understand the whole paragraph 4(c). It should be entirely rewritten. I feel that if we deleted the words "would be likely" the meaning would be more precise and would also prevent different interpretations either on the part of doctors, or on the part of the person who is seeking an abortion. Moreover, it would perhaps avoid litigations.

I also share the opinion expressed by Dr. Légaré when he appeared before the committee of justice and legal affairs. He was answering a question put by the member for Calgary-North (Mr. Woolliams). This is what he said:

In fact, this is why it is so difficult to legislate. When legislators have in all good faith drawn up a legislation, you may be sure that someone will come and try to find faults in the text. It is quite possible that such is the case. In fact, the difficulty for the legislator is to draw up legislation whose text is well-structured in order to prevent abuses in one way or another. This is not impossible however. We can always try but I do not know whether it will be a success from a legal viewpoint. I am not acquainted with that field.

Abortion is a rather serious surgical operation. According to Dr. Cairns, who appeared in Ottawa on December 14, 1967 before a parliamentary committee responsible for studying the question of abortion, therapeutic abortion performed under the best possible circumstances, as it is done in Denmark and in Sweden has a death rate ten times higher than deliveries attended by obstetricians.

In a Toronto hospital where 250 abortions have been performed in the last 12 years, the rate of complications is 9 per cent.

This means that errors of judgment are possible. Some decisions must be made and the wording should be clarified further in order to avoid errors that would naturally be imputed to a doctor or to an abortion committee that might have been established.

Many scientific discoveries have been made. The risks of error are much slighter, since the number of cases where therapeutic abortion would be needed is reported to be

around 3 out of 10,000 pregnancies. I feel this is further reason to prompt the legislator to make the law more explicit.

Any abuse should be avoided unlike certain countries where, after abortions have been allowed for a while, people are wondering if it was not a mistake.

I agree with the hon. member for Gatineau who moved this amendment that it is necessary to clarify paragraph (c). I hope the Minister of Justice will be agreeable to this.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, after listening to the speech made by the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont), I want to congratulate him for the courage he has shown in spite of his party's admonition.

I also hope that people will finally understand that what French Canadians or Canadians are expressing in their own terms is that one cannot legislate with any certainty when there is some doubt.

I do not intend to play on words, even if the debate is a very sophisticated one, as the minister might object. Nevertheless, there is a distinction to be made.

Mr. Speaker, paragraph (c) of clause 18 reads as follows:

(c) has by certificate in writing stated that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health—

Mr. Speaker, we are asked to adopt this provision on the ground that the Criminal Code is evasive, non-applicable and difficult to understand. We are asked to insert that paragraph which attempts to establish a link between the danger inherent to pregnancy and the danger to the life or health of the mother.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that is not logical and that is why I give my wholehearted support to the motion submitted by the hon. member for Gatineau.

Mr. Speaker, the progress of medical science has been amazing, as the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) said a moment ago. Less and less will pregnancy be likely to endanger the health of the mother, and still less will it be likely to endanger her life.

Medical experience has shown—the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) could probably corroborate this—that German measles can in some way endanger the life and the health of the mother and even of the child. However, last week, I had the pleasure and the honour of meeting a group of doctors from my riding and, in their opinion, such cases are extremely rare.

[Mr. Rodrigue.]

Mr. Speaker, this is a borderline case. But the minister would like to put together in the same clause not only such cases where the woman's health would likely be impaired, but all abortion cases without distinction.

If a woman pretends to be ill to justify an abortion, the medical practitioner will then abort her, thus killing a human being. No attempt was made to find out whether that woman was truly ill.

Mr. Speaker, doctors agree, as a rule, that a pregnant woman often claims to be sick whereas she is not really. On the contrary, a woman is ill when she cannot bring forth a child, not when she is bearing one. That is why this is completely illogical. It should be the other way around, Mr. Speaker.

A woman is considered ill—and I challenge the member for Hull to deny this—when she cannot have a child. Doctors are at a loss to find a way whereby that woman could satisfy her natural need to give birth to a child. Pregnancy is not an illness.

Having heard other members of parliament, I think it is a mistake to tell women that pregnancy is a form of illness. Not at all. Several women claim nevertheless to be sick when they are pregnant. Why? Because they feel they have lost something of their beauty, etc. They say they are sick for such reasons of a psychic nature.

To the woman who consults him, a doctor will say what is in the law. He will tell her that he can state, by way of a certificate, that in his opinion the continuation of pregnancy—for this woman who says she is sick, psychologically, even if she does not admit it frankly—would or would be likely to endanger her life.

The law leaves much latitude for its interpretation. I think we cannot afford not to clarify the situation.

In my opinion, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme) has clearly established the difference between the French and English versions. This is a poor French translation.

That is why we must consider the situation very seriously.

Pregnancy, Mr. Speaker—and it is important to repeat it—is not a sickness. The doctors themselves acknowledge the fact, and since the hon. member for Hull does not deny it, that proves I am right.

The fact that she is pregnant does not necessarily mean that a woman is sick. Some women feel temporary discomfort, but generally with the almost safe medical advances and new techniques, few are really sick to the point that their health or life is endangered. That is why, Mr. Speaker, even if the words "health" or "life" remain, we cannot leave the words "or would be likely to".

We can at least ask the minister to add thereto, as the hon. member for Montmorency suggested a while ago, the words "likely to endanger" so that the physician will have to prove that the condition of the patient is liable—since there is a fifty-fifty chance—to endanger her health or her life.

To show how important the shades of meaning of those words are, I would like to remind the minister of two precedents that already have been mentioned. It is quite important to clarify the situation for physicians, experts, professionals and to protect them. In addition, we must give precise details, since some cases could go before the courts, in order to help judges and lawyers. Moreover, the minister has spoken about it a while ago.

For several years, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian and British courts have been broadly interpreting—and I insist on the word broadly—the reservation provided in subsection 2 of section 209 of the Criminal Code, so that it is now generally recognized—we know the great influence of precedents—that to save the life of the mother, it is not necessary to wait until the latter is in an imminent danger of death.

And to confirm my statement, I rely on two specific cases to show how important it is to specify the terms of that section not only to protect the patient, the father and the mother, but also the physician and the courts.

• (5:10 p.m.)

In the famous Bourne case in England—and I hope my colleagues remember it—the judge stated that the doctor had the right to procure the abortion of his patient. It must be observed that it is not a question of interpretation but rather an extract from the judgment. The presiding judge alleged that "the doctor has the right to procure the abortion of his patient if he thinks the pregnancy will likely contribute—note the significance of those words likely contribute—to ruin the physical and mental health of the latter".

Legally, the words "will likely contribute to ruin the physical health" mean that there is more than a fifty-fifty chance. From the scientific point of view this is almost a certainty.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the word "likely" is not necessary here. It is even dangerous.

This interpretation was later corroborated in the Newton vs Stongo case, where it was explained that "the protection of the woman's health meant the protection not only of her physical health but of her mental health also".

The courts of justice, the doctors or patients can go as far as that in requesting abortion if the word "likely" is not clearly defined. The word "health" should also be defined.

In that judgment the court ruled "that the protection of the woman's health meant the protection not only of her physical health but of her mental health also."

In the bill now under consideration mention is made of health in general in paragraph (c). What do we mean by health?

If a pregnant woman has a headache, visits her doctor—the hon. member for Hull, for instance—and requests an abortion, that doctor can read the Act and say that the headache in question "would or would be likely to endanger her life or health". Then abortion would be allowed. The headache would be considered as an unusual and abnormal illness and indicate that the physical condition of that woman is deficient at this time.

Mr. Speaker, let us define the word "health", for the matter is of consequence. Otherwise, one might allege all kinds of indispositions to request abortion.

The more I look into that legislation, the more I feel that the government is opening the door to all possible excuses not to discharge its responsibilities and apply the law.

That is why it does not give a clear definition of the word "health" and resorts to the word "likely".

Now, the medical practitioner will not have to be sure that the health or life of the mother is being endangered, and any illness might be considered as threatening one's health. Consequently, it could be a valid excuse to ask for an abortion.

Mr. Speaker, if the house rejects the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau, it will prove irresponsible, since the hon. members' basic duty is to be explicit. Mr. Speaker, before completing my remarks, I would like to tell the house that I am pleased to see, as I was saying at the very beginning of my speech, that the hon. member for Gatineau was not afraid to rise and to move an amendment to the bill since everything cannot be perfect from the start.

In my opinion, it is important that everyone should contribute in some way to the improvement of the legislation. That is why we are legislators and if we do not express our opinions, we do not fulfil our responsibilities and duties.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to see that the hon. member for Gatineau was not deterred by the fear of being given a good scolding by the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who do not want to understand anything. However, it is important that his colleagues, the members of his party, should take the floor to encourage him and that the members of the Ralliement Créditiste should rise to support him because he feels lonely. I think it is a pity, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore I would like to invite his colleagues to support him, as all of us should. All hon. members should be free to move amendments which might improve the legislation. Perhaps the minister thinks he has a full knowledge of everything, but I have a feeling that it would be to his advantage to listen to what people say to him, in order to improve the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have so much to say that I just do not know where to stop. My head is simply buzzing with ideas. But if we fail to delete the words "or would be likely to" in the wording of the bill, we are on the wrong track and fail to assume our responsibilities. Let us be honest enough to ask ourselves where this law is likely to lead us.

[Mr. Fortin.]

Could any member or the minister tell me about a single case in which under the law, a doctor would not be allowed to perform an abortion?

There would not be a single case, where abortion would be forbidden. Indeed all the doors are left wide open, every pretext and every excuse is good, because the government fails to assume its responsibilities and, under all sorts of phony excuses is legislating without giving us the slightest assurance, that the law will be effective, in some cases at least.

The government is introducing a bill that will open every door; and tells us: Here's for you, all cases are permitted. Go ahead. Abortion is legalized. No more problems, thanks to the great, big Liberal party.

Mr. Speaker, this is an irresponsible approach. The minister does not realize the awkwardness of his position and we would all admire him if he had the guts to, urge his colleague, the hon. member for Hull to enter the debate instead of merely telling us that we are wrong.

Mr. Speaker, ministers would profit by considering what ordinary members are doing. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is wrong when he says that it is merely a subtle distinction, and house should be enlightened as to the exact meaning of the words *probablement, certainement* and *santé*. Otherwise there will always be some grave doubt in our mind and, as I said earlier, any doubt involves a risk which, in the present case, may lead us to commit a criminal act.

In conclusion, I urge for the third time the hon. member for Hull to tell us whether our statements are true or not.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) I extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) on taking a stand that he feels he should take regardless of the position of his party. However, any similarity between my views and those of the hon. member for Lotbinière on this question end there. That, indeed, is the reason for my taking the floor for just a few minutes.

I want to say that I feel, and I am sure most if not all of my colleagues agree with me, that this amendment must be rejected. The hon. member for Lotbinière suggested.

that this amendment was a way of improving the legislation. I submit that it destroys the whole attempt to bring our abortion laws in line at least with modern thinking and modern practice.

If we were to take out the words that the hon. member for Gatineau wishes to be removed, then the section would permit therapeutic abortions only when a therapeutic abortions committee was absolutely certain, beyond any doubt whatsoever, that the continuation of the pregnancy would endanger the life or health of the pregnant woman. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that would mean practically no abortions at all. What therapeutic abortions committee could be absolutely certain that that would be the result?

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that members like the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) and other medical men in the house have supported the idea of improving our abortion laws is that at the present time they are in a difficult position. At the present time the law is unclear, and many a time a doctor just does not know what to do because of the uncertain state of the law. If the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Gatineau were carried the law would be worse. No therapeutic abortions committee could ever be in a position of absolute certainty, and so there would be no such certificates and no matter how much an abortion might seem to be necessary there would be a very real danger it would not be permitted at all.

In such circumstances you would still find doctors who were human beings, who had compassion, who felt in certain cases that this should be done and who would go ahead in spite of there not being a certificate from the committee, and the law would be still in a mess. So, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the start I cannot but give my hon. friend across the way full marks for moving an amendment that does not have the support of his party, but I think the position stated by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is absolutely right. If we are going to write this new abortion law into our statute books let us not destroy it by wording it in such a way that it would not have any operative effect at all. Therefore I ask the house to reject this amendment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau):** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) permit a question?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** With pleasure.

**Mr. Clermont:** If the hon. member followed attentively my remarks, he must have realized that I was dealing strictly with the French version of paragraph (c), subclause 4 of clause 18 and I even gave the Larousse definition of the word *certainement*. And that word, even according to the Larouse definition, leaves some doubt, Mr. Speaker, for according to that dictionary, the word *certainement* also means *sûrement*. But that does not mean that there is no doubt. So I referred to the French version.

As I am not a linguist, I cannot comment on the English version. But according to my interpretation of the word *certainement*, if doctors have a valid doubt, I believe that word would justify their performing an abortion.

What I do not accept, Mr. Speaker, is the use of the words "ou probablement". If the officials of the Department of Justice find a more adequate expression, I will have no objection. But I cannot see—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member asked permission to ask a question, but I believe he is now making another speech.

**Mr. Clermont:** Maybe I should have raised a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, as I would not like the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, by his remarks, to leave the house under the impression that I am absolutely against abortion. But in my opinion, the word *certainement* leaves the doctor free to perform an abortion, if there is a valid doubt.

[*English*]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I take a moment to answer the hon. member's question which I am very pleased to have on the record. May I say that I am less an expert in the two languages than he is, much less, and I appreciate the fact that he is concerned about the French text, but it does seem to me that we need to have in the English version the two concepts, namely, that it would endanger or that it would be likely to endanger the life or health of the female person and, by the same token, it seems to me that in the French text there must be the same two concepts. There must be the idea of certainty but there must also be the idea of reasonable probability.

If better words can be found by experts in the French language I am sure the Minister of Justice would be quite happy to accept

them. But I think that just as the two concepts are necessary in the English version so the two concepts must also be in the French version. If you have in the French version only the concept or certainty, even with the nuance the hon. member for Gatineau has put on it, it seems to me it would have the effect I described earlier of limiting a committee from making recommendations for abortions where they really were needed.

I appreciate the last remark of the hon. member for Gatineau that he is not opposed to abortions where they are necessary, that he is merely trying to straighten out the wording of the French text. But it does seem to me that the wording in English is satisfactory, and so far as the French is concerned there must be the same two concepts, one of certainty and one of reasonable probability.

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull):** Mr. Speaker, there were a few digs at me, this afternoon, as to medical science, health and especially as to the interpretation of the words *certainement* and *probablement*.

I do not intend to speak at length but I hope the members opposite may one day leave to future generations the speeches they delivered during the last few days and I am afraid that one of their descendants might say to his mother: Good were it for that man if he had never been born.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member for Hull is a doctor, I would like to tell him that thanks to the progress of science, it is more and more probable that even after an abortion the foetus is still alive and it will then say to the Liberal party: You wanted me to die and I live.

**Mr. Isabelle:** We have daily examples of this.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Isabelle:** I would like to explain somewhat to the house the meaning of both texts. In my opinion and as a doctor, if one of the two words expresses adequately the thought of:

[*English*]

—would or would be likely to injure—

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

[*Translation*]

I think one should delete the word *certainement* because medicine is still an art and even today there are not only diseases but also patients. One can operate today on somebody under normal conditions, and if the patient dies, one is incapable of determining, even with the help of the post mortem examination what he died from.

Thus, medicine still remains an art. There is never any certainty in medicine and there will never be, because the doctor works on man who is subject to changes and on cells which are not identical in all individuals. The proof of it is the phenomenon of rejection and you cannot graft on victims of serious burns the skin of another person. On the contrary, it is necessary to use the skin of the patient. Then, it simply means there is no certainty in the field of medicine, and consequently, this should not be included in the wording of any legislation. And if you want to give a legal definition of health, there is a great risk of making a mistake. Indeed, if lawyers find it often difficult to interpret legislation, how would they manage to express their views on health, since they do not know anything about it.

So, law should be left to lawyers and to legislators, and health, especially its definition, should be left to medicine. It belongs to doctors to define health; and the bill has taken this into account. Then, let no one say that doctors are against the measure.

An association of 25,000 doctors, which includes all the doctors in Canada, that is the *Canadian Medical Association* wrote on January 29, 1969—I saw this by accident while I was glancing through a few publications—and I quote:

[*English*]

We have recently obtained a copy of your Bill C-150 to amend the Criminal Code, and again wish to congratulate you and your colleagues in bringing in legislation to amend the Criminal Code in respect to therapeutic abortion—

[*Translation*]

It groups 25,000 Canadian doctors, including those of the province of Quebec.

Now, there are dissident doctors in the province of Quebec as everywhere else. Of the 11 provinces, some protest against the federal government.

The same thing exists in medical ranks. The interpretation of certain individuals has

been given; I shall mention that of associations such as the Canadian Medical Association.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** How many provinces?

**Mr. Isabelle:** Ten. There will be another one soon: the federal district.

I follow the idea of the member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont); there must have been some confusion, some error in the translation or interpretation. That is why we insist so much, when requiring a document, on the original copy being produced.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

**Mr. Rondeau:** I should like to point out to the hon. member that he may not impute motives to the hon. member for Gatineau.

**Mr. Isabelle:** The member for Gatineau always has good intentions. That is why the wording of an act—and we discussed this with my colleague, Mr. Clermont—seems to have been poorly translated—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I should like to remind the hon. member that he must identify members by the name of their ridings and address his remarks to the Chair.

**Mr. Isabelle:** He is such a good friend of mine that I often slip up on that: I apologize. If the member for Gatineau belonged to the medical profession, I am sure he would have removed the word "Certainement" and left the word "probablement" for the reasons I have just given.

Medicine will always be an art, Mr. Speaker, regardless of any new scientific discoveries; for it will always involve that undefinable element that is life. It is almost as difficult to define life as it is to detect cancer, in spite of all our modern scientific methods, precisely because we are dealing with the phenomenon of the multiplication of cells.

So, Mr. Speaker, if it is possible to find a solution, I would suggest that the word "certainement" be deleted with a view to perhaps enabling the medical profession to do its work properly.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening for the past few minutes to a French lesson, to the meaning to be given to the words *certainement* or *probablement*. I know very well that if the government maintains its position, the word *probablement* will probably be replaced by the word *certainement* and in the next election, the government will certainly be defeated.

There is a difference, Mr. Speaker, between *probablement* and *certainement*.

Naturally, one is always sure that his cause is just and one is surprised by the position adopted by others, namely that of the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle). I understand what he means. I agree with him when he says that medecine is an art of probabilities, that is that one can never state categorically that something will happen or that a certain treatment will surely cure the patient.

• (5:40 p.m.)

We object to abortion for the same reason that the member for Hull has just given. Therefore, the doctor never can say whether the woman's life or health is endangered. It is exactly the argument he put forward. Medicine is an art of probabilities. The doctor never can say positively in connection with a pregnant woman whether the pregnancy will affect the mother's health or life.

That is the main reason why we are discussing this bill. Feelings or politics are not involved, it is only a matter of life and death. The point is to pass an act or not. Our arguments are serious and well-founded.

In this connection the hon. member for Hull gave us a chance and I thank him for it. If we take up his own words, we must acknowledge that medicine is an art of probabilities. As abortion is part of medicine, we cannot see why we should now be legislating on that matter. That is the very reason why we are discussing so much.

Mr. Speaker, in a letter that the *Alliance pour la vie* sent to members on November 20, 1968, one could read, and I quote:

Dear Hon. Member:

It seems that you will soon be called upon to vote amendments to the Criminal Code involving radical changes in the clauses concerning abortion. Anyone who considers carefully the proposed amendments realize that they involve major changes, regardless of any assurance given to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, the second paragraph is most important.

Unfortunately, few members have had the time or the opportunity to consider the amendments carefully. Therefore, very few clearly understand the meaning and the reasons of the amendments proposed. We noticed that such a confusion exists not only among members of the government party and the opposition parties, but even among members of the cabinet.

The *Alliance pour la vie* gives evidence of that in the third paragraph, which reads as follows:

During a conversation with one of our members on August 29 last, the Minister of Justice admitted that the government had formed its opinion on the matter of abortion before due consideration had been made. He—

Mr. Speaker, is there anything less responsible, more immature than to propose amendments to a legislation before having considered it, all its implications and all its consequences?

The hon. member for Hull or rather the dull member for Hull, as said the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), said that he was eager to know what succeeding generations will think of our interventions.

I do not know whether he has listened to or read my other speeches on this subject because I spoke on several occasions. In fact, this is not the last one either since I intend to speak on each amendment.

As I have pointed out, I want at least posterity, that is to say my own children and others, to know that we stood our ground, that we made our views known, that we challenged the position of the government on this question. I feel sure that sooner or later we shall overcome.

The standing committee on health, welfare and social affairs held hearings on the question in the fall and winter. However, as the proceedings will show, the amendments had been drafted before the committee hearings. And we are told that we are not serious to fight in such an untimely way, if I may put it that way, those clauses of the bill! If we are putting up such a fight it is for reasons we are not afraid to explain openly; it is for scientific reasons, for medical reasons and because the government does not face its responsibilities and is passing legislation before having considered it carefully.

The following is the text of a document that everyone has received. I am quoting:

In December last, the government exerted pressure on the committee in order that an interim report should be prepared before having heard the majority of briefs. Neither the government, nor the committee in its sympathetic report, rely on the proceedings to justify the proposed amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the more I keep on reading this text, the more I get worked up, the more I find this situation ridiculous and childish. That is why I keep harping on about that. I had already put on the order paper a question for the minister asking him if:

—some organizations were bringing pressure to hear on the government to promote the passage of the omnibus bill?

If so, what were those organizations?

On which of the three subjects—homosexuality, divorce, abortion—were the pressures the strongest?

The minister answered in the negative. I have it here, it is the original and complete text.

On the other hand, several organizations have sent us representations and the minister still answered no. Then, he said, and I quote:

Several organizations made representations in favour or against such and such provision of Bill C-195, the first reading of which took place—

Of course, it was the former bill, Bill C-195.

As far as abortions are concerned, here are some organizations that have made representations to us on this subject. I want the minister to tell us—there is a whole page here—how many are in favour of the bill and how many are against it.

According to my information and the documents we have received, not two are in favour of this bill which was given so little consideration prior to its introduction.

I am taking the minister's words, namely that no organization has brought any pressure to bear.

But, a great many organizations have opposed this bill. On that basis, we feel quite justified in defending our position fiercely.

I continue the quotation:

The official explanations given by the government for broadening the grounds for abortion are inconsistent and contradictory. It seems that the proposed amendments are designed to make a distinction between sin and crime and mainly to clarify the existing act.

• (5:50 p.m.)

That is what the minister had said and before him, the former minister of justice, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

The purpose of the legislation was to make a distinction between sin and crime.

The explanations contradict each other and will not bear examination.

First of all, if the government really believe that abortion may be only a sin, why does it not delete any mention of it in the Criminal Code?

One can see how logical it is, since there is no reference to sin in the bill. In fact, at a given time, the debate was diverted on that subject and it was suggested that it did not rest with the government to determine whether an act was moral or not.

If the act was considered immoral—because it is deemed immoral by a number of people—it would not be enough to consider it a criminal act. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I agree on that point, but if the government considers it is only a matter of sin, then, it should stop dealing with sin and legislating on sin.

The Minister of Justice recognized it would have been a logical conclusion to reach. However, such was not the case, for he wrote subsequently:

—that the government would not do so under any circumstances.

Furthermore, the Prime Minister maintained "that the government in its amendments to the Criminal Code was not legalizing abortion."

This is the argument brought forward. Abortion is not legalized but on the other hand it is said:

—the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health—

This, Mr. Speaker, constitutes an obvious contradiction brought about by the famous word "likely" and I also commend the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) who, like us, had noticed this excessive freedom allowed by in saying: ... "or likely".

If all doctors were as honest as the hon. member for Hull, we could most certainly rely on their professional conscience and on their knowledge. There would not be any problems then. Besides, legislation would not even be necessary in any field if everybody was assuming his responsibilities.

When a law is enacted it is because some people are not behaving as they should and it is their case which is provided for in using the famous word "likely".

One can imagine all the possibilities that such a word as "likely" represents. A great many unwed mothers will likely become insane temporarily in order to justify their abortion.

"Likely" a great many married women who in order not to have any more children and to avoid doing more work at home will always succeed in finding a disease to justify abortion.

There will "likely" always be welfare recipients who will find themselves all kinds of diseases to justify their request for abortion.

What will the physician do in such circumstances? Will he be stubborn and say to the patient that she is not ill; she will reply that she is. And if she succeeds in discussing during 12 hours, the physician will probably decide that she is mentally ill and he will agree to procure an abortion.

Mr. Speaker, we have to think about the implication, of the words. A while ago, the Chair interrupted me on account of a comma, but words "would be likely to" are much longer and much more dangerous for the above-mentioned reasons.

Mr. Speaker, these words give complete freedom to those who wish to evade the law. Complete freedom is liable to bring about a decadence of morals, which should certainly not be promoted by the house.

Mr. Speaker, a great number of persons, due to their lack of education, will maintain that they approve that bill. Others, better educated, will state their views after mature consideration.

This last argument has been suggested to me by a so-called survey reposted in the press and which indicated that most people are in favour of abortion.

Even if such was the case, I do not think that we would be justified in promoting abortion.

If a pregnant woman who has marital troubles or others is asked if she is in favour of abortion and if she answers yes, can we rely on her judgment?

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me; I would like you to call it six o'clock.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being six o'clock this sitting is suspended until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

*Criminal Code*

**AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, when the house rose we were discussing the amendment of the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont), which aims at deleting from the legislation the words "or would be likely to".

I must congratulate the member for Gatineau who was not afraid to speak up; when he says that the legislation is too liberal, we could not agree more. His standpoint tallies with the ideas we have already expressed in this house, with those of many doctors and with testimonies we have received, namely that the proposed legislation we are now proceeding with will impose no restriction on abortion.

Our arguments are supported by the documentation we have on similar legislation adopted in other countries and by the experience in those countries. It would be useless to quote all the figures in connection with experiences made elsewhere where abortion laws have been liberalized the same as we want to do here through Bill C-150. In any event, this legislation has far too much scope and will open the door to all kinds of abuses and that point was made very clear before the committee on justice and legal affairs.

We heard, for instance, quite eloquent witnesses say that childbirth could impair the health of the mother, but that, on the other hand, the child had to be saved. We reject those arguments.

It is obvious that no woman can go through pregnancy without experiencing some inconveniences. But if we should allow all abortions that are claimed for health reasons, there would not be many hon. members in this house.

Perhaps we would have accepted arguments balancing the health of the mother against the life of the child. We have been told that medicine has made big steps forward in this connection and that old arguments whereby the doctors of yesteryear justified the taking away of the life of the child for health reasons do not hold water today. Medical science has overcome them through the rapid and constant progress of medicine.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

I have here the evidence of Dr. Légaré who is well versed in this field. This evidence appears on page 616 of issue No. 13 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. Here is what he said:

> We believe that this is precisely what makes the text of the bill dealing with therapeutic abortion unacceptable. If even, it were proposed to weigh the life of the foetus as against the life of the mother, the discussion would be possible and furthermore, we are going to come back to this. But when we propose a text that would accept to sacrifice a foetal life in order to eliminate a cause that would "certainly or probably endanger the health of the mother", we feel the argument is one that does not carry any weight and makes the test unacceptable. I would like to know, in fact, who can reply to the following question: "What is health? Where does health begin and where does it end?"

He goes on to say that in the light of experience, what was taught to our doctors does not hold anymore.

And, further, he says:

> The main indications in regard to therapeutic abortion under this heading are especially of a psychiatric nature. We know of many pitiful cases and we are not indifferent to these cases. However, we must admit that this is a field of medicine where individual interpretation is easier than elsewhere and also that psychiatrists are far from being unanimous on this subject.
>
> Those doctors who support therapeutic abortion claim attractive results when careful enough to question their patients during the period of euphoria in the weeks following the expulsion of the foetus. But they would be wise to see these patients again a few years later when a feeling of guilt may possibly have developed amongst several of these women a guilt complex that is difficult to overcome. Every one recognizes there is a psychosis after delivery, but therapeutic abortion is not a panacea and does not eliminate the possibility of a post-abortion psychosis that is every bit as serious as the other.
>
> Another indication of therapeutic abortion that is discussed to great extent is the possibility of serious trouble in foetal development caused by the taking of certain kinds of medicine or because of certain virus infections. A pregnant woman who catches German measles during the sixteen first weeks of her pregnancy is the most typical and the best known example. We want to emphasize that this phenomenon is a rare one and will become more and more rare because of the recent appearance on the market of a preventive vaccine that can be given to the mother—
>
> As an Appendix to my brief, I have an article from the Lancet 1966, an English medical journal, to prove this. Therefore, this means that the systematic acceptance of this indication of therapeutic abortion amounts to accepting in cold blood to eliminate, at least, 75 p. 100 if healthy children amongst whom this accident occurs—
>
> Fortunately, medicine is progressing with gigantic strides and indications that were formerly imperative for having recourse to therapeutic abortion have become of minor importance.

Concerning the amendment under study, when it says *certainement* or *probablement*, we find that the wording of this legislation is much too vague, because a pregnant woman will be able to get an abortion on any ground. Even here, doctors have questioned the merits of this argument and their experience proved to them that even the committees of doctors once they start practicing abortion, accept more or less any reason given by the patient.

To corroborate my argument, here is an excerpt from the brief submitted by the Quebec Association of Medical Boards and I quote:

It is universally admitted by all serious obstetricians that the cases where therapeutic abortion would really save the life of the mother have become extremely scarce and are getting even scarcer with the progress of science.

It is alleged that therapeutic abortion would certainly or probably endanger the life of the mother but we think that this argument is not valid.

We have also here all the evidence of the doctors given on page 606 of the proceedings of the standing committee on health and welfare on the same bill, in which these words by Dr. Whyte are reported, and I quote:

Yes, I think they should include mental disorders.

I know it is difficult to define this area and those who have tried to find such a definition have had difficulties. For some people, this includes even social balance. For example the birth of a child can cause a complete upheaval in the way of living.

And Dr. Whyte has this to say about health on page 695:

That is a very hard word to define, I agree; you can define it as meaning happiness if you like.

• (8:10 p.m.)

We can also read at page 667 of the report submitted by the Hôtel Dieu du Sacré Cœur de Jésus, of Dolbeau, and I quote:

We feel that the health of the mother is an elastic criterion which may involve rather wide interpretations of the law, particularly when psychiatric reasons are taken into account.

We may also read, at page 682 of the same report, the evidence given by Dr. Quigley, and I quote:

We submit that your committee and the government have recommended a change in the law to include health grounds, without adequate information on such a vital issue and without any definition of the meaning of the word "health".

We are here legislating on health, and the text of the law fails to define the word "health".

At page 486, Dr. Quigley goes on saying and I quote:

The word "health" is used rather loosely. Are you talking about a cold in the nose? Are you talking about a girl who comes into your office and says that she is so upset at being pregnant and so forth? Somebody can say that this girl is really upset and her health is jeopardized. Is this serious enough for abortion?

I am not being facetious when I state that somebody could say, "I am so upset; I am so nervous about this pregnancy that you have to abort me." Now, her health at this particular moment is interfered with. She is a nervous, upset, anxious, possibly depressed, woman. Is this going to be sufficient justification for terminating that pregnancy?

Thus, the word "health" is not defined and it is felt that any meaning can be applied to it. Furthermore, at page 488, one can read the question asked by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) and I quote:

I gather that you are not happy about the inclusion of the words "and health", the health of the pregnant woman, as proposed in the Criminal Code.

And Dr. Quigley answered:

I am very unhappy because I do not know what is meant...

...by health. And here is what Jack Walters said about this, and I quote from page 540 of the report:

How you are going to change this law is something that disturbs many of us.

I think the omnibus bill, which has already been submitted, extends it into a field which is going to be very difficult to interpret, and I would submit that we are getting out of a frying pan into a fire. "Health" as defined by the World Health Organization or by a final year medical student on an examination paper, entails a tremendous area—economic, social and emotional.

Again, it is going to come down to interpretation of what you mean, what we in London mean, or what somebody in Ottawa means by "health"... This is going to be the problem in including "health" as well as "life".

The wording of the bill refers to health and states that life begins at birth, when medical authorities tell that life begins long before birth. This is what dismays the medical profession.

On page 541 of the report, Dr. Walters says:

There is difference of opinion in the medical profession. When you have a group discussing this in a specialty, or in a multi-specialty—the general practitioner group—you have differences

of opinion on a purely medical basis. If it could be established only on the life of the mother being endangered there would be much firmer solidarity.

—I know what life is, but I am not so sure about health... The term "health" is very ambiguous.

And further on, one can read on page 533:

—As for the doctor, he could give medical evidence concerning the life of the patient in such or such conditions, but it would be asking too much of the members of the medical profession to have them interpret the word "health".

Dr. Paul Christie says on page 475 of the brief submitted by the Anglican Church:

"The term "health" must in this case be subject to the broadest interpretation."

I believe that health as understood now by specialists in health and organic medicine, always involves social factors—

But for health reasons, for social reasons, for psychological reasons, a woman will be able to resort to abortion in order to free herself.

And Dr. H. Brody tells us on page 274:

—What these laws may do is give us a greater opportunity to find medical and psychiatric rationalizations... However, the interpretation of these reform laws will still remain in the hands of physicians. As stated by Howell "the law will again be unclear and dishonest".

Mr. Speaker, I could quote a host of doctors who say that "health" is a general term that is not defined in our statutes.

And to distinguish between "health" and "life", let us see what Dr. Douglas Cannell tells us on page 110 of the Proceedings of the standing committee on health and welfare:

The greatest proportion were done for psychiatric reasons; next to that was rubella; then cardiac disease, renal disease, malignant disease and a variety of others.

Today, medicine proves that it has overcome those problems which were formerly medical indications but which today are readily cured by medicine.

This is what Doctor Gray has to say on page 110:

—this type of mental illness may encompass almost any variety of mental illness, but the types which most commonly provide an indication for abortion are the depressive illnesses because of the risk of suicide.

And the risk of suicide is again another pretext to revert to abortion.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

Doctor Theodore Lidz, speaking of suicide, as reported on page 174, says as follows and I quote:

(as given in a brief presented by the Emergency Organization for the Defence of Unborn Children): ...When the psychiatrist says that there is a suicidal risk, in many instances he does not mean that at all, but feels that there are strong socio-economic grounds for therapeutic abortion. Since the only ground for abortion in many states is if it is felt there is threat of death, suicidal risk is thus established as the only legal way out of the situation.

On page 223, we find the figures given by Dr. Ford. I quote:

—Interruption of pregnancy for psychiatric indications is given as the commonest reason for therapeutic abortion in the United States. In one four-year study from 1960 to 1964 in the States, there were 80 therapeutic abortions per 15,000 deliveries, 77.5 per cent of these therapeutic abortions were done on psychiatric grounds. Another authority states that the incidence of therapeutic abortion on psychiatric grounds is 85 per cent.

A bit further, we read as follows:

One of the commonest ways for a patient to present for an opinion about therapeutic abortion is with the threat of suicide. There is nothing more likely to force the doctor's hand than this and I have little doubt that it has been used frequently as the reason for recommending termination. However, once again, the available opinions indicate a different story. The Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists report states that it is extremely rare for suicide to take place following refusal of termination for psychiatric reasons. Anderson, in a series of 90 patients, had 33 threatening suicide but only one in fact committed suicide a year later and the refusal of termination was only one amongst other factors. And Lindberg reported on 304 patients with 62 threatening suicide, but without any actual suicides.

Mr. Speaker, the scope of this bill and more particularly of the clause now before us is too wide and so we cannot approve it. We have to congratulate the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) who moved the amendment.

We received another very interesting evidence which refers to emotion, as a pretence to ask for abortion and, most of the time, it is emotional reasons which bring the women—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member who is to quote another evidence, but his time has expired.

• (8:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, I join with those who have spoken before me in congratulating the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) who moved the amendment.

I have had the honour to work with him on some committees and even then I had great regard for him. He is not the only one who found fault with the omnibus bill. However, Mr. Speaker, he is the only member of the Liberal party who had the guts to move an amendment.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Clermont:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I think the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) also moved an amendment to the omnibus bill.

**Mr. Godin:** Mr. Speaker, I am glad there are two of them.

That means we are gaining ground.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau on April 14, 1969, reads as follows:

> That bill C-150, an Act to amend the Criminal Code . . . be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or would be likely to" on line 4 on page 43.

The hon. member for Gatineau told us this afternoon that he could hardly grasp the meaning of clause 18(4)(c), page 43 of the bill, which reads as follows:

> (c) has by certificate in writing stated that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health,

Mr. Speaker, when reading the words: "pregnancy of such female person", we realize the significance of this amendment.

If the bill dealt with a male person, it is obvious that the amendment would not be justified since the dangers of a pregnancy would certainly be non-existent.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Godin:** When we read in the bill, and I quote:

> —endanger her life or health—

—the problem is as the hon. member for Gatineau pointed out this afternoon.

We know when life begins, but as far as health is concerned, this is another matter. The word "health" has many meanings. On the occasion of a birth, for instance, one can drink to the infant's health. On the occasion of an anniversary, a graduation, an engagement, a wedding, one can drink to the health of the people concerned. On election night, one can drink to the new member's health.

When an hon. member becomes a minister, we extend to him our best wishes and drink to his health. Good luck, good health, do we repeat more often than necessary.

"Good health" are meaningless words, when we know that the persons to whom those wishes are extended are suffering from a deadly illness.

How do you do, how is your health? We know that we will not say the truth, because most of the times, we have to feel sharp pains to make up our minds to disclose publicly our condition.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I may be mentally ill and it is probably due to their civility that my colleagues refrain from telling you so. I am not at all in a position to speak about it.

On the other hand, when we see those lovely ladies with a hair piece or a man with a well curled wig, we must think that all those persons enjoy a very good health, when probably it is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate once again the hon. member for Gatineau who is thoroughly conscious that section 18(4)(c) is ridiculous. If the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) would consider that clause a few minutes, he would understand the importance of that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is probably aware of that. However, I take this opportunity to quote another article published in *Le Soleil* and which shows that in the medical or legal fields, it can be difficult to ascertain the truth.

Let me quote you an article published in *Le Soleil* of Quebec City on Saturday, January 25, 1969. I quote:

> When removing a tumour, the physician discovers a nice baby of 9 lbs. 2 oz.
>
> Mrs. Evelyn Crawford, 47 years of age, to whom physicians had told she had an abdominal tumor, had it removed yesterday and at the same time she gave birth unexpectedly to her first child.
>
> The mother, who was unaware that she was pregnant, and the baby girl, Kitty Roslyn, were both well, but the father, Irving, 53 years old, was shaken up.
>
> Crawford, who was working at his snack bar in Houston when the doctors phoned him the news that he was a father, was so shaken that he ruined three cars on his way to the hospital and was given a ticket for causing an accident through careless driving.
>
> The doctors said they did not know about the baby until the birth because the tumor prevented from hearing the heartbeats. The tumor weighed

seven pounds. The little girl, born by Caesarean section weighed nine pounds and two ounces.

The Crawfords, who celebrated their 25th wedding anniversary last December 27, have two adopted children and they take care of three others, all teen-agers.

"Naturally, I was flabbergasted, said Crawford. I expected to hear about the tumor operation. The doctor phoned and said he had a surprise for me. I could never have imagined!"

Mr. Speaker, in No. 13 of Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, on March 25, Dr. Benoît Légaré, gyneacologist at St. François d'Assise Hospital, in Quebec City, told us and I quote:

We do admit that certain mitral stenoses that cannot be operated on give rise to certain reservations. What does that leave? A handful of cases that will become fewer and fewer as medicine benefits from modern techniques.

Is it worthwhile risking to upset through an Act a state of equilibrium brought about under the status quo? Is it worthwhile setting up a mechanism that would risk going beyond the intentions of the legislator? Would it not be better to have broader consultations, accessible to all the strata of the medical profession, to medical associations, specialists and so on? Would it not be better to find out what we can at that particular level, all the distinctions that may improve the legislation before it is adopted?

Mr. Speaker, in view of those statements and those of many other competent persons, the proposed amendment is clear and stands to reason. If the hon. member for Gatineau had not introduced it, the opposition would have taken this opportunity to move it.

I am therefore happy to give it my wholehearted support and I would be more happy still if I were sure that the Liberal members would do the same.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Is the house ready for the question?

• (8:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, concerning the amendment that I have just read, submitted by the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont), I wish to congratulate, at last, a government member who has spoken up. Let us hope, as an hon. member said a moment ago, that others will also speak up, so that the truth be heard across the country.

The object of the amendment is to delete from sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 4 of clause 18, the words "or would be likely."

[Mr. Godin.]

All members have heard last week, the people of Western Canada protest strongly, saying that Parliament is always discussing legislation on homosexuality or amendments to legislation of this type.

When this bill was submitted, we ourselves asked that the provisions relating to homosexuality and abortion be withdrawn. If that had been done, we would not have to spend days on such matters. We could perhaps discuss urgent problems arising in the West and in the whole of Canada.

As the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) was compelled by an uncompromising Prime Minister to introduce the omnibus bill as it is written, the debate goes on and because of this, newspapermen say that we in the opposition do not have much success.

Canadians were truly aware of the night of June 25 that, with an authoritative government, the amendments proposed—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I must interrupt the hon. member to remind him that he must not speak on all the provisions in the bill, but simply on the amendment that was moved by the hon. member for Gatineau.

The hon. member has been talking for a few minutes already and he has not even come close to the matter under consideration.

Of course, he is allowed by the rules to make a 20-minutes speech. However, he is also required, pursuant to the standing orders, to relate his remarks in one way or the other to the amendment being considered.

**Mr. Dumont:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I shall probably come to the amendment that has been moved, and to . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I think an hon. member has a question.

The hon. member for Frontenac has the floor, and it is up to him to permit a question.

**Mr. Dumont:** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but in view of the interpretation, I would rather ask him to send me his inquiry in writing. I shall supply him with any information he wishes in my office where interpretation is easier.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the phrase "or would be likely to" should be deleted from the omnibus bill; this would clarify the

bill legalizing abortions and explain a number of points.

We know that that phrase should be replaced by this one: "when the mother gives her life so that a human being may have a chance to start his own". That is what the Ralliement Créditiste proposes.

As I said at the beginning, we would like at least this amendment to be carried.

The hon. minister has no doubt received a great deal of protests, and this is why I am convinced that he will at least accept this amendment. As a matter of fact, the revised edition of the bill to be introduced in the house is now being printed. As to the comments made to us, they are in favour of the adoption of this amendment.

The Canadian Association of Catholic hospitals, representing 300 hospitals, requested that the amendments which would have to be made to the legislation be not studied before the whole question had been thoroughly considered and more effective research undertaken by the government.

This is the information we received. The minister must also have received it. A translation had been prepared. Since the amendments were proposed by members of his party, he is willing to accept them.

Besides, the brief dealt mainly with the importance of the administrative aspects, that is to say of the real problems faced by hospitals, should parliament, without analyzing beforehand all possible consequences, hastily legalize a practice which the majority of the population consider not only revolting but contrary to the common good of the country.

As far as the amendment moved today is concerned, I could quote a statement made by the Catholic bishops. It says, and I quote:

God, Master of life, entrusted man with the noble ministry of giving life; man must therefore carry it out in a manner worthy of himself. Life must be carefully preserved from the moment of conception. Abortion and child-murder are abominable crimes.

And the brief states further:

The advancement of civilization, we say it firmly, lies in the recognition always clearer, both theoretical and practical, of the dignity of the human being, of its sacred character and of its absolute inviolability.

Everything leads us to believe that it is illusory to think that the proposed amendment by the enactment of a law will bring about a reduction in the number of clandestine abortions. Here again, the experience made in a few countries where legislation has already been approved, similar to the one that is proposed here, shows that the contrary is to be feared. But could it be otherwise? With a law that belittles, by the very exceptions that it accepts, the right of the foetus to live, it promotes the development of a permissive attitude that no longer considers abortion as a real crime. Here is where one should be reminded that the lawmaker must not underestimate the educational value of the law. People are indeed easily led to consider as morally acceptable what the law itself allows.

It always rests with the lawmakers alone to find realistic means of adjusting their convictions to the often complex situations of current life. They should not passively wait for the Church to come to their rescue, at this connection; but, on the contrary, they must—in co-operation with their colleagues—endeavour to find efficient means of promoting the common good, especially through the drawing up and the enactment of wise and just laws.

Instead of unjust laws.

I have here the report of an inquiry conducted in United States. Everyone knows that in United States, where the people have a rather liberal mentality, several States have adopted measures to allow abortion for reasons other than the health of the mother, as for example, eugenics, incest, poverty of the family and other social and economical reasons. A woman who is not pregnant from her husband can get an abortion. However, people are not ready to accept abortion for such reasons. They accept it largely when the mother's health is in serious danger.

On the other hand, 56 per cent only of the people are in favour of abortion in case of malformation of a child.

On the other hand, they are against abortion requested for economical reasons, as for instance when a family income is so low that the family cannot be brought up properly—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Dumont:** Refusal in 77 per cent—

**Mr. Speaker:** It is with a deep regret that I interrupt once more the hon. member to remind him again that he must limit his remarks, under the standing orders, to the amendment before us.

The hon. member is dealing with abortion in a very general way. That is not the object of the amendment under consideration. As I said a while ago, the hon. member may speak during the time allotted under the rules, but on the other hand, he must limit his remarks to the subject before us.

• (8:40 p.m.)

As I mentioned before, this is a subject with a very limited scope, namely the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau, and I am sure the hon. member has very interesting remarks to make on that.

**Mr. Dumont:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for following my remarks so closely. However, I read a while ago the speeches delivered by many members, especially from other parties, who had spoken at great length. I thank you for following my speech so closely, so as to call me back to order and I will try to sum up my thinking to the effect that we want the word *probablement* to be struck off, so as to make sure that this bill will be quite clear.

If they thought fit to add in the omnibus bill words such as *ou probablement*, the moment has come to make sure that the wording is such that people will interpret it exactly as it should be. That is why we want the word *probablement* to be struck off so that this abortion law, which will likely be passed, will be clear, even if we do not approve it.

We hope that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Justice, by pleading to the Prime Minister, will succeed in ensuring a free vote, so that we may know the real thinking of Parliament.

We must congratulate the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) for having allowed his members to vote freely, on sections of the bill dealing with homosexuality and we hope that the Prime Minister will let the government members vote also according to their conscience, as was established a long time ago within the Ralliement créditiste. Let us hope that the word *probablement* will be struck off once and for all from the omnibus bill.

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief, but I would like to make a few remarks on the amendment proposed by the government member.

Frankly, this amendment is quite reasonable and I think that government members should at least consider the amendment moved by one of them, an amendment which reveals a certain social spirit and a certain generosity.

No amendment has been made to the bill, as if the minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) or all the members opposite considered themselves extremely strong, powerful, learned, even more so perhaps, than the Creator himself. In fact, it is a legislation which affects freedom. God wants that in a world men be born and be able to fulfill their destiny, like the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

I wonder if the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister would now be in their seats if their mother had made use of such an immoral and unjust legislation.

We need men, and I think the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister are great men, of the type we need to ensure the progress of the nation. But today, we claim, perhaps like the bad angels, to be more learned than the Creator and to oppose his designs.

Mr. Speaker, as far as this bill is concerned, we are more and more frustrated, more and more annoyed by the fact that the government members and the Minister of Justice refuse to consider the point of view of the opposition. None of the amendments we proposed has been in any way adopted or even considered.

I really wonder if the minister is so convinced that the recommendations of the opposition are worthless and that his views should prevail and this bill should be adopted since what is at stake is life itself and the survival of our nation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that a country as young and vast as Canada, with tremendous resources—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I presume that all we have heard until now from the hon. member is the preamble to his speech, but after hearing his remarks submitted to the house as introductory, I would ask him to come now to the amendment before the house.

**Mr. Latullipe:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that you will realize that it is rather difficult to keep exactly to the proposed amendment, because it is from this amendment that all the consequences of this bill and of abortion result. That is why we are inclined to go a little beyond the amendment which is meant only to change one word. It is a word with a special meaning and to speak about it we have to use several words and make sentences.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you will have the opportunity to help us in trying to convince the minister. I know that everything we say will be of no use because so far nothing

has been taken into account as yet. So, Mr. Speaker, we could say many things but I will limit myself to asking the minister, as the Lord, through him, is helping the nation and guiding future generations, not to go too far.

For, when it comes to analyze the divine act of creation, I believe that nobody is in a position to oppose the laws of creation. We should let the Creator fulfil His views for what He has done is well done and it does not befit us to interfere with his divine laws. I do not think we are at all qualified to interfere in the rules and commands of the Lord.

• (8:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Oza Tetrault (Villeneuve):** Mr. Speaker, before I am asked to vote on Bill C-150, which will legalize the destruction of human life, I wish to make a few comments. I have come to the conclusion that the passage of this bill would create more social evils and injustices than it would cure. Killing can never be a cure. It can only be a denial of the basic right to life which we all enjoy equally before the law. To deny this right, even to so small a human being as a foetus in the womb is to deny it, in principle at least, to every citizen in Canada.

To deny that, a foetus is a living human being is to deny the scientific evidence of biologists who without exception say that human life begins at conception. This is no longer merely a religious belief or opinion; this is a proven scientific fact.

Secondly, this matter involves a change to the whole basic concept on which our laws of society are founded, the equality of all human beings before the law and the dignity of human life. It is useless to have a conference on human rights if we are about to deny the primary right of the dignity of human life, and if we are about to deny the primary right of life itself. The measure of a society is in direct proportion to the protection it gives to its weakest members.

Surely, in this great country we cannot accept the suggestion that we have no room for these innocents because we cannot feed or clothe them. What is always overlooked, however, is the experience in other countries which already have permissive abortion laws. When a country legislates to permit abortion, the demand for it is always increasing. Women become abortion-minded to such an extent that doctors and hospitals find it impossible to respond. Let us look at some of the figures from Japan.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Before the hon. members refers to the Japanese figures I should like to remind him, as I have tried to remind other hon. members who have spoken during this debate, that it is not the whole bill which is before the house at the present time but just that portion to be amended by those amendments proposed at the committee stage. These matters are open to consideration, but I must remind hon. members that their remarks must be relevant to the amendments under consideration. The hon. member should direct his remarks to the matter which is under consideration.

**Mr. Tetrault:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will not continue my remarks.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the floor just for a few minutes.

I intended to speak only for two or three minutes because the Speaker seemed slightly exasperated by all those speeches which are so very much alike but like his assistant seems quite fit, I guess I will take a few minutes more.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to take the floor about this bill for I had already done so to discuss Bill C-196. Here is the reason why I now want to take part in the debate: the amendment now before us is rather short but it is worth being considered, especially since it is introduced by a Liberal member, and a French Canadian.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I congratulate most warmly the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) who had the courage to oppose his leader and to introduce this amendment. At the outset very strict orders were issued and we were hoping that the new Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) would show a little more understanding, but that is not true, he is following the others blindly, as in the army.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Gauthier:** We have here in front of us a military government and a dictatorship. I am sincerely sorry for our hon. friends opposite, for they cannot express their feelings as freely as the hon. member for Gatineau did a moment ago.

We have received many recommendations concerning this bill. I shall certainly not read

all the testimonials and protests I have received.

The first brief on the first bill we dealt with was sent to us by the Quebec Association Hospital Medical Boards. All the members received it and I am sure all of them have read it. That brief gives the point of view of the doctors. It enumerates the reasons which forbid them to accept the principle of abortion, or the bill, as it is from the human and medical points of view.

We have also been made aware of the grievances of the religious authorities through the declaration of the Canadian Catholic Bishops on abortion. Catholics know where they stand.

We also received from the Alliance for Life a release on the reasons for which they oppose the bill.

At the start, as in the case of homosexuality, we tried to pull out from the omnibus bill those two articles so that they could be voted on separately. We failed all down the line. Again tonight my words fall upon deaf ears. My words run off like water on the backs of ducks. The public will know that I speak on deaf ears, because members have been given strict orders, and when the leader has spoken, they must comply. I want to move, Mr.—

**Mr. Marceau:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I point out to my hon. friend that we are not of the Ralliement Créditiste party to comply solely with what our leader has said. We have not received instructions from the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice; the hon. member is presuming a lot. This is the second time it happens and I object to that type of accusations.

• (9:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder whether this exchange will advance the cause of the debate. The hon. member did not raise a point of order, but rather stated a grievance. I suggest that we might hear the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier). I might also mention to the hon. member for Roberval that, as the Speaker has mentioned previously, he should try to keep his remarks within the framework of the amendment that is now before the house.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, my remarks were in order. I was urging government members to support the amendment. I urge them to express their views. If they claim they were not given any guide-lines, let them speak. We only want to know their views in order to make them known to their constituents. They may be accused of having no opinion, because they remain silent.

I want to congratulate the member for Gatineau on having moved his amendment with a view to deleting at least the words "or would be likely to". And that is the purpose of my intervention.

If a few members of the party in power wanted to be sincere and at least help one of their colleagues to have the words "and would be likely to" deleted, I think many consciences would feel relieved, especially within the medical profession.

On January 19 and 22, I received a letter that all hon. members probably received also. I would like to quote part of it.

Dear Sir,

You will find herewith the opinion of the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards on the problem of abortion.

That report represents the opinion of the majority of doctors—

That brief was not submitted by lawyers but by doctors practising in the hospitals of the province of Quebec.

I continue:

We hope that this will enlighten you so that you may take a fair and just stand towards every citizen of our country.

The letter is signed by Mr. Robert Lavigne, Chairman.

The protest reads as follows and I quote:

Concerning Bill C-195 on abortion, the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards is in agreement on the following:

—that an amendment be made to the present text of the Criminal Code.

—that the procedure of case studies by therapeutic abortion committees in each hospital be agreed to.

—that the medical practioners who have decided, after a serious study within their hospital committee, to authorize a therapeutic abortion should no longer be considered as guilty under the Criminal Code.

We believe:

—that only scientific medical research will furnish the true solution to the problem under discussion and we are in favour of any study group.

—that abortion, in the present state of medical science, remains a murder perpetrated on a human being.

These statements are not mine, but those of physicians and surgeons.

I continue:

—that any medical practitioner or hospital should be free to refuse to take part in such a medical technique.

That is the reason why I congratulated the hon. member for Gatineau a while ago for he seems to share the views of the experts.

I continue the quotation:

—that as such a technique involves the life of a human being... the decision should not be left to the sole will of the patient.

We are against:

—a bill creating false hopes among the people.

Heaven knows that the Liberal party has created false hopes since it coming to power.

And I go on:

—furthermore we ask that the hospitals entitled to perform therapeutic abortions be designated by the Physicians' College in each province so as to ensure the quality of the established standards.

We conclude:

—that is why the Q.A.H.M.B. is opposed to the present wording of the proposed Bill C-195 and would like to have it amended in order to restrict it to cases presenting serious danger to the mother's life.

This is precisely why I am convinced, without having discussed it previously, that the hon. member for Gatineau, in wanting to delete the word "likely" is trying to restrict pretty much the scope of the law. If we do not remove that word, well, an unwed mother or a pregnant woman will pretend to be sick. A pregnant woman is always a little sick. Right there is ground for abortion. Right now. In the case of a mother fearing pregnancy, she will be able under the existing law to procure her miscarriage. Within a year or two this will mean disaster.

We are told that in Canada because of the pill births have dropped by 40 per cent. In two years, births will have decreased by 60 or 75 per cent. We shall no longer need the Chinese to destroy us then. We shall only need abortionists to decimate the Canadian race. We shall import immigrants to replace these people who should have lived and who were killed by abortionists. We who are in the process of passing this anti-social measure...

Well, I believe that—

**Mr. Marceau:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Gauthier:** If that point of order is like the other previous one, Mr. Speaker, I shall continue with my comments.

• (9:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marceau:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that my hon. friend has strayed from the question. I think he is always coming back to the same point.

I believe that—

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

**Mr. Marceau:**—nothing is said about the amendment and that comments should be limited to the text of the amendment.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I might point out to hon. members that I can only hear one point of order at a time. I think out of courtesy to the hon. member for Lapointe I should hear his point of order, after which I will decide whether he has a legitimate point of order. If, following that, the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) has another point of order, I will listen to him and decide that. I did not hear what the hon. member for Lapointe said, so possibly he would like to repeat it.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marceau:** Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to say that my hon. friend is not speaking about the amendment. His remarks are of a general nature and would be proper on third reading.

**Mr. Gauthier:** On a question of privilege—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I might point out to the hon. member that I was listening to the hon. member for Roberval fairly carefully. Sometimes it is difficult to decide whether or not he is dealing directly with the amendment. I was trying to give him as much latitude as possible, while recognizing his right to express his point of view. I think that within fairly broad limits he is in order, but I also remind him that the Standing Orders are fairly specific on this matter. We should confine our remarks to the amendment before us. I know that the hon. member for Roberval, who has been in the house for a number of years, knows this as well as I do and I am sure he will try to confine his remarks to the amendment before us.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gauthier:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to congratulate you for being impartial, since my remarks were in order, whereas the silence of the hon. member for Lapointe was not.

Mr. Speaker, I was finishing reading the report on the bill. The hon. member for Lapointe is trying to make me digress from the subject matter.

The amendment under consideration is the best one moved since the beginning of the debate, and I am particularly proud of it as it was moved by a Liberal member. I like it when Liberals are sincere, since I feel there are good people among the Liberal members. However, a good animal on a leash is not worth much. Just set the Liberals free, and you will see that the business of the house will be speeded up and amendments accepted.

I was saying...I have now lost the thread of my thoughts.

**An hon. Member:** It was not a big one.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Your thread was not a big one.

**Mr. Gauthier:** But the amendment is not a "big" one. Just one word. We have to speak for 20 minutes on one word, while limiting ourselves to the amendment. The hon. member for Lapointe, being a lawyer, tries to catch us digressing from the subject, but he has nothing to do. He does not digress since he does not speak.

I have another letter of protest which I should like to send to the minister—

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

**Mr. Gauthier:** I realize, Mr. Speaker, that I have only three minutes left. I would then beg leave from the house to read this letter.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I see the hon. member for Lapointe wishes to rise on a question of privilege. I will hear him, as I am duty bound to do.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marceau:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of my hon. friend the fact that he has just made a rash and untrue judgment. I have talked on second reading of the bill, I have already expressed my viewpoint and what he has said about me is not fair.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. This matter does not constitute a point of privilege.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I respect my hon. friend for Lapointe. I simply told him that he had not spoken to the amendment and that I wanted him to do so. It is not asking too much, I think.

Now, for the information of the Minister of Justice, I would like to read a letter published in *Le Droit*, January 30, 1969 issue, and which reads as follows:

> With respect to the abortion bill, Catholic hospitals say that they are in an awkward position.
>
> In a letter sent to the Minister of Justice—

So he received a letter. I go on quoting:

> —the Association of Catholic Hospitals of Canada asserts that the bill... designed to legalize, in certain conditions, therapeutic abortion, could place Catholic hospitals in awkward positions.

● (9:20 p.m.)

I am sure, once again, that it is for that reason that the hon. member for Gatineau is trying to do something about it. I continue:

> Catholic hospitals refuse to provide for such purposes premises, equipment or staff under their authority.
>
> Because of that position, the A.H.C.C. maintains that the bill would place Catholic hospitals in a very vulnerable position, since provincial authorities can oblige them, pursuant to the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code, to establish abortion committees in their own institutions.
>
> Therefore, the A.H.C.C. asks, on behalf of all its members, that a special clause be inserted in the proposed amendment to protect Catholic hospitals and their staff against the obligation of establishing such committees.

This amendment answers the desired purpose.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I too should like to congratulate the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) for having brought in an amendment to Bill C-150, in order to clarify one of its clauses and to make it clearer. However, I wonder if he went far enough.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to support that amendment, I should like to make one thing clear. Even if I support this amendment to clause 18 of Bill C-150, it does not mean

that I support clause 18. I wish to mention it again quite clearly. I am against any liberalization of the legislation concerning abortion and I know that there is another amendment for deleting clause 18 of Bill C-150 and I will fully support it.

But since other amendments must be considered before that one, we must necessarily vote on them.

Then, the hon. member for Gatineau as well as my colleague for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue), who introduced similar amendments, were right when they asked the members of the house to strike out the words "or would be likely." Otherwise, it could cause trouble to those who are compelled to comply with those rules and to apply them.

As I said, I wonder if the hon. member went far enough with his amendment.

This afternoon, one of my colleagues said something that upset me. According to him, physicians are liable to make mistakes and none of them can come to a categorical conclusion as to any health condition.

It reminded me, Mr. Speaker, of a situation I heard of four or five years ago, about a woman who had come to an Abitibi hospital where she was going to have a child. The doctor who examined her just before the delivery foresaw some difficulties. Thinking that he would have to make a Caesarean section and anxious to make a good job, before he quite made up his mind, the doctor consulted two of his colleagues. While they were talking, the woman was giving birth to her child in the delivery room without undue trouble.

This goes to show that people may often make mistakes, even if they are the greatest physicians, scientists or experts in the world. Then, Mr. Speaker, in view of this irrepressible doubt, we have cause for concern and doctors responsible for the life of human beings are concerned too whenever they have to run this risk. That accounts for the determination of the members of the Ralliement créditiste to take all available means to convince the government of the need to be very careful in connection with the amendment to the Criminal Code dealing with abortion.

Mr. Speaker, this determination results from the requests of persons who are interested in the well-being of patients and of mothers who are to give birth to children.

The question came up: Is the government truly concerned with protecting the life and the health of women? The proposed amendment seeks also to add that when a doctor

—has by certificate in writing stated that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person—

Yes, a female person.

—would or would be likely—

"Probably" means "perhaps".

—to endanger her life or health.

Then was added to the amendment the word "health", for the bill already contained the expression "to endanger the life of a female person".

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, if the government wants to make health a reason for justifying abortion, one wonders what it will do next. Bill C-150 includes provisions on homosexuality and abortion. Who knows, perhaps next year a bill will be introduced on artificial insemination for human beings? A stop must be put immediately to this excessive liberalizing of the Criminal Code.

Mr. Speaker, when I heard this afternoon—

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I presume the hon. member wants to put a question. The hon. member for Abitibi has the floor and a question may be put to him only if he agrees to it.

[*English*]

**Mr. Broadbent:** Would the hon. member permit a question? Would he agree that if his party were not so illiberal in its attitude toward homosexuals it would not have to be so illiberal on the question of abortion?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, I shall reply to my hon. friend, that as a Créditiste and a Catholic, I consider myself one of the most liberal members of this house. I recognize freedom for everybody, but I do not admit abuse of liberty.

I shall have the opportunity, later on in the debate, of putting one of his colleagues straight.

This afternoon, when I heard the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) question the wisdom of the amendment proposed by the government—if I understood him correctly, he was in favour of the amendment of his

colleague from Gatineau—I wondered whether the amendment went far enough and, to improve it, to complete it, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin):

That Bill C-150, an Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, etc., be amended by deleting, in clause 18, on line 4 on page 43, the words "or would be likely to" and inserting therefor the words "according to medical science".

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in moving this subamendment, is to improve this legislation even further and to recognize the importance of the associations, in order to express confidence in the decisions they will take on each application for abortion that is presented to them.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have here the amendment just proposed by the hon. member and I must say that I doubt very much that it is in order.

I am ready to make a decision on the spot if the hon. member so desires.

Some hon. members might want to express their point of view but I must remind them that the only thing they are allowed to do at this stage is to amend the amendment itself, but not to amend the clause that the amendment under consideration is trying to amend.

In other words, the hon. member is trying to go back to a previous stage of the debate or to go beyond the terms of the motion now before the house by amending the clause itself. This is clearly out of order.

If the hon. members want to make some comment, I shall listen to them before making a decision.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure your remarks are quite timely, but, with your permission, I would like to present a few arguments which, in our opinion, justify the submission of this amendment to the amendment and make it in order.

First of all, we believe, Mr. Speaker, that under Standing Order 75(8), it is possibly, at this stage of the report of the committee, and I quote:

When the order of the day—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I remind the hon. member that it is not the matter put to the house for consideration at the moment. Nobody denies the hon. member the right to present a subamendment. I admit that the hon. member can, under the rules to which he has just referred to present a subamendment.

[Mr. Laprise.]

What I am telling him now is that the subamendment does not seem to be in order and that is the point on which I would like to hear his arguments.

**Mr. Fortin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now come down to this specific question.

The subamendment proposed by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) says this; and I quote:

—be amended by substituting the words "or would be likely to", by the words: "according to medical science".

So, there are two things. The deletion of the words "or would be likely to" and their replacement by the words "according to medical science".

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the amendment before the house moved by the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) tended to delete the words "or would be likely to", but suggested nothing positive to replace them.

On the other hand, if the words "or would be likely to", are deleted, any sub-amendment must be related to the main amendment. That is why the hon. member for Abitibi thought perhaps of replacing the words: "or would be likely to" by the expression: "according to medical science".

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the terms "according to medical science" are related to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau since it merely tends to make it more acceptable, and that it is directly related to the amendment, and not necessarily to the bill.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe, in accordance with the clause I was quoting, we have linked up the sub-amendment to the amendment so that it is acceptable.

[*English*]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I argued yesterday for the right of an hon. member to move an amendment with which I did not happen to agree. Tonight, however, I must argue against an amendment with which I do not agree. I think I can do it briefly.

It has already been established under Standing Order 75, paragraph (8), that an amendment to a motion that has been put down at the report stage is in order. However, I submit that this amendment is faulty on two grounds. In the first place, it is not draft-

ed in the form of an amendment to the motion that is before the house; it is drafted in the form of an amendment to the bill itself.

**Mr. Rondeau:** No.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The hon. member says no, but even with the limited amount of French that I understand I can assert that it is. The amendment is to section 18 of the bill, and specifically to line 4 on page 43. Section 18, line 4, on page 43 of the bill is not before the house at this time. What is before the house is an amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont).

The other ground on which the amendment is faulty is that it violates the rule of relevancy. While an amendment may be in order at this stage, it must be relevant. I am thinking in particular of citations 202 and 203, and the various paragraphs of those citations, in Beauchesne's fourth edition.

I submit that the hon. member for Gatineau proposes merely to drop certain words. The hon. member who is now proposing an amendment is introducing a new concept, that of bringing medical science into the picture, and surely this is going beyond the substance of the motion he seeks to amend. Therefore, on those two grounds, I submit that while an amendment at this stage is in order, the present amendment itself is not in order.

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Lotbinière has already expressed his views and hon. members know that the Chair can make a ruling when all the arguments have been submitted. However, I would not want to be unfair towards hon. members and if others want to express their views, I will gladly listen to them, in order to reach a fair and equitable decision.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, on the amendment just moved by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) it is obvious that it is not an amendment to the bill itself. The amendment proposed by the hon. member is an amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont). It relates not to the bill itself, but to clause 18, where the words "would be likely to" would be replaced by "according to medical science".

I think that this amendment automatically relates to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau and that it is fully relevant. I trust your judgment, Mr. Speaker, but this amendment is in accordance with standing order 75(8). As the debate, since this afternoon, has been on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Gatineau, we want to clarify the intention of the hon. member who merely deplored a factual situation about which the legislation is ambiguous.

As for the linguistic aspect, we wanted to clarify his thought by suggesting that the words "according to medical science" should replace "would be likely to".

For those reasons, I think that this amendment complies with the procedural rules.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Shefford repeated exactly the argument brought forward by the hon. member for Lotbinière. I do not see why we should listen over and over again to the same argument.

I must point out to the hon. member for Shefford, as I said earlier, that his proposed subamendment is not in order for at least one reason.

I suggest to the hon. member that this amendment is of the kind which could have been proposed under standing order 75, that is to say by giving notice of it before the motions are considered in the house. Once the motions have been proposed—there are 43 or 44 of them I think—the house must consider particular amendments or specific motions proposed by the members and only such motions can be the subject of a subamendment under Standing order 75(8).

What the hon. members can do now is to propose a subamendment to the motion of the hon. member for Gatineau, because they cannot introduce an amendment to change section 18 of the bill under consideration. I suggest to the member for Abitibi and to the other members that the motion of the member for Abitibi is in fact intended to amend clause 18 of Bill C-150 and not the motion of the hon. member for Gatineau.

In fact, the motion of the hon. member for Gatineau is so simple that it would be difficult I think to imagine an amendment which could be in order. Therefore under the circumstances, I find it impossible, even if I wanted to be as tolerant as the Rules allow me, to accept the subamendment proposed by the member for Abitibi.

I thank hon. members who have been good enough to enlighten me and to advise me, but I must say I am in full agreement with the arguments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member having already taken part in the debate on this amendment can not speak a second time of course.

Mr. Clermont, seconded by Mr. Comtois moved that Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or would be likely to" on line 4 on page 43.

[*English*]

The question is on motion No. 26 (Mr. Clermont). Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11) the recorded division on the said motion stands deferred until after consideration of proposed motion No. 28.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi)** moved amendment No. 27:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "a female person who, being pregnant," on lines 29 and 30 on page 42 and by inserting the following words:

[Mr. Speaker.]

"—a female person who is married or of the full age of twenty-one years, or a female person who is under the full age of twenty-one years, with the written consent of her parents or guardian."

Mr. Speaker, I moved another amendment to clause 18 of Bill C-150, in another attempt to clarify the bill. I want to replace the words "a female person who, being pregnant," in paragraph (b) subsection 4 of clause 18 of the bill, by the words "married or of age or a female person under age, with the written consent of her parents or guardian".

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, that amendment stipulates that only married women or those of full age will be allowed to call, on their own, on a medical practitioner or an abortion committee, should clause 18 be agreed to. However, if the pregnant woman is a minor, she should first get an authorization from her parents or guardians.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask parliament to agree to that specific point, so that the relaxing of the law will not cause a mad rush for abortion. We are told already that many people seem to believe that the amendment to the Criminal Code now under study will open the door to various types of abortion for any person wishing to get an abortion. That is the common belief among the public. The same belief prevails, among the public concerning the amendment to clause 7 of bill C-150: homosexuality would be quite legal and allowed. That is what the bill led the public to believe, and people are already talking about it in Montreal.

The same thing will happen, Mr. Speaker, as concerns the relaxing of the abortion law. I believe that clause 18 should spell out that only married women or persons of full age could ask for an abortion on their own. If they so wished, they could, under the provisions of the act, meet a responsible and qualified medical practitioner and be directed to a committee made up of two or three medical practitioners—I know that other amendments on the same subject will be discussed a little later on—who could then decide whether they may get an abortion.

That concerns a married woman of the full age of twenty-one years or a single person of the full age of twenty-one years. However, the unmarried girl under the full age of twenty-one years, will have to get authority from her parents or guardian, that is to say that the committee, it it must decide to procure an abortion for her, should get the written consent of her parents or guardian.

Mr. Speaker, I think that with the insertion of that detail in clause 18 of the bill, once more difficulties would be avoided.

If my memory serves me well, it was necessary in the province of Quebec until recently to obtain the father's authorization, for instance in the case of a person under the full age of twenty-one years applying for a driver's licence or any other thing normally granted only to persons over the full age of twenty-one years. The Civil Code of Quebec will be amended soon and the mother will also be able to give her consent if it is impossible to find the father or if he refuses. I therefore think the federal government should use discretion so as not to go beyond the provisions of the provincial laws. That is why I ask for an explanation on clause 18 of Bill C-150. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be important to have the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) as well as that of his colleagues and other members of the house. I think that, pursuant to Standing Order 75, the amendment has been tabled early enough to enable members of the house to take notice of it and to appraise it.

I want once more to point out quite clearly that this amendment has been moved with some reservation. I moved it in case clause 18 would be agreed to. However, if the amendment tending to delete clause 18 is agreed to my amendment would not hold out any more. But in case amendment No. 19 were not rejected, I would then ask the house to pass my proposed amendment.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), had considered asking this evening to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) his opinion on this amendment, but I thought it advisable to rise, in order to enable him to think about it until tomorrow afternoon. It is a serious, logical and judicious amendment, because the hon. member for Abitibi wishes to amend clause 18 by substituting to the words " . . . a female person who, being pregnant" the words "who is married or of age, or a female person under age with the written consent of her parents or guardian."

Now, we are considering a most serious amendment, because how can we imagine that a pregnant girl of 17 years of age could have an abortion without the consent of her parents?

It is possible that a young girl, who could be an only child, for instance, becomes pregnant and would like to get an abortion, without the consent of her father who could be anxious to be a grandfather. The girl might want to interrupt her pregnancy for all kinds of social considerations or not to let her parents know. Then, because the law authorizes her to get abortion without the knowledge of her parents, the father could one day learn about it and realize he missed an unique opportunity to become a grandfather.

From that point of view, I believe the girl's father has a right, as far as his grandson is concerned.

Moreover, if his daughter, one day, is remiss in her duties towards her child.—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. It being ten o'clock it is my duty to put the questions to be debated at this time.

[*English*]

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### TRANSPORT—BORDEN-TORMENTINE FERRY RATES

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I regret that the other day when asking the Minister of Transport (Mr. Hellyer) about the ferries between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, I directed my question to the wrong terminal and it ended up with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) who immediately disclaimed responsibility for the cargo and the container. I did not know, in the few days following my question, there would be such change and turmoil as developed in connection with the Minister of Transport.

It is not new, Mr. Speaker, for representatives of the province of Prince Edward Island to be addressing this chamber on questions of transportation. Indeed, the Fathers of Confederation from my province over one hundred years ago very wisely put transportation at the top of the list of priorities. The Province of Prince Edward Island entered Confederation on the promise of "continuous and efficient communication with the mainland". The people of Prince Edward Island were assured that, as far as humanly possible, the province's insular geographic disabilities would be overcome as a result of national governmental

policies. We were to be made a part of the national railway system, or I should say more precisely we were to be made a fully integral part of the national system of transportation, whatever contemporary technology made that system to be.

• (10:00 p.m.)

The issue today is acute, Mr. Speaker. Our promised causeway, on which $15 million has already been spent, has now been finally thrown into the ashcan of unfulfilled obligations. The building of the causeway was not just an election promise but a commitment of one level of government to another, made over and over again by the representatives of the dominion government to the representatives of Prince Edward Island in this parliament of Canada. One must say, and one must always say if he believes in federalism, that without full faith and credit between the various levels of government within a federation, the functioning of federalism is difficult if not impossible.

I had today brought to my desk an old newspaper, the Charlottetown *Guardian* of February 2nd, 1967, dealing with the causeway in which the then Minister of Public Works, now the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) who is doing other things in other places, was reported as having assured me that by 1970—and note the precision, Mr. Speaker—2,004 people would be employed as a result of work that would be undertaken by the causeway. The year preceding that there were to be 1,833 people employed, and the year preceding that there were to be 1,549 people employed. After 1970, he did not wish to predict.

But with the causeway discarded, how cruel to pile Pelion upon Ossa in our terrain of discontent. Surely, this is too much even for the smallest province of Canada. Now, the C.N.R. wishes to increase the rates, and the government is going along with this iniquitous suggestion. I have two comments to make on this suggestion. The first is that while the Government of Canada, rightly or wrongly, decided to farm out this ferry service to the C.N.R. it did not thereby divest itself of its constitutional or indeed moral responsibilities in the field of interprovincial transportation. The mode of communication in transportation between one province and another is a very, very important federal responsibility.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, long ago in the days of the Bennett government, the operating deficit on this ferry service was transferred from the C.N.R. account to a charge on the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada. In other words, there was a fiscal recognition of the dominion government's obligation to join province to province. What is confederation all about if not at least that? Therefore, the C.N.R. need not penalize the people of P.E.I. and its neighbouring provinces in any exceptional and unique exercise in economy. Their job is to provide adequate service as agents for the Government of Canada, the government which is solemnly committed to provide full and ample service.

It is presumptuous of the C.N.R., with government connivance, to seek to impose excessive tolls on transportation between P.E.I. and the rest of Canada. To what other province of Canada do we pay admission? Does it cost to enter Ontario, to enter Quebec, to enter Manitoba, or any other province in this dominion except Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland? Why must so high a price be paid by those of us who were born on islands?

We live in an age where discrimination is regarded as an evil ingredient of social life, and properly so. Why, then, is this kind of discrimination tolerated, yea fostered by the government of all Canada and of all Canadians? I ask that this measure be not proceeded with and that the government look into, by means of a modern device such as a task force or some other form of investigation, the prospect not of increasing the tolls or of holding them as they are but of abolishing them altogether. This, at least, would be something of a consolation prize for the long promised and much desired causeway now consigned to 60 years of neglect by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of the just society. Surely, upon the corpse of our causeway hopes anything less would be inadequate.

**Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I have a very short and sweet reply to the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarie) in respect of tariffs on the Borden—Tormentine Ferry. The acting minister advises that the government's decision concerning passenger and automobile rate changes on the Borden-Tormentine Ferry will be announced in the very near future.

INDUSTRY—DEVCO—COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF MINERS

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I put a question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) with regard to the Devco corporation, asking that the officials take account of the situation in respect of the Crown Corporation Devco and the suggested compulsory retirement situation. I wanted to know why the minister supported the plan for this compulsory retirement at between age 60 and 65.

It has been brought to my attention that in respect of this voluntary aspect of the situation Devco suggests the employees or dependants of persons employed by the company in coal mining and related work will fall into a similar category. Surely, the minister is aware, as is the Prime Minister, that this case will wind up in court. The final solution, I suggest, will be worked out as a result of a judgment by the court. In seeking a reply to the question I requested further information from the government, but the Prime Minister again referred this matter to the minister who has some responsibility. In spite of the fact that this company has spent some $20 million in respect of this retirement situation, and the reference of this matter to a minister who in fact has nothing whatever to do with the situation, I suggest the government should take a second look at the matter and refer it to another minister who perhaps might have some responsibility.

The Prime Minister's response was that something was being done about it, and that the responsible minister was actively engaged in doing something about the situation. However, my information is that in response to the efforts which have been made, nothing has been done. That is why I feel this situation will wind up in a court case.

I asked the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) a week ago if some answers could be given to the questions posed to the law officers about his last answers in the house, in respect of this matter. He did not give any positive answer, but suggested that the committee chairman, and no one else, could perhaps deal with the answers at this time.

It was my understanding when we were dealing with Section 18 of the act to establish the Cape Breton Development Corporation which provided for the establishment of pension arrangements for the benefit of persons and dependants of persons formerly employed by the companies in connection with coal mining, related works and undertakings formerly operated by the companies, a permanent secretary was to be appointed to look into appropriate legislation.

It may be that Devco assumes it is looking after this obligation, but this is not the case. This has not been the case in respect of any works or undertakings formerly operated or carried on by the company. This has never been the policy in respect of the situation which even now exists. This is the substance of the matter in respect of which I asked the question.

• (10:10 p.m.)

The miners have been pensioned off by the former company since 1953. The moment they qualified for old age security payments, $40 was knocked off the original $75, on the basis that the coal company had contributed toward the old age security payments. This is nonsense. It should never have been done. I argued this question many times with the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) when the Canada Pension Plan was set up. I maintain that this was not a pension but was a gratuity, because there was no such agreement between the union and the company.

I hope that Devco will at least restore to these former workers the $40 that has been lopped off by the Dominion Coal Company, because the legislation makes this mandatory. The Interpretation Act provides that the word "shall" is imperative. It has been laid down that the workers shall compulsorily retire at age 60. Therefore, this government will have to give these miners, former employees, what is theirs according to the legislation passed by parliament.

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is only about a week ago that we reviewed this matter. I indicated then that I thought the hon. member was a little confused, and I have no reason to think that he is any less confused tonight.

**Mr. MacInnis:** Nonsense. This is something entirely new. Let us have the truth. You did not give it to me last week. This will be a question of privilege, if you want to make something of it.

**Mr. Honey:** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend repeats, shouts and raves, but I do not like—

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder whether this is the way in which we should proceed. We have heard the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis), and the parliamentary secretary now has three minutes in which to reply.

**Mr. Honey:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In his remarks the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond referred to compulsion being used. I reject that suggestion out of hand; it is not the case. The hon. member again reiterated his former complaint about the legality of the action taken. I assure him that the matter has been approved and authorized by the law officers of the crown. I think this is the third time I have said that—

**Mr. MacInnis:** That is a lie.

**Mr. Honey:** It is a little difficult for me and hon. members of the house to understand why my hon. friend is so persistent in this matter. He has had the answer time and time again to this question. He has persisted, and I suggest to him respectfully that he is arguing against the interests of the people in his constituency. I should like to refer to a report in the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* of April 23, under the headline "MacInnis Asked to 'Cool It' by UMW". The article reads:

> No. 12 local union of the United Mine Workers has told Cape Breton-East Richmond member of parliament Donald MacInnis to "cool it."
>
> The New Waterford miners, in a special meeting, decided to send a telegram to Mr. MacInnis—

I hope the hon. member received that telegram.

> —scoring "his destructive attitude towards Devco's plan."

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry, but the parliamentary secretary's time has expired.

## AGRICULTURE—ST. PAUL, ALBERTA—PROTEST AGAINST FARM INCOMES

**Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** May I say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I am very pleased that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) is able to be in the house this evening to discuss what I feel is a very important and urgent matter. I wish to raise the question of the serious deterioration in farm income in the past seven months in western Canada, and particularly in the north-east central portion of Alberta, the area of St. Paul and Bonnyville. My question was prompted by the protest meeting by the farmers of this district which took place in the town of St. Paul, attracting in excess of 800 people last Monday.

I believe it is reasonable to assume that, in general, farmers are quite patient, willing and able to take their share of knocks, as they certainly have. However, when conditions continue to deteriorate with no immediate sign of improvement, with no significant sign of government interest, and no alternative means of securing a decent living, then I believe protests and lobbies are justified.

At a time when seeding and spring field operations are about to commence, farmers are confronted with a critical shortage of cash. The average return per bushel of wheat delivered to elevators in this area amounts to approximately $1.03. Most farmers last fall were forced to seek maximum cash advances, with the result that now, upon delivery, half of their return is deducted to be applied to the advance which was received last fall. As a result, the farmers are receiving an average net of roughly 50 cents per bushel.

The difficult conditions in this area are further aggravated by the fact that generally a large part of this area is a newly developing district, and by the fact that farmers have experienced three or four crop failures prior to this year. The problem that is foreseen now is that if some form of relief does not come in the near future, if markets do not improve, if deliveries are not more adequately accommodated, and if income is not upgraded, farmers will be confronted with a very grave difficulty in clearing their present cash loans on stored grain. They will thus experience much hardship in acquiring new cash advances this fall.

One alternative of course is to launch an all-out aggressive wheat selling campaign, something which this government has failed to do. We have not even been given any assurance that they might try. We have been given no indication of whether or not Russia might exercise her option of picking up 150 million bushels as part of the three year, long term agreement which I believe expires at the end of July.

We have been given no indication of any exploration of new markets. Japan has indicated its lack of interest in Canadian wheat and has elected, just recently, to purchase further large orders from Australia, the United States, and even Bulgaria for the first time. Perhaps Japan has reason to do what it has done. To date, we have failed to settle with the Japanese for a shipment of wheat which was of a low grade quality or which

was damaged by rain. Furthermore, I am sure they have not forgotten the bungling and mismanagement in loading their ships in Vancouver harbour this winter. We have seen many trade junkets to Asia and Japan but we have see no action, no orders, no sales, no sales programs—just lots of talk.

I suppose that now we shall have to wait perhaps for the resignation of the Minister of Agriculture before any action is taken with regard to western agriculture. The business community in the area to which I referred has also felt these adverse effects. During the period from January 1 to April 30, 1969, the area to which I referred experienced the following decrease in the level of sales as compared with the corresponding period last year. Machinery sales have decreased by 66 per cent; sales of fertilizer have decreased some 60 per cent; feed and prepared supplements have decreased by 15 per cent; hardware supplied by 38 per cent; clothing supplies by 20 per cent; machinery repairs by 55 per cent; and groceries by 10 per cent. So, it becomes very evident that if conditions of this nature continue hardship will be caused in the business community as well. Furthermore, there is a very strong indication of the fact that accounts receivable are being consolidated, and abnormal borrowings are being negotiated from banks and other lending institutions to liquidate accounts receivable which are being carried by the local business concerns. In other words, it would appear that farmers in this area are living on borrowed time.

• (10:20 p.m.)

We on this side of the house are rather disappointed at the government's lack of concern for western agriculture. We are also disappointed about the attitude of some of the western cabinet ministers. I do not refer particularly to the Minister of Agriculture. Many of the questions we pose during the question period are answered in a flippant or arrogant manner, as if to say these matters are none of our concern. In many cases we get no answer at all. Farmers are at a loss to know what to plant this year. Many are turning to coarse grains and oil seeds. Here, too, we must follow an aggressive sales policy; surely, we can produce far more than we can feed to our own livestock. I cannot understand our failure to develop the potential of the feed grain markets of eastern Canada. This being so, how can we expect to sell our produce abroad? The point I am making is that our marketing arrangements as a whole are in need of a major shake-up. I believe the policies of the Wheat Board have to become more flexible and ought to be upgraded. This is where government leadership is necessary, and until it is provided some form of assistance must be forthcoming.

I, therefore, plead with the government, asserting that western agriculture requires help, and requires it badly, now. Let it be in the form of an acreage payment or of a direct grant, or in the form of supplementary income to provide farmers with a decent living as a short term measure. If something is not done soon, the wave of protests we are now witnessing could grow and expand, conceivably leading to a form of violence. The agriculture community is communicating a message, Mr. Speaker. I take this opportunity to warn the government that it had better pick up the receiving unit and start listening. It had better start listening carefully to these submissions and institute proposals for overcoming a condition which could well develop into a crisis more severe than any we have witnessed before.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** I think the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) would agree that in the three minutes allowed to me to reply I could not make even a cursory examination of all the economic factors involved in the subjects he raised.

I would remind him that the Standing Committee on Agriculture is now in the process of preparing recommendations following its observations during a tour of western Canada when a first hand look was taken at some of the areas affected by the problems the hon. member has raised.

In the question he asked yesterday, the hon. member had something to say about the timing of government programs and policies for dealing with these measures. If the government were to make an announcement respecting precisely the matters which the committee is considering, it would not show the kind of respect I have for this house and for its committees. Surely, if the committee is prepared to come forward with a report in a very few days, the government ought to respect it sufficiently at least to provide enough time for the preparation of that report, which is being done, as far as I am aware, as rapidly as possible.

I am sure we intend to take very seriously the observations and recommendations of that committee. After all, that was the purpose of the tour of western Canada by the committee

earlier this month. Within the three minutes allowed me, I think that answers the question in the narrow context in which it was placed on *Hansard* yesterday. The hon. member, as usual, expanded it tonight because he is allowed seven mintues compared with my three.

The hon. member mentioned one or two other positive things that have been done, such as doubling cash advances, which must have been of help to the farmers in that area. They would have been able to get cash to take care of costs incurred last fall and through the winter.

I do not try to contend that this is a complete answer to the problem, which is a very serious one. However, I do not accept his contention that the Canadian government or the agencies of the farmers, such as the Canadian Wheat Board and other bodies involved, are doing anything less than the full amount that they think is advisable in a sales promotion campaign. There is a very vigorous sales promotion campaign in regard to all cereals and other crops which can be grown on this land. I see my time has expired.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I am afraid the minister's time has expired.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.28 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Wednesday, April 30, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

### FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Eighteenth report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs—Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau).

[*Editor's Note: The text of the foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

### TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

REFERENCE OF RAILWAY REPORTS TO STANDING COMMITTEE

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that the house made an order referring the report of the Canadian National Railways and Air Canada to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. As the house will also recall, the 1968 Annual Report of the C.N.R. is now available, and if the house is agreeable I should like to recommend an order whereby the report of the C.N.R. for the year ended December 31, 1968, and the report of the Canadian National Railways Securities Trust for the year ended December 31, 1968, both tabled on April 24, 1969, be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. If the house is generally agreeable to that, perhaps that could be made an order of the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is so ordered.

### EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

STATEMENT BY MINISTER RESPECTING PASSPORTS—REPAYMENT OF FEES—STAFF OVERTIME

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I promised the other day that I would make a brief statement on the passport situation. The passport office is going through its peak period—12,500 applications were received last week—and the present volume of applications is expected to continue with only slight easement until mid June.

I realize that this situation has created inconvenience for some members of the travelling public, and the following measures have been taken to cut down the delays:

(a) We are in the process of adding additional accommodation to the passport office which will improve the efficiency of operations and provide room for additional staff. Simultaneously as the program of renovation proceeds, we are adding additional staff;

(b) Nine departmental staff who in the past have had experience in passport work have been drafted on a temporary basis. In addition, during the course of the next two weeks some 27 students who worked in the passport office last summer will be returning to their jobs;

(c) The passport office staff has increased its daily overtime and will work Saturday until the present situation is resolved. The implementation of this policy takes into account individual staff problems, and we hope that Saturday work will not be required beyond the present week.

(d) Three additional telephone lines, for a total of six, have been installed in the special ternoon, has been on the amendment moved

(e) The staff of examiners has been reorganized in groups of five, each working under a leader. During the course of this week each group leader will be equipped with a telephone. If a form is not properly filled, he will be able to speak to the applicant by telephone to let him know what more information or documentation is required. This should cut down on time consuming exchanges of correspondence;

(f) During the course of a few days I intend to launch an advertising campaign to assist the public to obtain passports without undue delay.

May I add that all applicants could assist the passport office by initiating their applications at an early date, by taking greater care

in the completion of their applications, and by insuring that they have submitted the necessary documentation, photos and fee.

I should perhaps add answers to a couple of questions that were asked me and which I promised to answer. The first was a question about the repayment of refunding of fees to persons who cannot obtain requisite service or who cannot obtain their passports. If the passport office is unable to issue a passport for various reasons, or an applicant fails within a reasonable period to reply to a request for additional information or documentation to substantiate his entitlement, the fee is automatically refunded after due warning by two follow-up letters.

If an applicant informs the passport office that he is forced to cancel his travel plans, photographs and any documents submitted will be returned and the fee refunded. If in such a case an application has reached the stage in production where the document is being prepared, or already has been issued, the document is however forwarded. I suggest that at this stage it would be unreasonable for the passport office to refund the fee in view of the administration costs that have been invested. In any event, the passport when issued is normally valid for five years. The chances are, therefore, that the cancelled trip might be taken in the season or in an ensuing year.

• (2:10 p.m.)

There was also a question about payment of overtime to the staff of the passport office. There is no authorization to pay clerical employees for overtime at rates higher than those already established by the Treasury Board. When collective bargaining agreements have been ratified by the union membership, overtime will be compensated at time and a half and employees working on Sundays and holidays will be paid at a higher rate.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** I think Members of Parliament will agree that despite all the difficulties under which they work the employees of the passport office have shown patience in the face of what amounts to intolerable working conditions and hours. It is because the passport office enjoys such a low priority—I say this with great frankness—in the affairs of the department, that these conditions have not been remedied long ago.

[Mr. Sharp.]

I hope that when the minister begins his advertising campaign people will be told in plain language how to go about obtaining not only birth certificates but citizenship. There has been a crisis in this division for some months. Many hon. members have hesitated to raise this matter, feeling that to do so might only add to the problems which the overworked division is experiencing. I am glad the minister has finally recognized that conditions are altogether intolerable. Members of all parties have been subjected to forceful importuning over the last few months by citizens whose mail, telegrams or telephone calls have not been answered by the passport office.

I regret the program did not include the simple step of opening offices in other cities in Canada, as announced by the government some months ago. Heaven knows, there are plenty of facilities in our major cities for the receipt of passport applications. The government might follow the example set for some years in the United Kingdom, by decentralizing its passport system so that people could obtain passports in many places across Canada.

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo):** The calm statement we have just heard from the minister belies the absolute chaos which exists in the passport office at this moment. We are facing an emergency situation and the government has been caught completely unprepared.

It is a situation which is intolerable. There are more people travelling today than ever, and these people are being seriously inconvenienced. At every airport in this country there are cases of passengers waiting for passports which have not arrived and which will not arrive.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Saltsman:** I do not know the reason for those comments from members on the other side. Apparently they do not admit there is any kind of urgency here, though I believe every member of this house knows that there is an emergency. Indeed there is a tendency for this house to bog down because Members of Parliament are almost totally occupied looking after passport problems. Something has to be done about this.

I was over at the passport office yesterday, and the way in which those girls have to

work under existing conditions is absolutely inhuman. How those girls can stand it, I don't know. Telephones are ringing and the girls are running around. The more confusion that exists, the fewer passports issued. No relief is in sight as far as I can see.

The idea of regional offices, whatever their merit may be, does not offer any solution; I wonder whether it could be a solution anyway. In regard to unemployment insurance the government asked the public to use the mails. It is now talking of reversing the process.

I do not think that the government does have a policy or has one clue about what to do in this situation. The minister talks of refunding the money paid for passports. Is he also going to refund the money people lose because they could not make a charter flight? There are more significant expenditures involved than just the passport fee.

The passport office was designed to operate at a nice, leisurely pace. That leisurely pace has now disappeared. I hope the minister will reply to the suggestion that an emergency does exist, and that he appoint an emergency controller for the passport office immediately to investigate what the problem in the office is, and get the situation cleared up. The minister's statement today is not one designed to instil any confidence for the future.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, if we were not aware of the facts in respect of the passport problem, we could believe that the opinions expressed by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat are exaggerated. But, it happens that we have had to help several persons to obtain their passports. We, of the Ralliement Créditiste, are experiencing the same difficulties and we must address the same criticisms to the minister because he has not taken in time the necessary steps to prevent such occurrences.

On the other hand, we are not blaming the officials of the passport office who, up to now, have fully co-operated with us.

However, since there has been in the last few months such an increase in the number of applications for passports, the minister's statement was, I think, too long in coming. We also believe that he did not resort to the proper means to alleviate the situation, because the problem is growing worse every month.



[*English*]

## NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, 1954

AMENDMENTS CLARIFYING DEFINITIONS AND DEALING WITH THE INTEREST RATE ON INSURED LOANS, AND WITH OTHER MATTERS

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-192, to amend the National Housing Act, 1954.

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).

### BERTHIER—SOREL FERRY SERVICE

Question No. 1,739—**Mr. Caouette:**

1. Has the government considered, or is it considering, or will it, in the near future, consider the inauguration of a ferry service between Berthier and Sorel?

2. Has a study to this effect been made or will such a study be made?

3. If not, for what reasons?

4. If so, what are the government's plans?

5. At the present time, what means of transportation are available to these citizens to enable them to travel between Sorel and Berthier?

6. At the present time, what is the shortest route between Sorel and Berthier?

7. How many people from Berthier are presently working in Sorel?

8. How many people from Sorel are presently working in Berthier?

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1. A ferry service is on operation between Berthier (Ile St. Ignace) and Sorel.

2. See answer to question one.

3. See answer to question one.

4. See answer to question one.

5. Ferry service operating all year long.

6. One mile and a half via ferry.

7. Ferry operators report that 250 to 300 people work in Sorel and Tracy.

8. Ferry operators report approximately 15.

### LAW OF THE SEA LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

Question No. 1,842—**Mr. Harding:**

1. What specific legislative changes did Canada make as a result of becoming a signatory to the

*Questions*

Final Act of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1958?

2. What steps have been taken to define Canada's territorial sea?

3. What steps have been taken to define Canada's inland waters?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1. Canada has not taken any specific legislative action as a result of becoming a signatory to the Final Act of the 1958 United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. However, in 1964 Parliament passed the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act which took into account certain provisions of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone. This statute also necessitated the passage of certain consequential amendments to the Aeronautics Act, the Canada Shipping Act, the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act, the Criminal Code, the Customs Act and the Fisheries Act. Certain provisions of the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea are also reflected in the Oil Pollution Regulations of September, 1968.

2. Canada's territorial sea has been defined by the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act and also by an initial list of geographical coordinates for the establishment of straight baselines pursuant to Order-in-Council P.C. 1967-2025 of October 26, 1967.

3. It is presumed that the term "inland waters" refers to the internal waters of Canada. Pursuant to the 1964 Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act these include the waters on the landward side of the baselines of the territorial sea of Canada. These waters have been defined in the same manner described in the reply to part 2 above.

MILK AND BUTTERFAT PRODUCERS

Question No. 1,911—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. How many registered milk and butterfat producers were there in the last three years in each province?

2. For the last three years, what amount of subsidy was paid to these producers in each province (a) for the production of whole milk (b) for the production of butterfat?

3. For the last three years, what was the maximum production upon which a subsidy was paid, in each province?

4. In each of the years that the phasing out policy has been in effect, how many producers in each province received payment and what amount was paid?

5. In each of the last three years, including 1969, on what date was the dairy policy announced?

[Mr. Harding.]

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):**

1.

| | 1966/67 | 1967/68 | 1968/69 |
|---|---|---|---|
| P.E.I. | 3,868 | 3,490 | 3,031 |
| N.S. | 2,503 | 2,212 | 1,759 |
| N.B. | 3,214 | 2,836 | 2,322 |
| Que. | 53,342 | 49,660 | 45,116 |
| Ont. | 36,515 | 32,208 | 28,080 |
| Man. | 16,333 | 14,476 | 12,086 |
| Sask. | 23,459 | 20,979 | 16,980 |
| Alta. | 24,940 | 22,767 | 19,104 |
| B.C. | 887 | 829 | 612 |
| Canada | 165,061 | 149,457 | 129,090 |

2.

| | 1966/67 | |
|---|---|---|
| | Cream | Milk |
| | $ | $ |
| P.E.I. | 808,703.36 | 387,523.05 |
| N.S. | 333,223.94 | 237,855.30 |
| N.B. | 701,916.64 | 220,140.91 |
| Que. | 4,816,263.56 | 26,657,361.29 |
| Ont. | 4,992,027.00 | 22,320,115.99 |
| Man. | 3,024,544.11 | 324,444.31 |
| Sask. | 3,199,704.22 | 18,842.90 |
| Alta. | 5,189,488.73 | 1,576,059.60 |
| B.C. | 97,731.98 | 1,454,678.79 |
| Canada | 23,163,603.54 | 53,197,022.14 |
| | 1967/68 | |
| P.E.I. | 1,026,431.71 | 577,664.53 |
| N.S. | 437,329.31 | 132,177.59 |
| N.B. | 854,399.99 | 268,112.30 |
| Que. | 5,090,675.93 | 36,127,794.04 |
| Ont. | 6,087,841.06 | 27,890,330.81 |
| Man. | 3,756,356.16 | 623,012.89 |
| Sask. | 3,938,387.89 | 74,427.25 |
| Alta. | 6,585,409.79 | 2,142,867.16 |
| B.C. | 143,337.19 | 964,925.87 |
| Canada | 27,920,169.03 | 68,801,312.44 |
| | 1968/69 | |
| P.E.I. | 1,045,579.06 | 530,683.23 |
| N.S. | 339,812.47 | 94,697.57 |
| N.B. | 815,566.59 | 224,294.84 |
| Que. | 4,285,748.88 | 39,080,470.78 |
| Ont. | 5,659,471.39 | 27,454,880.43 |
| Man. | 3,501,757.99 | 727,958.64 |
| Sask. | 3,317,906.70 | 17,119.65 |
| Alta. | 6,339,677.07 | 2,067,029.46 |
| B.C. | 89,732.28 | 1,068,311.06 |
| Canada | 25,395,252.43 | 71,265,445.66 |

3. No maximums.

4.

| | 1968/69 No. of Producers | Amount of Payment $ |
|---|---|---|
| P.E.I. | 763 | 120,784.13 |
| N.S. | 1,138 | 106,616.09 |
| N.B. | 825 | 120,346.22 |
| Que. | 5,343 | 1,039,347.98 |
| Ont. | 3,693 | 654,856.39 |
| Man. | 4,996 | 578,551.67 |
| Sask. | 10,141 | 924,432.85 |
| Alta. | 7,624 | 868,956.34 |
| B.C. | 267 | 32,009.41 |
| Canada | 34,790 | 4,445,901.08 |

5. March 22, 1967
March 29, 1968
March 31, 1969

CO-OPERATIVES AS A HOUSING INVESTMENT BANK

Question No. 1,931—**Mr. Beaudoin:**

Are discussions being held to establish co-operatives which will become a housing investment bank as was recommended in the Hellyer Task Force Report?

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** Discussions have been held with representatives of the National Labour-Co-operative Committee regarding the establishment of a Co-operative Housing Foundation designed to promote and provide technical assistance by local and regional housing associations serving the interests of low and moderate income groups.

While the supply of mortgage funds is being kept under review no action has been taken towards the establishment of new forms of lending institutions.

RETURN OF CENTENNIAL MEDALS

Question No. 1,932—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many Centennial Medals awarded to recipients have been returned to the government and are they to be awarded to other Canadians and, if so, who will be the recipients?

2. Have all Centennial Medals been distributed and, if not, how many are available for distribution and what are the terms of reference for distribution?

3. What units and/or formations did not receive any allotment of Centennial Medals and why were awards not made and is it because the units did not have any worthy (a) Officers (b) N.C.Os. (c) Men?

4. Was the allocation of Centennial Medals to military units awarded in accordance with the "actual strength" or "paper strength"?

5. Did the Officers of any militia unit in Canada receive more than three Centennial Medals and, if so, which units?

6. Were all Centennial Medals allotted to the militia distributed and, if not, how many are still available for distribution?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Departments of National Defence and Secretary of State as follows: 1. Eleven Centennial Medals were returned. These medals were not reallocated but are maintained as a reserve from which replacement of lost medals may be made.

2. Distribution of the Centennial Medal is complete.

3, 4 and 5. See reply to your question 737, *Hansard* dated 25 November, 1968, pages 3125-6, and supplementary reply tabled 15 January, 1969—(*Votes and Proceedings* page 590 refers).

6. Yes.

STARCH DIVERSION PROGRAM

Question No. 1,948—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. What effect is the starch diversion programme announced by the Minister of Agriculture on March 21 likely to have on the potato producers of Prince Edward Island?

2. What amount of potatoes will be purchased from the Prince Edward Island potato growers and what is the expected price the growers will receive?

3. What other forms of assistance are being contemplated in order to assist the Prince Edward Island potato growers in this regard?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** 1, 2 and 3. Storage holdings of potatoes in the Maritime region were in excess of the five-year average, resulting in depressed producer prices. A starch diversion program was authorized under the Agricultural Stabilization Act as a means of removing potatoes from the market and stimulating producer prices in the Maritime area. The market is being carefully watched, but there are no current plans for other forms of assistance.

SEPT-ILES AIRPORT FIRE-FIGHTING EQUIPMENT

Question No. 1,953—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Was an Air Canada *Viscount* recently destroyed by fire at Sept-Iles and, if so, what fire-fighting equipment was available to the Department of Transport at the Sept-Iles Airport?

2. Were all vehicles using Foam fully equipped with foam during the fighting of the fire and, if not, what was the amount carried and the amount that could be carried?

*Questions*

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** 1. (a) Yes, Air Canada Viscount CF-THK was destroyed by fire April 7, 1969; (b) One Department of Transport Crash Rescue Truck equipped with 1,000 lbs. of dry chemical extinguishing agent. A pick-up vehicle was also available, carrying 23—5 gallon cans of foam concentrate and portable foam equipment. The City of Sept-Iles, on request, responded with one structural fire truck carrying 500 gallons of water and one 2,500 gallon Water Tank Truck.

2. (a) The Department Crash Rescue Truck is not designed for foam application, therefore, was not equipped with foam concentrate. The foam concentrate and portable foam-making equipment carried on the pick-up vehicle was used in conjunction with the City of Sept-Iles fire fighting vehicles. As these vehicles are not designed for major foam applications, they are not equipped with a foam concentrate carrying capability; (b) The Department of Transport's major foam fire fighting vehicle at Sept-Iles Airport, which carries 800 gallons of water and 90 gallons of foam concentrate, was out of service for maintenance at the time of the incident. A NOTAM (notice to airmen) advising that this vehicle was out of service was in effect at the time of the incident.

C.B.C.—PERMISSION FOR COMMERCIALS

Question No. 1,970—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Is the C.B.C. considering eliminating its traditional ban on commercials in news, public affairs and special events programs and, if so, what are the reasons for the above review?

2. Is the government considering making representations to the C.B.C. in order that the ban on commercials for the above areas be not lifted?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** 1. I am informed by the C.B.C. that while C.B.C. news and public affairs programs have never been commercially sponsored, commercial messages have occasionally been carried in public affairs and special events programs. Extension of this practice has been considered, as a source of revenue to meet rising costs, but no decision has been taken.

2. No.

* DISCUSSIONS ON U.S. AIRBORNE WARNING SYSTEM

Question No. 1,973—**Mr. Lewis:**

1. How long have discussions been proceeding between Canada and the United States in relation to the proposed Airborne Warning and Control System?

[Mr. McCleave.]

2. Who has represented Canada at these discussions?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of this question is, since 1966, and to the second part, discussions and briefings on the proposed U.S. airborne warning and control system have been included in discussions regarding co-operative defence matters by the Canada-U.S. permanent joint board on defence and between planning staff members of Canada's Department of National Defence and the United States department of defence.

P.E.I.—STAMP VENDING MACHINES

Question No. 2,003—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. How many postage stamp vending machines are in operation in Prince Edward Island and what is the location of each?

2. How many are operated by use of new twenty-five cent coins?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: 1. (a) Twelve; (b) Alberton, one; Charlottetown, two; Kensington, one; Montague, one; Port Borden, three; Souris East, one; Summerside, two; Slemon Park, one.

2. At present none, but a modification programme is expected to be completed by 10 May, 1969.

TRAVELLING CLAIMS OF ARMED SERVICES PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,010—**Mr. Saltsman:**

Has the Department of National Defence rejected the recommendations by the Auditor General, as referred to in his 1968 Report, page 68, paragraph 119, that the Department require travelling claims submitted by service members to be supported by a special certificate of an officer who has knowledge of the trip being undertaken?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence):** It is impractical administratively and economically for an officer to have personal knowledge that the claimant did in fact complete the journey in the manner claimed. It is considered that the existing audit procedures should reveal cases of fraudulent claims, and the disciplinary action which could be taken affecting careers and pension entitlements is a reasonable deterrent.

STUDY ON USE OF STAFF CARS

Question No. 2,011—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. When is it anticipated that the special study of the use of staff cars and chauffeurs by senior officers of the Department of National Defence, that began in 1966, will be completed?

2. On completion, will the Minister table the above report?

3. What are the reasons for the long delay in the completion of this study?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence):** 1 and 3. Canadian Forces administrative transport is established, purchased and accounted for as a capital resource to enable the forces to fulfil their role and commitments. The requirements are reviewed continually and the present review, which is nearing completion, is to ensure that the use and allocation of these vehicles, with particular reference to staff cars, satisfy new guidelines for economy and efficiency. This study has been lengthy in that it embraces not only the use of staff cars but has been expanded to encompass a review of existing policy regarding the employment of all administrative transport used by the Canadian Forces.

2. No.

NEGOTIATIONS IN PORT OF MONTREAL STRIKE

Question No. 2,030—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Where do Judge Gold's negotiations stand regarding the dispute between shippers and stevedores in the Port of Montreal?

2. Does the government intend to introduce special legislation regarding the problems of shippers and stevedores in the Port of Montreal and, if so, when will such legislation be introduced?

3. What steps is the government taking to avoid having shippers abandon the Port of Montreal?

**Mr. Jim McNulty (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour):** 1. Conciliation proceedings involving the Shipping Federation of Canada and the International Longshoremen's Association, were brought to a successful conclusion. A Memorandum of Agreement was signed by the parties in Montreal on 8 April, 1969.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

DEPLETION ALLOWANCE CLAIMS

Question No. 2,033—**Mr. Harding:**

1. What is the total amount of depletion allowances claimed by (a) oil and natural gas companies (b) all other mining companies in each of the years 1960 to 1968?

2. Are these statistics broken down according to individual company (a) by size of assets, employment, etc. (b) by nationality of ownership and, if so, what are these statistics?

3. What is the total amount of exploration and development expenditures claimed for tax purposes by (a) oil and gas companies (b) all other mining companies for each of the years 1960 to 1968?

4. What controls, if any, does the government have to ensure that deductions claimed for exploration and development purposes by oil and gas companies have in fact been spent for those purposes?

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue):**

| 1. Year | (a) $ Million | (b) $ Million |
|---|---|---|
| 1960 | 20.7 | 76.9 |
| 1961 | 14.8 | 87.1 |
| 1962 | 25.2 | 77.0 |
| 1963 | 40.2 | 85.2 |
| 1964 | 40.7 | 115.5 |
| 1965 | 61.0 | 136.0 |
| 1966 | 68.0 | 109.0 |
| 1967 | Not available | |
| 1968 | Not available | |

2. These statistics are not available in the form requested in (a) or (b).

| 3. Year | (a) $ Million | (b) $ Million |
|---|---|---|
| 1960 | 118.9 | 72.2 |
| 1961 | 174.5 | 46.8 |
| 1962 | 155.0 | 52.0 |
| 1963 | 233.2 | 41.1 |
| 1964 | 296.7 | 42.5 |
| 1965 | 306.0 | 64.0 |
| 1966 | 346.0 | 121.0 |
| 1967 | Not available | |
| 1968 | Not available | |

4. Qualified Department of National Revenue assessors carry out field audits to test check the accuracy of the income tax returns filed. In order to verify the amount claimed for exploration and development purposes the checking would include an examination of documentary evidence and on occasion a physical inspection of the properties involved.

SUGAR COMBINE INQUIRY

Question No. 2,039—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. Has an application been received in the name of Roberta Gray et al for an inquiry under Section 7 of the Combines Investigation Act into the practices of Atlantic Sugar Refineries, Canada and Dominion Co., and St. Lawrence Sugar Refineries and if so, what was the date of such application?

2. Has an investigation been started and if so, on what date and, if not, for what reason?

*Questions*

3. At what date is it anticipated that this investigation will be completed?

4. Will the report arising out of this investigation be made public?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** 1. Yes, the application is a matter of public knowledge. Section 8(a) of the Combines Investigation Act requires the Director of Investigation and Research to institute an inquiry on application under section 7 and he is carrying out his statutory duty. The general practice in regard to the matter of inquiries under the Combines Act, however, is that no information is given out as to whether a particular inquiry is being pursued with respect to a particular group of companies or individuals unless and until a report is published as the statute may require.

2, 3 and 4. See answer to 1.

DEFENCE COLLEGE LOCATIONS

Question No. 2,050—**Mr. MacLean:**

1. Are there any plans to change the location of any of the Defence colleges and, if so (a) is it the intention to combine two or more of these colleges at one location, and (b) what is the location?

2. Are there any plans at the present time to close down any of the Defence colleges?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence):** 1. No.

2. No.

*SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN DAM—LAND RESERVED FOR RECREATION

Question No. 2,056—**Mr. Kaplan:**

1. How many acres of land forming part of the South Saskatchewan Dam project are reserved for recreational purposes?

2. How much did the federal government contribute toward the cost of acquisition of the recreational land and what percentage was this amount of the total cost of such land?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Forestry and Rural Development):** Mr. Speaker, in respect of the first part of the question, this is a provincial responsibility and any information would need to be requested from the province of Saskatchewan. In respect of the second part, the federal government did not make any contribution toward the cost.

[Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway).]

PATHOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF CHEMICAL WARFARE

Question No. 2,066—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. Is there any department of our government concerning itself with the pathological and ecological consequences of chemical and biological warfare, which have such profound implications for the health of the Canadian people and for the whole chain of life's processes?

2. Will the Canadian Government keep the public informed about the results of this research?

3. Will the government place this research under the control of agencies such as the Medical Research Council and the Department of National Health and Welfare?

4. Could Canada co-operate with the World Health Organization in this type of research and in disseminating information about it?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence):** 1. No.

2, 3 and 4. Not applicable.

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

ADVERTISING EXPENDITURES

Question No. 1,208—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. For the years 1960, 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968 what were the advertising expenditures for each government department or agency?

2. Is there a competitive tendering system for the advertising budgets of government departments or agencies?

3. If not, what system is used in the awarding of advertising contracts?

4. Is there any co-ordination among government departments or agencies in order to achieve efficiency in advertising expenditure allocation?

5. If so, who are the members of this co-ordinating group and what are their specific functions and objectives?

6. Is the government considering the establishment of a Crown corporation for public advertising expenditures?

Return tabled.

EXHIBITIONS—TORONTO AND VANCOUVER

Question No. 1,385—**Mr. Fortin:**

What expenditures or contributions have been made each year since 1965 by the various departments of the federal government in connection with exhibitions in Toronto and Vancouver?

Return tabled.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I should like to draw the government's attention to starred questions 1964 and 1965 which were placed on the order paper on

April 15. Neither of them require any statistical data or research and I should hope that answers can be obtained at an early date.

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the government's attention to Question 933, which was put on the order paper on December 3; Question 1121 which was placed on the order paper on December 20; Question 1256, which was placed on the order paper on January 27, and Question 1323 which was placed on the order paper on February 4. I should like to know whether I can expect answers to these questions, unless there is some reason for us not wanting to know why we should not be given this information in respect of—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could respond in respect of Questions 933. An examination of a number of departments, for example, the Department of Transport, indicates that it would require several thousand dollars to prepare this information. Under the circumstances I wonder whether the hon. member would be prepared to withdraw certain parts of the question so an answer can be prepared more easily?

**Mr. Skoberg:** Mr. Speaker, I was contacted to see whether I would do this, but I believe the information should be made available?

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** At any expense whatsoever?

• (2:20 p.m.)

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, notices of motion Nos. 102 and 114 are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

GIBSON FINANCING STUDY

Motion No. 102—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study of Canadian export credit financing by J. W. Gibson.

Motion agreed to.

*Motions for Papers*

FORT CHURCHILL, MAN.—MARINE TERMINAL

Motion No. 114—**Mr. Anderson:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Treasury Board Minute 642800, being an agreement between the Department of Public Works and Imperial Oil Limited concerning marine terminal facilities at Fort Churchill, Manitoba.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Forest:** Notices of motion Nos. 105, 107 and 108 are acceptable to the government subject to the usual reservations concerning privileged papers and authorization of the government authorities concerned.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the hon. parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that notices of motions numbered 105, 107, 108 be deemed to have been adopted?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

REPORTS TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE POLICY—PAGES 4380 TO 4382

Motion No. 105—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of each report referred to in the submission of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy on February 26, 1969, listed on pages 4380 to 4382, No. 31 of the proceedings of the Senate Committee.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE POLICY—PAGE 4439

Motion No. 107—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of each report referred to in the submission of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy on February 26, 1969, listed on page 4439, No. 31 of the proceedings of the Senate Committee.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE POLICY—PAGES 4395 TO 4396

Motion No. 108—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of each report referred to in the submission of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy on February 26, 1969, listed on pages 4395 to 4396, No. 31 of the proceedings of the Senate Committee.

Motion agreed to.

*Motions for Papers*

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Forest:** Mr. Speaker, would Your Honour call notices of motion Nos. 88, 92, 93, 97, 98 and 104?

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

[*English*]

DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION OF THE VATICAN

Motion No. 88—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all telegrams, correspondence and other documents received by the Prime Minister or any other member of the government since January 1, 1969 relating to the proposal that Canada extend diplomatic recognition to the Vatican.

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the house last week, it is estimated that between January 1 and March 28 of this year 10,275 letters responding to this inquiry have been received. In view of the fact that this would require the reproduction of over 20,000 copies of the document at a heavy expense to the treasury, I wonder whether the hon. member would be agreeable to withdrawing the motion?

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Far be it from me to put public servants to such an amount of work as a result of such a carelessly thought out proposal as the one advanced by the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, so I will gladly withdraw it.

CANADIAN TERRITORIAL AND INLAND WATERS

Motion No. 92—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a map of Canada showing both territorial waters and inland waters claimed by Canada.

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the government intends in the near future to issue maps illustrating additional straight base lines which will be drawn along Canada's coasts. It is also intended to amend the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act to permit the establishment of fisheries lines in certain areas without affecting the limits of Canada's internal waters and territorial sea. It would not be in the Canadian interest for the government to issue further maps of Canada's possible maritime claims at this time. On this basis I ask the hon. member if he will agree to withdrawing his motion?

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to have permission to have the matter transferred for debate.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed that it shall be transferred for debate?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Transferred for debate.

LAW OF THE SEA—ARCTIC ISLANDS BASELINES

Motion No. 93—**Mr. Harding:**

Than an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all notes exchanged between Canada and the United States concerning the drawing of baselines between the islands of the Canadian Arctic pursuant to the provisions of the Final Act of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, any communications on this subject form part of confidential exchanges between the government of Canada and the government of the United States. Such communications are privileged. It has not been the practice to produce them. I therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN CANADA DEPOSIT INSURANCE AND B.C. RESPECTING COMMONWEALTH TRUST

Motion No. 97—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Province of British Columbia, or any of its agencies, concerning the operations of the Commonwealth Trust Company since its incorporation.

**Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I am informed the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation considers correspondence in its files with member institutions to be of a confidential nature. I am informed this is consistent with the policy followed in this regard for the Bank of Canada, the Industrial Development Bank and other Crown corporations that report to the Minister of Finance. I therefore ask the hon. member if he would be willing to withdraw his motion.

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to have permission to have this matter transferred for debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed that it shall be transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Transferred for debate.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN CANADA DEPOSIT INSURANCE AND COMMONWEALTH TRUST

Motion No. 98—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Commonwealth Trust Company concerning the operations of the Commonwealth Trust Company since its incorporation.

**Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remarks I made with regard to the preceding notice of motion apply to this one as well. For the reasons expressed, I again ask the hon. member if he would be willing to withdraw this notice of motion?

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to have permission to have this matter transferred for debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed that it shall be transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Transferred for debate.

EFFECT OF WAGE PARITY IN AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Motion No. 104—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study by Economist David F. Smith of the Mechanical Transport Branch, Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, on "The Effects of Canada-United States Wage Parity Upon the Cost Structure of the Canadian Automotive Industries".

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce that the study referred to in this motion is an internal departmental document which is privileged, and will therefore not be tabled. The minister wants to point out to the hon. member that this work is not an official departmental study but one carried out by a university student. In addition, this document contains confidential information received from the industry. On this basis, the minister hopes the hon. member will withdraw his motion.

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, I regret I cannot accept the explanation given by the government. I should like to have permission to have this matter transferred for debate.



*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed that it shall be transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Transferred for debate.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION—ACTION TO PREVENT FRAUD

Motion No. 70—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Unemployment Insurance Commission's cost-benefit study with respect to the operation against fraud referred to in the answer to Part 4 of Question No. 1,074, as set out in Sessional Paper No. 126-D, tabled on Wednesday, February 5, 1969.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I make a brief reference to Motion No. 70? I had a few words regarding this motion with the Minister of Labour. Subject to my right to redraft it, I ask permission to have it withdrawn.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining notices of motion be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

• (2:30 p.m.)

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### HOUSING

PROVISION IN MEASURE TO REMOVE CEILING ON LOANS

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in his capacity as minister in charge of housing. Does the housing bill which received first reading this afternoon, and which we have not yet seen, contain a provision to remove the ceiling on interest rates charged on N.H.A. loans?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** The bill will be in the hands of hon. members within a few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Meantime, Mr. Speaker, we can hope for the best.

REMOVAL OF ROADBLOCKS ON URBAN RENEWAL AND PUBLIC HOUSING

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** I would now like to ask a supplementary question. With regard to people

on very low incomes will the Prime Minister say when the roadblocks on urban renewal and public housing projects will be removed so that Canadians can get ahead with the work of adequately supplying housing for these people?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister did report that in many cases the so-called roadblocks have been removed after discussion with the authorities concerned and many projects have received approval, but there are still some under consideration.

ISSUANCE OF NEW GUIDELINES

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the acting minister in charge of housing if he would advise when the new guidelines for public housing will be issued?

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, the guidelines on public housing are being prepared by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and when these guidelines have been received and approved by the government they will be made public.

MEASURES TO BENEFIT LOW INCOME GROUPS

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, so that there is no ambiguity this time I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Will he say whether the government plans any measures at this session which will bring housing within the reach of a large number of Canadians to whom subsidized public housing is not available, and yet who earn less than $8,000 per year and therefore are effectively prevented from buying, building or even renting improved housing? I am speaking about measures in addition to those concerning limited dividend companies, which I understand are in the housing bill.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is anticipating the debate on that bill. The first reading of the bill was given a few moments ago. It will soon be in front of hon. members and this will be the answer to all these questions.

CITIES INCLUDED IN URBAN RENEWAL SCHEME

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether to direct my question to the Prime Minister or to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. I think I will try the Minister without Portfolio. Now that some cities have had the freeze removed from their urban renewal schemes may I ask which cities are these, and have they been advised of any federal commitment?

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to urban renewal projects the position is really the same, that guidelines are being prepared and they will be made available to all municipalities as soon as the government policy is determined.

## THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

THE PRAIRIES—REQUEST FOR ACTION TO AUGMENT FARM INCOME

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the serious deterioration in the prairie economy due to the decline in farm income resulting from declining grain prices and reduced delivery quotas, may I ask the Prime Minister has the government completed its consideration of the various proposals submitted to it by farm organizations, and how soon will the appropriate ministers be able to announce the specific measures that the government intends to take to augment western farm income before the situation becomes more desperate?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I will discuss this with the ministers, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Then, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether any consultations have been held between his government and the governments of the prairie provinces regarding what steps should be taken to meet the very serious economic situation on the prairies?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Well, we have received many representations from various authorities, including the provincial governments, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** As a further supplementary question, could the Prime Minister give the house any idea what proposals have been received from the provincial governments and what

action the federal government intends to take with respect to these proposals?

**Mr. Trudeau:** As the hon. member must know, Mr. Speaker, they cover a variety of subjects from two-price wheat to various forms of subsidy to the grain producers. They are all being given consideration, and they have been the subject of answers in this house at various times.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the situation is pressing, may I ask the Prime Minister when the prairie provincial governments and the western farmers can expect some statement of policy from the government as to what it proposes to do about the situation?

## TRADE

### REDUCTIONS IN WHEAT EXPORTS— OIL QUOTAS

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, this is a supplementary and somewhat related question. In light of the serious reductions in wheat exports and the imposition of export quotas on petroleum exports to the United States of America will the Prime Minister now agree to set forth on motions this week, his government policy in reference to these serious matters, so that the industries of western Canada can make decisions which will be good for the nation?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Not this week, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Woolliams:** If he will not do it this week, when can we expect some decision on the deterioration of the economy of western Canada?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, as is indicated by the increase in demand for passports the economy is booming more and more—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

### PROMOTION OF GRAIN SALES IN ASIA

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. During his present trip to Asia is the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce putting some emphasis on grain sales and markets?

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I hope that I may suggest to the Prime Minister that he might alter that last answer of his.

**Some hon. Members:** Question?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The right. hon. gentleman has to ask a question.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I find it difficult, sir, to understand why any minister, or the Prime Minister—

**Some hon. Members:** Question?

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** —can make these gratuitous observations—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Is the right hon. gentleman rising on a point of order?

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. With great deference to you, I find it very difficult to understand why we on this side of the house are to be denied answering gratuitous statements such as the Prime Minister and other ministers are making from time to time.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. With equal deference to the right hon. gentleman I have to tell him that unfortunately the rules do not allow the present procedure at this time. This is a question period, and the long established practice is that hon. gentlemen in the opposition may ask questions but may not make statements.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Again on a question of order, does that mean that ministers can do that which other members in the house cannot do? If it does, then I take the strongest possible objection to it. It is developing day by day that the ministers make their smart Aleck interruptions and statements—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister this question. In view of the fact that the other day in an interview he spoke of the western people as being those who are forever crying about something—either too much production or too little, that the country is too dry or too wet—will he send somebody out west to look into the serious situation there, which cannot be laughed off by the government? Will he do something

about it instead of postponing, procrastinating and doing nothing but laugh at the situation in western Canada?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** There was no indication the government was not doing anything for the people of this country. I was just describing a condition of human nature.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** In western Canada?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Yes, and in the House of Commons. Some people are complaining all the time. When I said what I did about the west I said it was a condition occurring in all parts of Canada. Naturally people want the government to improve conditions in all areas and the government has to answer as it can these demands.

## FARM IMPROVEMENT LOANS ACT

FORECLOSURES UPON FAILURE TO MEET OBLIGATIONS

**Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. While the economy booms will the Minister of Finance and the government consider what they are going to do for the western farmer? Will the Minister of Finance consult with the banks in order to stop the banks foreclosing on farmers who cannot make their payments?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** If my friend has any specific instances, I would be very interested to have him bring them to my attention and I will certainly take them up with the Bank of Canada.

## ARTS, LETTERS AND SCIENCES

NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE OPERATING DEFICIT

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the President of the Treasury Board. I should like to ask the minister if our economy is so booming that we can afford to subsidize by half a million dollars a two-week opening festival at the Arts Centre.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member's question is hardly a supplementary question. I do not think it should be asked at this time.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

[*Translation*]

## INCOME TAX

REFUNDING OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT TAX

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of National Revenue.

Has the minister received from his Quebec counterpart a request for the refund of the social development tax from January 1, 1969, up to the date medicare will be implemented in the province of Quebec, and if so—

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue):** No, Mr. Speaker, and I do not expect to receive such a request. There might be an exchange of letters between the federal and provincial ministers of Finance.

[*English*]

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PASSPORTS ISSUED SINCE JAN. 1 1969

**Mr. Colin D. Gibson (Hamilton-Wentworth):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can the minister inform us how many passports have been issued since January 1, 1969?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

## CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

CORNER BROOK, NFLD.—BUS ACCIDENT

**Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Acting Minister of Transport. Will the minister investigate and report to the house the details surrounding an accident on April 25 in which a Canadian National bus, one of the fleet which is to replace the reliable and accident-free rail passenger service in Newfoundland, left the highway 12 miles west of Corner Brook while carrying 35 passengers, plunged over an embankment, coming to rest on its side, striking two large boulders which completely penetrated the side of the bus—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. We have only 40 minutes.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Peddle:** Mr. Speaker, I apologize, but since there have been so many accidents with this service, and are apt to be many more, I

thought I should properly identify the particular accident for the minister. I have just about finished my question, Mr. Speaker, and this is a very pertinent part of it. It did strike two large boulders which completely penetrated the side of the bus and injured nine passengers, necessitating hospital treatment, and rendered the $60,000 bus a total loss.

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, this accident is being investigated and I will be pleased to report to the hon. member.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

### NATO—STATEMENT BY GENERAL LEMNITZER ABOUT EUROPEAN REQUIREMENTS

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of National Defence. In light of the statements of General Lyman Lemnitzer to the effect that there is no justification for any military reduction in Europe at this time, will the Minister of National Defence say whether the government of Canada has formed an assessment of the military and political situation in Europe different from that of the NATO military command? If so, will the minister undertake to make an explanatory statement in this regard to the house at an early date?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member I understand is not asking the minister to make a statement now. The question is acceptable only to the extent that the hon. member is asking the minister to indicate whether he will make a statement, and when.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Well, in view of Your Honour's very correct observation about the question I realize that perhaps there is a slight misunderstanding. I wonder if I might be permitted to put the question in this way: Will the minister undertake to make a statement to the house at an early date concerning the first part of the question I asked him, and can he indicate when he might be in a position to make the statement?

**Hon. Leo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** I think first of all I should investigate the interview to find out exactly what was said. After having done that I suppose I could advise whether or not it would be advisable to make a statement.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? After the Minister of National Defence has investigated and obtained a copy of this statement will he table it in the house, so that all members will have an opportunity to examine it?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** I do not believe it was in written form. I think it was in the form of questions and answers.

**Mr. Baldwin:** The questions and answers are what we want—the answers particularly.

### STATEMENT BY GENERAL ALLARD IN LONDON, ONTARIO

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Since the minister has been so kind as to give this undertaking will he now tell us if General Allard, the chief of staff, was speaking on behalf of the government last Saturday in London, Ontario—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member cannot ask a question about statements made outside the house. He can ask the question directly, but not in relation to a statement made outside the house.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Perhaps I could rephrase the question. Did the Minister of National Defence authorize the remarks purportedly made by the chief of staff in London, Ontario in which the chief of staff was quoted as saying:

> I don't give a damn. You tell the university professors they are not going to destroy Canada.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think the ruling applies to the second portion of the question as well as to the first.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** I just wanted to know whether that is government policy.

### A.B.M. SYSTEM—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, as nearly six weeks have passed since the Prime Minister discussed the United States A.B.M system with the President of the United States, has the government had a chance to give full consideration to this matter and is the Prime Minister now in a position to advise the house and the country what the government's position is on this important matter?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the government has been considering it. I hope the opposition has been doing the same thing. I know the debate is going well in the United States and it would be unwise for Canada to intervene in it.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Hees:** Mr. Speaker, of course the Prime Minister did not answer my question. He has not told me whether the government is in a position to state its position. Since the government seems to find it increasingly difficult to make up its mind on matters—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member is making an argument. Would he ask the question directly.

**Mr. Hees:** Would the Prime Minister and his government consider taking some form of mental laxative to free up their mental processes so that they would be able to give an opinion on these important matters, so that the country will know in what direction they are trying to go.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings knows that when the Speaker has the floor he should resume his seat.

## AIR CANADA

### REPLACEMENT OF NON-STRIKING EMPLOYEES BY NON-UNION EMPLOYEES

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Transport and/or the Minister of Labour, whichever of them has been dealing with the matter. I should like to know whether such minister has received any protests from the non-striking unions of Air Canada, or whether he has in some other way been made aware of their dissatisfaction with the fact that all union employees who are not on strike have been laid off without pay, and that non-union employees have been put on their jobs? If so, has he discussed the matter with Air Canada, and what is being done about it?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, representations have been made to my department, and possibly to the Acting Minister of Transport. We have informed the particular groups involved that if they think they have a grievance within the confines of their collective agreement, they are quite capable of taking whatever action is necessary. In other words, if they think their collective agreement is being violated, having in mind the provisions of the I.R.D.I. Act, they should place the problem before arbitration.

**Mr. Lewis:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If there are cases, as I am informed there are, where the collective agreement may not apply or have the required provisions, would the minister discuss with Air Canada the simple justice of retaining on the job people who held the job previously, rather than replacing them with people who are not members of the bargaining units?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member's question is in the form of a submission.

## HEALTH AND WELFARE

### INCREASED EXPENDITURES FOR MENTAL HEALTH

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Having in mind that tomorrow marks the start of national mental health week in Canada, would the minister consider increasing financial aid in this very important area, particularly because there has been in recent years a great increase in the rate of mental ailments in Canada, even prior to the present government's taking office?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member that I would be pleased to take that matter into consideration.

## DRUGS

### CANADIAN ACTION IN MARKETING OF ANTIBIOTICS

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to a question put to me on April 16 by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) with reference to antibiotics. A study group was set up in the United States to study particular antibiotic drugs and their efficacy on the United States market prior to 1962. It was felt that many claims were made for these drugs which experience might not bear out as being true and accurate. The manufacturers of those antibiotics have been advised that they will have an opportunity to prove the claims made before the drugs are removed from the market. I think approximately 80 antibiotics are involved. As of now these drugs are still on the United States market. Our Food and Drug Directorate are watching the situation closely and working closely with the food and drug people in the United States in order to determine whether we will have to take similar action.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that this investigation revealed that some 78 drugs containing

antibiotics exposed the patient to unnecessary risk, is the minister's department following this aspect of the investigation with a view to taking whatever action is necessary to protect the public?

**Mr. Munro:** Yes, we are, Mr. Speaker. As I have indicated, our information, obtained after close work with the food and drug people in the United States, would indicate that they are not alarmed to the degree indicated by the hon. member. The investigation being carried out by the food and drug people in the United States may show that the claims made in respect of these drugs are not borne out by the facts. But no serious harm is being done. For this reason they have not as of this date removed the drugs from the United States market.

[*Translation*]

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

### CONSULTATION WITH TEACHERS OVERSEAS BEFORE CONTRACT CHANGE

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of National Defence.

According to the Canadian Teachers' Federation, the minister refuses to consult the teachers before making changes in contracts for teaching in national defence department schools overseas. Is that statement true?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member cannot ask a minister to confirm or to deny a statement. Furthermore, I point out to him that a similar question has been asked yesterday.

[*English*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

### "DON MESSER'S JUBILEE"—INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE CONTINUATION

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, as one who admits that he is fond of the Don Messer show, I would ask the Secretary of State whether in view of the widespread requests from all parts of Canada for the continuation of this program, the C.B.C. has given consideration, either finally or interimly, to the continuance of the show.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, I shall inquire of the C.B.C. about its views on the matter. Every day, I know, we forward to the C.B.C. representations made to us by listeners. I also know that the C.B.C. takes them under consideration. I shall ask C.B.C. officials to what conclusions they have come and whether they intend to revise their decision or not. I will be happy then to make their answer known to the right hon. member.

[*English*]

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the rather lengthy delay on this matter, would the minister communicate with the C.B.C. today and give tomorrow on motions a report of the situation? Many people are asking that this show be continued, and they are not particularly pleased with the fact that Black Panthers and the like apparently have the inside track with the C.B.C.

**Mr. Barney Danson (York North):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State. Will the minister ask the C.B.C. to allow Don Messer to fiddle while the hon. member for Prince Albert—

**Mr. Hees:** "Burns" is the word.

**Mr. Danson:** Yes, while the hon. member for Prince Albert burns.

## HEALTH AND WELFARE

### RUBELLA EPIDEMIC—ACCESSIBILITY TO VACCINE

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare based on a question I asked him on April 16 regarding the availability of anti-rubella vaccine for the innoculation of expectant mothers, to prevent foetal abnormalities. Has the minister the answer to this question?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member for Simcoe North that my department has under review several investigational new drug submissions for anti-rubella vaccine. We expect that one of these vaccines will be cleared for clinical trial in Canada in the next few weeks.

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

### PROSECUTIONS FOLLOWING MONTREAL BOND THEFT

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice which might be considered an economic question. Is he contemplating any prosecutions in respect of the

recovery of bonds stolen recently from a Montreal firm? These bonds, worth approximately half a million dollars to the company, are supposedly worth $10 million.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member—

**Mr. MacInnis:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think the hon. member should have asked the supplementary question first, because my understanding of the situation is that the first question need not have been directed to the Minister of Justice.

**Mr. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, I was asking the Minister of Justice about the arrest of anybody connected with the theft of half a million dollars worth of bonds. However, I direct my supplementary question to the Minister of National Revenue and ask whether his interest has not been aroused by the fact that negotiable bonds could be held in this manner, as they were before the theft.

## FISHERIES

### SHUSWAP RIVER DIVERSION—INQUIRY AS TO DECISION REACHED BETWEEN FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries. Can he inform the house of any decisions reached between the federal and provincial governments over the proposed Shuswap River diversion plan?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It is difficult for the Chair to understand whether this is a matter of some urgency. If it is an urgent matter, the minister might like to reply at this time.

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, that important matter is under active consideration. The minister responsible is the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

## FORESTRY

### LOGS—DENIAL OF EXPORT LICENCES TO MEET DOMESTIC DEMAND

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), concerning the export of logs from British Columbia to Japan. I would tell the hon. member that exports to Japan for the first three months of this year were down about 25 per cent. Most of these logs are of substandard quality and of no interest to our sawmills. They are not a potential source of employment. Others come from the Peace River reservoir which will be subject to flooding. The last approval by our log export committee was in December, 1968. Shipments made since that date have been made in fulfilment of contractual obligations entered into last year and under permits granted prior to January 1, 1969.

As a final point of information I should like to say that exports of logs from British Columbia have never exceeded 2 per cent of the annual timber cut, and exports from the western United States are ten times our own.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the figures released by the British Columbia forestry department indicate an increase of some 2.6 million board feet for the first three months of this year and a sevenfold increase from Vancouver Island—Crofton and Chemainus—from 1.5 million to 10.5 million board feet in March compared with one year ago—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Will the hon. member ask his question, please.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Would the minister undertake to have the figures checked to see whether or not there has been any violation of the voluntary ban on log exports and, if so, make it a mandatory ban?

**Mr. Davis:** The answer is yes. The statistics which I gave today have been checked today with the British Columbia forestry service. Nevertheless we will look into the subject again.

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's reply with regard to the Shuswap River water diversion, would he indicate to the house whether he has any responsibility for salmon conservation in that particular area?

**Mr. Davis:** I certainly agree that the federal government does have a direct interest and responsibility in respect of salmon conservation in the Fraser River system, and hence in the Shuswap area as well.

## HOUSING

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF FURTHER LEGISLATION

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask either the Prime Minister or the Acting Minister of Transport whether it is the intention of the government to introduce any other legislation in this session respecting housing, in addition to the bill introduced by the Prime Minister this afternoon?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** There is no additional legislation beyond that which we have set out in the program previously. The hon. member is referring to the bill with regard to the National Housing Act.

## HEALTH AND WELFARE

MEDICARE—OPTING OUT BY QUEBEC

**Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre):** I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Has the minister, or anyone else speaking on behalf of the government of Canada, advised the government of Quebec that they could opt out of the federal medicare system before entering it, but still get the money?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** No, Mr. Speaker.

## FINANCE

NORTHERN ONTARIO—ALLEGED INVESTMENT DISCRIMINATION

**Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Since the minister has announced that there will be new regulations governing the trust companies can he assure the house that there will no longer be a double standard on the part of lending institutions, which discriminates against capital investment in northern Ontario?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I am not sure whether the question is one of urgency. Perhaps the hon. member might consider the advisability of debating it at the time of adjournment.

## HIGHWAY SAFETY

SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF SUBJECT TO STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as house leader. While the house awaits concurrence in the fifth and sixth reports of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, would the house leader give consideration to referring to that committee by an order of the house the very important matter of automobile safety standards and highway safety in Canada?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** I might be prepared to discuss it with my colleagues. I might indicate that there is a bill amending the Canada Shipping Act which will have to be referred to the committee, in addition to the harbours study which should be considered in the committee. So it looks as though the committee's timetable will be very full for the next two months.

**Mr. McGrath:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the house leader ensure that the committee will study this matter before the legislation is brought in?

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** I am prepared to discuss this with my colleagues to see whether it fits into the timetable. I understand that the legislation referred to by the hon. member concerns automobile safety.

## ARTS, LETTERS AND SCIENCES

NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE OPERATING DEFICIT

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I hope you will agree that the President of the Treasury Board should be held accountable. Therefore I should like to ask the minister whether specific and prior approval was given to the group of people who decided on a course of action which will result in a deficit of $500,000 for the two-week opening festival of the arts here in Ottawa?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member suggested that the minister is accountable, and I do not disagree with this. But the hon. member is asking a question which was asked yesterday, I believe, or recently. At the time I suggested to the hon. member, a suggestion which I repeat at the present time, that his question is normally of the type that is put on the order paper or discussed at the time of adjournment.

[*Translation*]

## INCOME TAX

REFUNDING OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT TAX

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of National Revenue answered the question of the hon. member for Abitibi a while ago, I understood him to say

that the question should have been asked of the Finance Minister.

As the Quebec Finance Minister has stated that he would ask for the transfer of the 2 per cent social development tax, I ask the minister whether he has received from Quebec an official request to that effect?

[*English*]

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** I do not know whether it can be called an official request, but the idea has been put forward several times.

## AIR CANADA

### STRIKE OF MECHANICS—AVAILABILITY OF ALTERNATIVE MODES OF TRAVEL

**Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton):** Mr. Speaker, my question arises out of the statement made in the house on Monday by the Minister of Labour that the air strike did not constitute an emergency because there were alternative methods of transportation available. I direct my question to the Acting Minister of Transport. Since the railways and bus companies are not able to handle the extra traffic and are not providing a satisfactory alternative service between the maritimes and the rest of Canada, what action is the minister taking to assist other carriers to provide a suitable service?

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I think we have already given that answer in the house. The President of the Canadian Transport Commission has said that the commission will grant any reasonable requests for licences. My office has been in touch with the President of C.P.A. expressing parliament's concern and the government's concern about some of the goods that are not moving, and he has agreed to give all help possible. I think the government is doing all it can in the emergency.

**Mr. Thomas (Moncton):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the acting minister aware that C.P.A. does not provide service in this area, and that the railways will not book sleeping car accommodation?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** I have a supplementary question for the Acting Minister of Transport. Would he cause the government to re-examine its present policy, which prevents the development of a second coast to coast national air line service?

[Mr. La Salle.]

### STRIKE OF MECHANICS—INQUIRY AS TO PROGRESS IN NEGOTIATIONS

**Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Labour. Will he take this opportunity to report to the house on what is happening in the negotiations between Air Canada and its employees?

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** The minister is getting up more slowly every day.

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** I plead guilty to having been in Montreal last night because I thought it would be the last occasion this spring when there would be a National Hockey League game in that city.

With regard to the hon. member's question, may I say that I feel a little better as the result of the public statements made both by the union and by Air Canada that they welcome an opportunity to resume negotiations. I hope that in the next few days, of their own volition and by their own initiative, they will seize the opportunity to resume negotiations.

## FISHERIES

### SALT COD—RESPONSE TO ANNOUNCEMENT OF POLICY

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries. Can the minister indicate whether he has received any unfavourable response to his recently announced program on Atlantic salt codfish?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** So far the response has been one of general approval.

**Mr. Lundrigan:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the government's aim to have the prices received by fishermen approximate the target prices set by the government regardless of the prices paid by merchants?

**Mr. Davis:** We have sought the advice of fishermen who are on the advisory committee in this program and my understanding is that the price schedules are meeting general approval.

**Mr. Lundrigan:** Can the minister indicate whether the government would be willing to revise the formula in the event of a depressed price being received this year?

**Mr. Davis:** The answer is no. However, the formula is this: Whatever the price, the government will make up half the difference between that price and the target price, which is a high price, as the hon. member knows.

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my appreciation to the government for providing me with an answer to a question posed on April 22, which was not asked by me in the first place. I would ask the government to give the same consideration to a question I asked one month earlier, on March 21.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

### CANADIAN PROPOSAL TO NIGERIA

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, a week or so ago I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs for information regarding the proposal made by him to the government of Nigeria. I wonder whether on his next appearance in the house he would make a statement on motions with regard to the proposal which was made?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to answer the question but I do not know whether it would be worthy of a statement on motions.

[*Translation*]

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## CRIMINAL CODE

### REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, April 29, consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 27, Mr. Laprise.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Order.

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** I thank you very much to have called the members to order, Mr. Speaker, because we must consider such an important bill as earnestly as possible. Some members may not take this bill too seriously. As far as we are concerned, we feel that this bill as well as the amendments moved these past days are of the utmost importance.

That is why we study them so carefully and so seriously. We put forward every argument we can possibly find, including some opinions expressed by experts and by the public at large who may unfortunately be governed in a few months' time by so odious a bill.

Yesterday, we were discussing amendment No. 27 proposed by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), and pertaining to abortion in the case of a female person, pregnant, of full age or married, or of a person under age provided she gets the written consent of her parents or guardian.

The amendment provides that a female person under age who would be pregnant must obtain her father's consent for abortion.

Parental authority over minor children has always been widely recognized in all areas. When the father is deceased, the consent of the mother or the guardian is required; that goes for driver's permits and for the right to enter liquor stores.

The father must always remain the guide, the protector of his minor child, male as well as female. I base my argument on the Civil Code which clearly establishes the responsibility of the father, the mother or the tutor if the father is dead or cannot act.

At page 215 of the Civil Code, and more particularly at section 1053 dealing with offences and quasi-offences, it can be read and I quote:

> Every person capable of discerning right from wrong is responsible for the damage caused by his fault to another, whether by positive act, imprudence, neglect or want of skill.

Section 1054 of the Civil Code of the province of Quebec as well as similar provisions in the Common Law clearly establish, and in a more detailed manner, the parents' responsibility towards minor children. Section 1054 reads as follows:

> He is responsible not only for the damage caused by his own fault, but also for that caused by the fault of persons under his control and by things he has under his care.
>
> The father, or, after his decease, the mother, is responsible for the damage caused by their minor children;

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the parents have authority over their children and are responsible for them. What is beyond me is that the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) corrects the Civil Code.

Under the above-mentioned clauses, the Civil Code recognizes the authority of the father, but the Criminal Code, as the result of the proposal made today, abolishes the authority of the father over his minor child.

That is why I feel the amendments on abortion are an infringement of the Criminal Code on the Civil Code. It is an infringement of the federal government on the authority of the provinces and by accepting the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi, we would confirm the paternal authority conferred by the Civil Code.

As for abortion, the amendment if adopted would have for effect to show that the Criminal Code cannot destroy what is already recognized by the Civil Code. The Civil Code establishes the authority of the father over his minor children, but at the present time the Criminal Code does not require the father's consent to the abortion of his female children.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) should be told, once more, that if he does not accept this amendment, he will be violating the constitution which provides the provinces with the authority in civil matters. Thus, he is creating the proper environment for separatism in the provinces.

Moreover, section 186 of the Criminal Code states and I quote:

**Every one is under a legal duty as a parent, foster parent, guardian or head of a family, to provide necessaries of life for a child under the age of sixteen years;**

Thus, the Criminal Code holds a head of a family criminally responsible for not providing necessaries of life for his children under age. Thus, a head of a family would be held criminally responsible if one of his children under age died of hunger.

On that point, the Criminal Code is clear. If the Minister of Justice were willing to accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Abitibi, once more we would be confirming the father's authority with regard to abortion.

Section 186 of the Criminal Code indicates that a person is fully grown up at the age of sixteen years. We have ample documentation showing when maturity begins.

On page 262 of a book entitled *Adolescence,* there is some definition indicating when a child can be considered mature.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Every parent . . . in regard to sex must have clear ideas of what he himself considers mature attitudes**

**[Mr. Rondeau.]**

**toward sex. He must know what he believes to be the values and goals in sex relations. He needs to be able to suggest ways in which such values and goals can be attained, what self-control and self-discipline will be necessary, and what satisfactions can be achieved.**

[*Translation*]

And further on it is said, and I quote:

[*English*]

**What attitudes toward sex are mature? A mature person sees sex in the total setting of life itself—**

[*Translation*]

However, Mr. Speaker, a person is only mature when able to understand all the responsibilities involved in life. If under the terms of the Criminal Code, one allows a 14, 15 or 16-year-old girl to have an abortion, it is obvious that this right is given to someone who is not yet capable of judging all the implications of her act.

Here are other reasons why we ask that the father's consent be compulsory for the abortion of a pregnant girl. The father should have his say regarding children under age.

A girl under age who would not have to get her father's consent will use every possible means to conceal her love affairs from him; she will take all the necessary steps for her abortion because she wants to hide the truth from her father.

The father should have the right to consent to the abortion of a girl under age, otherwise he will be unaware of those facts, and thus the girl will be encouraged to carry on in the same foolish way and make the same mistakes. Why? Because she does not yet have all the required knowledge and is still unaware of the full implication of her responsibilities in connection with life.

I hope that the bill will not be passed without this amendment being agreed upon, for if we granted as much freedom to children under 21, it would mean giving them the green light to lead a loose life that leads to moral decay. Nobody will be able to supervise the young girls who are still unaware of all the responsibilities of life and have their own way without their father's consent.

We claim, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment is in order. If it were not adopted, then there would exist a contradiction between the Civil Code in which the fathers' responsibility towards his child under 21 is made clear and the Criminal Code which for the time being does not enable young girls to consult their father in order to be allowed to undergo abortion.

Many other reasons could be put forward to justify the fact that the father should be consulted when a girl under 21 wants to undergo abortion.

I could quote a few cases which unfortunately arose. In fact, young girls or other persons have induced young girls to undergo abortion so as to obtain a better share of the estate, to inherit greater amounts of money. I would not like this afternoon to deal with all these matters for my hon. colleagues will be able to throw much more light on the facts than I.

I would like to remind the Minister of Justice of the fact that if we adopt the bill in its present state, the provinces will have the right to state that the Criminal Code abolishes the authorithy of the father vested in him by the civil law of the provinces.

[*English*]

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I want to speak specifically to amendment 27. This proposal would deprive a woman of the provisions of clause 18 relating to therapeutic abortions if she happened to be unmarried or under 21 and did not receive parental consent to a therapeutic abortion. The policy of clause 18 is to restrict therapeutic abortions purely to medical considerations, and such considerations ought not to be confused, as this amendment proposes, with age or consent.

[*Translation*]

As for the provincial law, I must point out to the hon. members of the Ralliement créditiste who are well aware of it, that the subsection 7 under section 237 of the law reads as follows:

> Nothing in subsection 4 shall be construed as making unnecessary the obtaining of any authorization or consent that is or may be required, otherwise than under this act, before any means are used for the purpose of carrying out an intention to procure a miscarriage of a female person.

There is nothing to prevent the provincial law, before such surgery is decided upon, to request the consent of the state and that of the parents.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question?

• (3:30 p.m.)

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. minister for telling the house that the Ralliement créditiste is of all the parties the best informed on the matter under study. We agree with his statement and that is maybe one of the main reasons for our wishing to inform the house about our opinions whether on the bill, as a whole or on particular opinions about the litigious sections it contains, especially, section 18 which concerns the amendment now under study. This amendment would require the terms of subsection (8) under section 18, to be much more specific, and I quote:

> —a female person who, being pregnant, permits a qualified medical practitioner to use in an accredited or approved hospital any means described in paragraph (a) for the purpose of carrying out her intention to procure her own miscarriage.

The object of our amendment is to delete the words:

> —a female person who, being pregnant,—

and to replace them by the following words:

> —"a female person who is married or of the full age of twenty-one years, or a female person who is under the full age of twenty-one years, with the written consent of her parents or guardian."

The reasons for such an amendment deserve to be thoroughly examined.

That amendment is to state clearly the problems doctors will encounter in the case of a female person under the full age of twenty-one years, who is pregnant.

Some people may accuse us once more of indulging in witch-hunting and of getting lost in the meandering considerations of past centuries, but it is not by accusing us of being mediaeval that they will clear up problems as old as the world itself.

If the daughters of Adam and Eve had had the freedom to dispose of the fœtuses nestling in their womb, where would mankind be?

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, the fruit of their love was of such a value that never would they have thought, even for a second, to get rid of it. They may have regretted the apple but never this fertilized ovum which was intensely wanted through one of the deepest instincts the Creator has ever instilled in the soul, one which is irresistibly manifested in the body by the ineffable sensual pleasure linked to the function of reproduction.

This instinct has been transmitted in full. This explains the existence of the world. Without doubt, it happened one day that a pervert came to sully this unescapable natural law. I would tend to think that this sad individual was a descendent of Cain.

And ever since, for all sorts of reasons that are more or less pure fantasy, and exist most often only in minds floating in unreality

whose lucubrations are causing this incredible loss of time we are now sustaining, others have been continuing to try and legislate against nature.

One must not let a girl under age alone reach some agreement with her doctor or the committee of the doctors of a hospital. The father and the mother of this girl must also take their responsibilities. One-sided decisions from the part of the child who is under 21, could greatly affect, in such circumstances, the health of her parents.

One talks of the health of the mother. One should also think of the health of the other close relatives. The extreme care which one brings to the protection of the pregnant mother is both very understandable and commendable. The whole problem consists in knowing which of the two following possibilities will affect more the life or the health of the mother. Is it abortion or normal pregnancy carried to its normal conclusion?

Now, if we refer to the evidence of the specialists who appeared before the committee on justice and legal affairs, we notice that the facts are sometimes very different from the inhuman theories of the supporters of abortion.

Allow me to quote, Mr. Speaker, a few words from Dr. Lavigne which are taken from the proceedings of the committee. In No. 12, page 535, one can read and I quote:

> However, the effects of abortion are often detrimental to women and create guilt and hostility complexes in the mother and this is often worse than what can be obtained by abortion, or than the secondary psychiatric or psychological reactions due to an unwanted pregnancy.
>
> We should ask ourselves whether in trying to solve one problem we do not create another problem.

To help the doctors understand more clearly the situation of a girl under age and whose problem is now under study, I would say that it is important that the doctor consulted should have the consent of the parents or guardians. That is the very reason for the amendment. The doctors would be delighted with this additional precaution.

Dr. Lavigne said, on behalf of all the Quebec doctors, and I quote:

> It must be noted that this bill does not take into account the personal conviction of physicians and hospitals who fear that they might be liable to legal proceedings for not having practised that which they consider as not acceptable as far as their own professional ethics are concerned. Medical doctors are always concerned with protecting their patients against death.

Indeed, doctors want the acts they are called upon to perform to be carefully considered, strictly scientific and medical, and consistent with the most elementary laws in the world. Dr. Lavigne added, and I quote:

> However, we believe that only scientific medical research will bring a true solution to this problem and favour any committee set up to study the problem. Dr. Hurteau has proven to us that abortion, in the present state of medical science, remains the murder of a living human being. Any doctor or hospital should be free to refuse to participate in this medical technique and this is not mentioned in the bill. Since this technique has to do with the life of a human being, the decision should not be left up to the sole will of the patient.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The amendment now before us, Mr. Speaker, seeks to give a little more precision to that. I repeat the last sentence of the quotation I just gave:

> Since this technique has to do with the life of a human being, the decision should not be left up to the sole will of the patient.

Is there anything more logical than to demand in the legislation the co-operation of the parents or the guardians in order to help the doctor responsible obtain a better knowledge of the health of his patient. And we should not forget, as I said a while ago, that the immediate family of this pregnant teenager could be affected in their physical or mental health just as much as the girl herself. I pointed this out a while ago and I noticed that the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) seemed to smile, finding this statement funny.

I think there is here food for thought, pondering and discussion.

Many possibilities or suppositions could be involved. The father has a heart attack upon learning that his daughter has secured a miscarriage. The mother has a nervous breakdown following the abortion performed on her dear young daughter.

Some may object on the other hand that many parents would also be affected upon learning that their daughter is going to give birth to a child. I say no and I will prove the merit of my opinion by evidence given before the committee on justice and legal affairs. It is the opinion expressed by Dr. Walsh, a psychiatrist, and I quote:

> There is at the present time a considerable body of psychiatric opinion which states that it is impossible to prove that either neurosis or psychosis can be prevented by abortion. This has been illustrated in several studies.
>
> On the contrary, neurosis and psychosis can be provoked by abortion, and this has nothing to do with the individual patient's religious or moral philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the favourite arguments of those who do not agree with us, who say we express the opinion of Catholic theologians and of members of the clergy and that our position therefore has no legal or medical value. We often come back to this argument as we would very much like it to be taken seriously.

When, everyday, at the opening of the sitting of the house, Your Honour says the prayers asking God to protect Her Majesty the Queen, her husband, Prince Charles, Princess Ann, I do not think this disgraces the house in any way. On the contrary, I think all hon. members are glad thus to state their Christian principles.

In the same way, when, by chance, the policy we are promoting agrees with the teachings of the Catholic church and of all the other Christian churches, there is no reason to feel upset. It simply proves that, from every aspect, we are right.

And I go on quoting Dr. Walsh:

> Here I am talking on psychological grounds. In other words, it has been our experience that, whatever the patient's moral viewpoint, abortion is, in fact, psychologically harmful. Therefore, many psychiatrists who accept this viewpoint would be reluctant to recommend abortion.

Such is the conclusion reached by Dr. Walsh.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of this evidence, it is easy to understand how important it is for the doctors, the psychiatrists and all those who might be requested to perform therapeutic abortions, to be in possession of all the necessary information on the condition of the patient.

How could we not feel shocked when we think of the incredible number of hon. members who close their ears to such statements? Fortunately, there are still, on the opposition side, free people who are not afraid of calling upon the whole country to witness the war they are waging for the sake of principles which are so important and so essential to the honour of the country. Besides, if she becomes pregnant the very young girl, who sees everything through rose-coloured spectacles, and for when nothing is more beautiful than love, is not mature enough to feel the seriousness of the problem; she is still malleable and she often falls a prey to common prejudices. Should not parents or guardians lend a helping hand?

Mr. Speaker, all of us have met with situations of that kind. It is quite normal for parents to intervene when their children find themselves in a predicament. Of course, we eliminate—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I would like—

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member asks the house to allow him to carry on with his remarks.

• (3:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Does the house agree to allow the hon. member to pursue his remarks beyond the allotted time?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no unanimous consent.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I have nearly finished—

**Mr. Speaker:** Unfortunately, the house did not agree.

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I regret that we cannot get the unanimous consent of the house so that the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) may carry on with his very serious remarks.

I would like to express my views, as a father, on this fair amendment to the omnibus bill. This proposed amendment suggests a reform which I think is quite justifiable. The members of the Ralliement Créditiste closely examine the remarks of hon. members on this amendment moved by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) which is before us. We agree with this amendment to the effect that the words "a female person who, being pregnant" be replaced by the words "a female person who is married or of the full age of twenty-one years, or a female person who is under the full age of twenty-one years, with the written consent of her parents or guardian."

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is logical and I commend the hon. member for Abitibi for moving it, because it forces us to think seriously of the fact that this house sometimes passes legislation, making light of parental authority.

Mr. Speaker, whoever has children is in a position to consider this problem in its true perspective. I agree with the hon. member for

Abitibi who, as the father of a large family, fears that such a legislation may lead to abuses.

In fact, if a girl under the full age of twenty-one who becomes pregnant does not need to have her parents' consent to get an abortion, we can expect serious abuses.

The minister said that our amendment was provided for in the act. So why not accept this amendment right away by the vote that will take place shortly, so that it is provided in the act that a girl under the full age of twenty-one years should get the written consent of her parents or guardians to get an abortion?

Nothing, I think, must be said lightly. This is why after scrutinizing the bill, I feel that if we accepted the amendment the minister would not feel frustrated. He leads us to believe that he must bend before the dictatorship of a Prime Minister who wants him to have this omnibus bill passed without any amendment.

The amendments we are presenting are logical. We would like them to be adopted and we regret the dictatorship which exists in parliament. This is why I am convinced that the Minister of Justice himself is sincerely sorry he did not follow his first thought, which was to divide the omnibus bill into several bills, as he said himself publicly.

In view of the fact that an order has been given and that amendments are rejected, I submit that if 14, 15, 16 or 17 year olds do not understand the beauty of maternity and hope to conceal the fault they believe they have committed, even though we are living in a perverted world we must ensure that their parents are given full authority to give their consent to abortion, because if the health of the minor girl is affected, her parents will have to bear the consequences.

I think this legislation should be made clearer, more explicit. The minister should explain to us why he does not want at least this amendment to be passed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question?

Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

[*English*]

All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

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

[Mr. Dumont.]

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost on division.

Before the next motion, no. 28, is put to the house may I draw the attention of hon. members to a printing error in the wording of the said motion as printed in the Special Notice Paper. The house will recall that on Friday last the hon. member for Abitibi was granted leave of the house to delete from his motion the words "or approved". The text, as it appears in the Special Notice Paper, unfortunately includes these words. The correct text of the hon. member's motion is appended to this day's Order Paper.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin (for Mr. Laprise)** moved motion No. 28:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting paragraph (a) of sub-section 6 of clause 18 on page 43 and substituting therefor:

"(a) For the purpose of this section, an accredited hospital means a hospital containing not less than four hundred (400) beds and/or forming part of a university, in order that the therapeutic abortion committee may execute its functions in an atmosphere of perfect professional ethics."

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) has moved the amendment which you have just read and to which we might revert later on.

Mr. Speaker, one can readily see that the purpose of that amendment is to clarify the words "accredited hospital" not only under clause 18, but everywhere they appear in the bill.

I wish a definition were given of "accredited hospital". Is it meant to be a 25, 30, 100 or 200 bed hospital? Or any hospital, whatever its status, where the medical practitioners are more or less competent? One does not know. We know that in a 20 or 25-bed building with medical practitioners in attendance, abortion could be procured by qualified physicians.

The hon. member for Abitibi, by means of his motion, wants the words "accredited hospital" to be clarified. In his opinion, the words "accredited hospital" should apply to an institution providing at least 400 beds.

Mr. Speaker, that is a minimum. We believe that a 400-bed hospital is not a small one; however, we consider that such an hospital, where several highly qualified medical

practitioners have to be in attendance, should be able to avail itself of all health, therapeutic, medical and other services in order to perform abortions.

If abortions must be procured under the law, let they be done at least in a safe and sure way, with all the odds in favour of the patient, which is not necessarily the case in small hospitals.

There are many services in large hospitals or in institutions of 400 beds or more which are not to be found in smaller ones. And the most evident proof of that, Mr. Speaker, is that in Quebec particularly—it is the same in other provinces—several hospitals with less than 400 beds have today to close down at the request of the government because their services are inadequate and do not comply with the minimum standards of health.

I do not say, Mr. Speaker, that hospitals with less than 400 beds should not perform abortions because they do not have sufficient health services and so forth.

That is not the question. The greatest security possible must be ensured with regard to abortions, in accordance with the professional ethics of those who will be performing such medical operations.

Consequently, the hon. member for Abitibi has drawn the line on the right side of the 400 bed hospitals, to make sure that hospitals will be in a position to give proper medical care—which is not guaranteed at least in certain hospitals—and that the therapeutic abortion committee may comply with the professional ethics when an abortion is performed.

This amendment seems to me most acceptable to the government for the simple reason that it is legalizing abortion, in short that it is allowing it in all possible and imaginable cases where probably the life or the health of the mother would be in danger.

Mr. Speaker, while we are in favour of the legalization of abortion, I am also asking the house—on behalf of the hon. member for Abitibi and my colleagues—to have at least the decency of providing in the legislation a minimum of protection for the patients admitted into the said hospital to undergo a therapeutic abortion. It seems to me quite logical to obtain at least the assurance that patients treated in the hospitals will obtain sound and competent care worthy of the university level in a well organized hospital of at least 400 beds.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows about the number of illegal abortions that are practised all over Canada and in many other countries.

All hon. members know that abortions are procured for pregnant persons, female—to speak as the minister—by abortionists who are not professional physicians but what we might call "jobbers" who work at an hourly rate or by the job, as the case may be. It is a professional "racket". I apologize for using such English expressions in a speech in French, but I want to show the Minister of Justice he is not the only one who is bilingual.

Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that all over Canada, in a word everywhere, illegal or clandestine abortions are practised. For the majority of those abortions the fact remains—and it is well-known—that abortionists who are not doctors but who do this in part to help and at the same time to make a little money, do not use the best means. They are professional killers—because abortion is still a homicide, a murder—who take advantage of the situation because the mother or the unmarried mother are in distress. The means they use are against the most basic hygienic principles and consequently, not only is the health but also the life of the mother endangered.

Mr. Speaker, the minister is well aware that illegal abortions we hear about sometimes, have most serious consequences which more often than not, prove to be dangerous for the woman.

If we cannot help the passing of that clause, namely the legalization of abortion to which we are opposed with all our might, let us at least ensure a minimum of safety in hospitals so that patients will be able to get abortion feeling secure because they will be treated in appropriate hygienic conditions, and receive professional care that will enable them to recover, whereas, with abortionists, there is the fear of death, sooner or later, or other serious diseases. This is unavoidable since, as the government itself acknowledges, even when this bill is passed, the number of clandestine abortions will keep on increasing, and this has been proved beyond any doubt in other countries.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot have any control over illicit abortions, we should at least state that no therapeutic abortion committee is to be set up nor any abortion performed in any hospital containing less than 400 beds, as is provided for in the act.

The law should compel hospitals to meet minimum health standards. I could give to the Minister of Justice the names of several

hospitals in the province of Quebec which must close down soon because they were giving inadequate service. Not that the staff was not well trained, but a 100-bed hospital cannot give the same quality of service as would a 400-bed unit.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is very important. As a matter of fact, the omnibus bill defines a person who might ask the doctor for an abortion as follows: "A female person who, being pregnant".

Mr. Speaker, no one will deny that this definition must be made more explicit. As a matter of fact, when a pregnant woman asks a doctor for an abortion, it may happen that the doctor is not a responsible one, as there are incompetents in all professions, among lawyers as well as among doctors. What protection does this woman have?

If the doctor says that he will consider the matter,—and the law authorizes an abortion only when the therapeutic abortion committee of the hospital has issued a certificate,—if he submits the case to the therapeutic abortion committee, when the hospital is not authorized to procure abortions, the patient runs the risk of receiving very poor care.

The therapeutic committee may say: My dear man, we can perform an abortion, as the life or health of the patient would or "would be likely to" be endangered. The therapeutic committee will be in such a position that it will have to say yes.

Then the therapeutic abortion committee issues a certificate and the doctor performs the abortion in circumstances that leave much to be desired and could lead to serious consequences.

The patient will have confidence, but she will not know whether those people are quacks or professional killers. She will never know it either if the hospital where she applies does not have the required services.

It is the responsibility of the minister to place the hospitals and the doctors who perform an abortion under the obligation of complying with minimum standards.

Mr. Speaker, this is something essential. It is extremely important, in my opinion, and the minister will have to admit we are right in this regard.

If a person goes to see a lawyer, it is, above all, because he has a problem to solve. He chose that lawyer instead of another, because he trusts him.

If a woman consults a doctor, it is because she has a problem. She is ill, she is suffering from a momentary or perhaps more serious disorder. Anyway she has a more or less serious reason to go and see her doctor. She has some sort of a problem. Why would she choose this doctor instead of another? There are hundreds of doctors everywhere. Very few communities are without any doctor in Canada. There will always be a shortage of doctors, but they can meet the needs. Every individual has to make his own choice. The minister can choose his doctor. I can choose my own doctor, as well as everybody else.

Why would this patient go to one doctor in particular? It is because she trusts him. Therefore, the doctor must be worthy of that confidence. As relationship based upon trust must exist.

If the doctor is not qualified, if he is not serious or if he is an alcoholic—

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The Minister of Justice is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the hon. member about doctors are very interesting but the amendment deals with hospitals and the number of beds available.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to play on words uselessly, but it seems to me that what I am saying concerns abortions and the conditions in which they will be performed. I am dealing with the safety, for the patient, at the hospital, such conditions should also concern those who perform the abortion. It is above all a matter of confidence and safety.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the doctor must, through his competence, experience, professional qualifications, and respect for his professional ethics, deserve the confidence of his patient, just as the lawyer must deserve that of his client.

The doctor may be a member of a team of specialists or doctors, in any hospital. Now, to help him, so that he can be sure he can perform the abortion, I feel the doctor will have to perform it in a hospital where the services are adequate.

If a very competent doctor wants to do a good job for his patient, and does it seriously, but finds himself in a small hospital where the equipment is not adequate, etc, it may

happen that even if he is competent and serious, even though he is honest and trustworthy, even though he can be fully trusted, without the necessary instruments, the minimum equipment required, without nurses to take care of the patient, then he will not be protected with regard to procuring an abortion.

A very small hospital, Mr. Speaker, will be allowed to accept an abortion case, and to designate a doctor to whom the patient will have to turn to perform the abortion. The doctor will comply, as he has no choice; if a certificate is issued, but he does not want to perform the abortion, he will be subject to prosecution on criminal charges. So, he is bound to comply. What safeguards will he have if he has to perform the abortion in a hospital which is not adequately equipped?

For those who know something about the matter, I shall say the hospitals with 400 beds are well equipped. There are also, of course hospitals with 300 beds which are just as well equipped as those with 500 beds. We should think in terms of an average. According to statistics, hospitals with 400 beds are adequately equipped since they are subject to such heavy demand.

• (4:20 p.m.)

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) was quite right in presenting this amendment—if only to dispel certain prejudices entertained by government members—for it does not aim at forbidding abortion but rather at making sure that it is performed under healthy and safe conditions which protect the patient, the doctor, the therapeutic committee on abortion and the government which has legalized abortion.

Mr. Speaker, if it is realized some day that 25, 30, 50 or 100 abortions have been performed in inadequately equipped hospitals, the patients would be entitled to blame the government for failing to provide for minimum security standards.

Mr. Speaker, we must take our responsibilities and see to it that abortions, if allowed, are performed in proper conditions. If doctors were consulted about the matter, we would realize that they agree, because they certainly want to be protected themselves by this legislation.

There were numerous opportunities in the course of this debate, to discuss this confusing problem. If the minister says that the amendment moved by the hon. member is not valid because there is a comma here and a line there, I think he does not adopt the proper attitude.

This is what I said to a visitor who asked me why we were moving so many amendments that were all rejected. Does it mean, he said, that all those amendments are stupid and out of order?

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we are here to legislate, that the opposition has a constructive role to play, that it must not always oppose but take part in the debates in order to improve the legislation.

If the minister says that the amendment is not in order, it means that he allows abortions to be performed in any Canadian hospital, by any doctor whether or not he is an alcoholic or whether or not he has adequate equipment. The minister no longer asks himself questions but simply says: Perform abortion on a large scale, commercialize it, do whatever you like, we could not care less.

I think the minister would prove irresponsible if he failed to recognize that there is something valid and positive in the subject-matter of the amendment, the purpose of which is not to oppose the government but to protect it against the disastrous effects of an abortion being performed in a hospital lacking proper equipment or in a hospital where abortion would be done by an alcoholic doctor.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to hearing what the minister will say in this regard, not because we are anxious to know if he will deny once more our assertions, but in order to know his viewpoint. I feel he cannot do otherwise than to accept the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks, I would like to tell the minister and members of the cabinet that there is nothing wrong for the Liberal party to vote for an amendment moved by the Ralliement Créditiste. This does not mean that they are becoming Créditistes. In fact, when we are supporting an amendment or a bill introduced by a Liberal member, this does not mean either that we are becoming Liberals.

We are here to legislate and we should try to forget those stupid political discussions which have been going on since we began to consider this bill, and endeavour to produce a legislation which will ensure the protection of women, doctors, the therapeutic abortion committee and the legislator.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I regret to inform the hon. member who has just

resumed his seat, that for very valid reasons, we must reject once again the amendment.

First, I must point out that when this bill has been considered by the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, several amendments have been moved by members from all political parties and the government has accepted about 25 of them.

We are now at the stage of the committee report. This report has been prepared by the members of the four political parties involved and we have to accept or reject the report. The amendments moved by the members of the Ralliement Créditiste are not affecting this bill, but the committee report.

Well, as I said, the committee has accepted about twenty or thirty amendments—

**Mr. Fortin:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Lotbinière on a point of order.

**Mr. Fortin:** I should like to remind the house, Mr. Speaker, that I think the minister is out of order. He is not dealing at all with the amendment under consideration.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Then, these interventions concerning the debate are of another order, Mr. Speaker.

The standing committee on justice and legal Affairs met 14 times in 30 days. It really meant business. The committee made inquiries, called witnesses, almost all the officials from the Department of Justice. After six days of debate on second reading, 14 committee meetings, and 8 more days of discussion in the house at the stage of the committee report, I can say we are very much concerned with this important legislation.

I should like to read the bill, and particularly the sections and sub-sections to which the amendment moved by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) refers to. This is related to the definition of a hospital in which therapeutic abortions can be performed.

This definition applies to two kinds of hospital, to an "accredited hospital" or to an "approved hospital", and the words "or approved" have been added by the committee on justice and legal affairs.

This amendment had been proposed to the committee. It was quite proper since it had been accepted by the committee at that stage. A hospital—

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Abitibi on a point of order.

**Mr. Laprise:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to say that Mr. Speaker asked me last Friday to delete the word "accredited" from amendment No. 28. As a matter of fact, the Speaker said, as reported on page 7963 of *Hansard*, and I quote:

> Amendment No. 28 appears unacceptable in its present form because, if it were adopted, it would give two different definitions to the words "accredited hospital" as used in the bill. However, as this is merely a technical error, the house would no doubt allow the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) to change his amendment by deleting therefrom the words "or approved".

I think those words were added by the committee as the Minister of Justice has just said. But those are the very words Mr. Speaker asked me to delete from my amendment to make it acceptable.

I wish to point out to the Minister of Justice that his reply is running counter to the ruling issued by Mr. Speaker last Friday.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** That is not correct. Mr. Speaker recommended that the words "or approved" be deleted because the amendment of the hon. member was related to paragraph (a) subsection 6, section 18 of Bill C-150. This paragraph refers rather to accredited hospitals, and paragraph (b) refers to approved hospitals. Thus, as the amendment of the hon. member refers rather to paragraph (a) but not to paragraph (b), Mr. Speaker suggested to the hon. member to delete the word "approved".

I am speaking about the definition given by Bill C-150, of the term "accredited hospital" at paragraph (a) and "approved hospital" at paragraph (b), subsection 6 of section 18.

> Under paragraph (a), "accredited hospital" means a hospital accredited by the Canadian Council on Hospital Accreditation in which diagnostic services and medical, surgical and obstetrical treatment are provided;

Paragraph (b) reads as follows:

> "approved hospital" means a hospital in a province approved for the purposes of this section by the Minister of Health of that province;

Because of this definition, only hospitals accredited by the Canadian Council on Hospital Accreditation or approved hospitals designated by the Minister of Health of a province are covered by this section.

In my opinion, this is sound and secure protection.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Now, what is this amendment trying to do? The amendment says that instead of allowing therapeutic abortions to be performed in an accredited hospital or an approved hospital they should only be permitted in a special type of hospital, one which must have at least 400 beds or is a hospital attached to a university. We reject this amendment because in our opinion it would impose an unwarranted restriction on the number of hospitals in which therapeutic abortions could legally be carried out.

Moreover, the amendment contains an unjustified presumption that perfect professional ethics do not exist in smaller hospitals. We believe that the tests of accreditation or of approval for which provision is made in the clause itself are entirely adequate. Our information from the Canadian Hospital Association is that the size of the hospital has no relationship to the quality of service or care which it provides. In fact I suppose some officers of the Canadian Hospital Association and of the Canadian Medical Association would admit that, for certain types of treatment, in many cases one gets better care, more regular care, more personal care, in the smaller hospitals. I do not think the size of the hospital has anything to do with the standard of care provided.

At a meeting in April, 1966, between representatives of the Canadian Bar Association, the Canadian Medical Association and the Department of Justice, the question of the accreditation of hospitals was specifically raised by the department. The reply was to the effect that where such treatment was available it could be carried out under the proposed amendment in an accredited hospital regardless of the size of that hospital. Hon. members who look up the testimony given before the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare which reviewed this matter during the last parliament will see that representatives of the Canadian Medical Association and others supported this point of view.

What the hon. member is really saying is that he has no confidence in the smaller hospitals. Yes, he is insisting—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière, on a point of order.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order simply because what the Minister of Justice has just said, with all due respect, is entirely false. It imputes motives to me that I do not have, and statements that I have not made.

Mr. Speaker, I want this to be clear to everyone; I repeated it and I even hit my desk with my fist when I said it: there is not necessarily a link between the quality of the services and the number of beds or the size of the building. Generally speaking, services are more adequate in large hospitals, that is those with a minimum of 400 beds; even the Hospital Association recognizes that fact.

Mr. Speaker, I would not have the minister, under the pretext of fighting for his stupid point of view, make others say stupid things, when it is he who says them.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, this is no point of order, but never mind; let us read the amendment. The amendment says that an "accredited hospital", in this text, means "a hospital containing not less than 400" beds and/or forming part of a university".

The only hospitals the hon. member trusts are those in which there are at least 400 beds and which form part of a university. To my mind, he is prejudiced against rural hospitals, against rural ridings and against the small cities of Canada or the province of Quebec.

I believe the Ralliement créditiste party does not trust rural hospitals!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Abitibi, on another point of order.

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

I simply reject all the charges just laid by the hon. Minister of Justice. I wonder if he still deserves that name after making such a statement.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why the hon. member is so sensitive. Indeed, does not his amendment say:

> A hospital containing not less than four hundred (400) beds and/or forming part of a university, in order that the therapeutic abortion committee may execute its functions in an atmosphere of perfect professional ethics.

According to this, there would be no "professional ethics" in the smaller hospitals.

That is what he contends and it really amazes me.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Chairman, I feel the hon. minister is indeed unfair when he makes such statements.

The amendment is drafted in the following terms and I quote:

(a) For the purpose of this section, an accredited hospital means—

—I repeat, an "accredited hospital"—

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** This is not a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Chairman, I shall go on reading the amendment:

—means a hospital containing not less than four hundred (400) beds—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member has already taken part in the debate and I can see no point of order right now.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, one must then conclude that under this amendment, the Ralliement créditiste does not trust small hospitals, does not believe that "an atmosphere of perfect professional ethics" can be found in small and/or rural hospitals.

I humbly suggest to the Chair that this amendment reflects a bias against all rural, all small hospitals in the province of Quebec. The women who live in small towns in the province of Quebec—

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, does the hon. minister allow me a question?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière has a question.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister tell me what he means by "rural hospitals"—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member knows that the member who is asked a question does not have to answer.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Not now.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. Minister of Justice has the floor.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The submission of this amendment leaves us under the impression that the Ralliement créditiste is not ready to grant the women who live in small towns in the province of Quebec, in villages and rural communities of that province, the same rights as to the women in the larger cities of that province.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) rising again to a point of order?

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Lotbinière wants to speak on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Fortin:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to tell the house that what the minister just said does not tally with the facts. Actually, in Arthabaska, in the constituency of Lotbinière, which is considered as a rural one, even on the electoral maps, there is a hospital with more than 400 beds. Therefore I believe the minister has no right to make such an assertion and we could give him many reasons for that. The Minister of Justice is a liar of the worst kind.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The Minister of Justice has the floor.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I cannot understand why the members of the Ralliement créditiste are so upset. Nor can I understand why people who are supposed to represent rural areas of the province of Quebec should choose to cause a serious wrong to all the women who live in the rural communities of the province of Quebec. Indeed, the government is not of the opinion that a woman living in a rural area or in a small town of Canada or of the province of Quebec deserves less service than the other women of the country. Therefore, we reject this amendment unreservedly.

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to speak on this amendment and I thank very sincerely my colleague, the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) for having moved it on my behalf since I had to leave for a few minutes.

I was surprised at the insulting remarks, I would say, of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) who imputed to us motives that we have not. We have never said that we do not

trust our rural hospitals nor that we want to deny any woman, from any area, the right to the care she needs.

The minister told us that we felt a little nervous, but I think that it is rather he who gets more and more nervous as this debate is progressing.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment I introduced reads as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of this section, an accredited or approved hospital means a hospital containing not less than four hundred (400) beds and/or forming part of a university, in order that the therapeutic abortion committee—

If there is one, because that is not yet sure.

—may execute its functions in an atmosphere of perfect professional ethics."

Mr. Speaker, when it is a matter of deciding whether one must kill a being which is supposed to live, it will have to be done in a normal way and as carefully as possible.

Today a killer gets every opportunity to defend himself.

The present Liberal party went as far as to abolish the death penalty for he who, in a deliberate way, takes the life of another person.

Mr. Speaker, in that struggle against abortion, we fight to protect the life of a helpless being. And if those beings have a right to be protected, it is the role of the state to ensure that protection, for themselves are deprived of any means of defence.

• (4:40 p.m.)

That is why we use every available means to see that the law should be quite clear, in order to ensure that the minimum number of mistakes will be made. We know that the government intends to establish committees of doctors responsible for deciding whether it will be possible to put an end to a life.

Mr. Speaker, it is not at my request that the amendment was moved but at the request of doctors who told us: We want those therapeutic abortions to be practised only in big centres and not in small centres in which everybody knows everybody else, so that people cannot point the finger at a well-known and respected doctor, saying that he has become a professional abortionist.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Laprise:** That is one of the reasons which led us to move this amendment. Doctors do not want to be considered as murderers, nor to be seen in such a light, when they are obliged, at the government's request, to destroy a life.

This amendment is also designed to preserve the identity of pregnant persons who will resort to abortion.

We know, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Justice also knows that in small communities, everybody knows everybody else, and if a girl or a married woman requests an abortion, the finger of scorn is pointed at her.

We have often been aware in our rural areas of so-called accidents—because many girls thought they could play around without getting into trouble—and to avoid scandal, a girl used to go to big cities like Montreal and Quebec to get a job, coming back seven or eight months later. Her employment was over and scandal was avoided. Very few people knew what had happened, and the baby was alive.

Mr. Speaker, if all small hospitals are allowed to do it—I do not question their competence nor that of their medical staff, because they certainly can perform that kind of operation as well as doctors in large cities—all the desirable security is not given. In the hospitals of LaSarre, Amos, Val-d'Or and Rouyn, the doctors are as expert in this field—when they have made the necessary studies—as in any other Montreal hospital—

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The Minister of Justice on a point of order.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I wish to call the attention of the house to the wording of the amendment:

—execute its functions in an atmosphere of perfect professional ethics."

How does the hon. member explain the lack of "professional ethics" in small hospitals, since these are the words he used in his own amendment?

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, the minister is really a blockhead. He did not understand anything, he will not understand anything.

**Some hon. Members:** He has received orders—

**Mr. Laprise:** Yes, he must have had orders to have this legislation passed at any cost. But at least my colleagues and myself will have done our duty and cleared up as best we

could this legislation, and we shall have nothing to reproach ourselves with when the effects of it will be felt.

Mr. Speaker, I moved this amendment for an entirely different reason than the one the Minister of Justice has attributed to me. We want to prevent young girls from being embarrassed when they go to a little hospital.

Another point is to avoid that hospitals, even if they are accreditated—and I believe there are still some—be insufficiently equipped to perform this type of operation. I know one, in particular, that can ensure very normal deliveries, but in a village where there is only one doctor.

How do they want to organize a therapeutic abortion committee under these conditions? The Minister of Justice should, in my view, reconsider the whole question. And I would be happy to hear other hon. members say so. Other members of the Liberal party may also express their opinions and I would be happy to hear them on that.

**An hon. Member:** They are not able to do it. They are afraid.

**Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières):** Mr. Speaker, I feel the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) might not be happy to hear my comments, even if he asked for them, because I have been listening for the last two weeks to the most rambling speeches I have ever heard during my whole career.

Those people who pass themselves off as guardians of virtue, come here to speak to us of what is the least noble in human nature.

They are in such a state of confusion that they say certain things even if they have to contradict themselves a few minutes later.

For instance, the hon. member for Abitibi spoke about a girl who had a mishap and wants an abortion. The bill makes no mention of such a thing. There is no question of allowing ny woman, who wants an abortion for all kinds of reasons, to have one.

However, the question is to authorize a woman to procure an abortion under the control of a medical board, when her physical or mental health or her life is endangered. And those people who claim to be more virtuous than the others—their electors whom they managed to deceive, are as virtuous as they are—do not trust their own physician.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

[Mr. Laprise.]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Lotbinière rises on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to take up the assertion of the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, when he said that the members of the Ralliement créditiste deceived their electors.

Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that such a statements affects our privileges.

We have not been elected through theft, electoral funds or patronage. We have been honestly elected and we have the courage of our convictions—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Speaker, again, I say that they have deceived the population and that they have been deceiving their electors for two weeks by their false statements, when they say for instance, that Liberal members have been instructed to vote in favour of that bill. It is absolutely untrue.

And if decency and the rules allowed me to do so, I would call them liars, because they do not tell the truth. This has never been so. Only when he calls the members of—

**Mr. Corbin:** Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The honourable member for Madawaska-Victoria on a point of order.

**Mr. Corbin:** Mr. Speaker, I ask for your indulgence. There is so much noise in that part of the house that it is impossible for us to hear the enlightening comments of the member for Trois-Rivières. I therefore ask you to call them to order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Indeed, an elementary Standing Order stipulates that when a member has the floor he should not be interrupted.

• (4:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Speaker, they even went so far as to call us murderers a while ago. I wonder what their position will be in the face of mothers they will condemn to death, when doctors have decided they must choose between the life of the mother and that of the child. I wonder who will be the more committed murderer according to his conscience, if the members of the Ralliement créditiste succeed in having this bill rejected, a bill

which was conceived and drafted by people as serious as they are and I am charitable when I say "as serious as they are".

Mr. Speaker, their amendment stipulates that abortion must absolutely be performed in a well-equipped hospital. But all those who have ever been to the hospital know that there are perfectly well-equipped hospitals with 100, 150, 200 beds, staffed with doctors who are as conscientious as those in any big hospital. And I say it is rather amusing to see the way the members of Ralliement Créditiste are caught red-handed for they do not even trust their own hospitals nor their own constituents who will want to procure themselves a miscarriage.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Mongrain:** They will force the mothers, whose life is endangered, to travel hundreds of miles, to the other end of the constituency of Abitibi, for instance, to get to a 400 bed-hospital with the expenses and dangers involved.

Mr. Speaker, such is the logic of those people who for two weeks, have indulged in petty politics with regard to this bill which is not perfect of course—in party politics, which will enable them to go back to their constituency around election time and say: We are the guardians of virtue. Yet they are the ones who today call others liars, traitors, murderers. Those are the guardians of virtue, Mr. Speaker, the ones who feed on things as shocking as those we have been hearing for two weeks. I have never seen such experts on immorality or bestiality as those I have just seen among the members of the Ralliement Créditiste.

Mr. Speaker, they talk of an atmosphere of professional ethics as if such a thing could be found only in large hospitals.

As for me, I would like to talk about an atmosphere lacking in professional ethics in this house on account of the demagogy those people have indulged in for two weeks, while bills that could enable the government to give bread to the unemployed, to stimulate the economy, are pending because some members paralyze the work of the house, for purposes of party politics, which will enable them to say to the simple-minded, around election time: We have haved the virtue of the Canadians. Yes, Mr. Speaker, but it was by dint of lies and misrepresentations, by dint of statements which have a double meaning, by dint of mental reservations and of concealment before the electorate.

Mr. Speaker, we are studying another of these silly amendments which cannot be explained, but which enable all the members of the Ralliement Créditiste to raise, one after the other, and with a kind of masochism and parliamentary "auto-eroticism" to wallow in these dirty things which are hidden in good families.

**Mr. Fortin:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière on a point of order.

**Mr. Fortin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is merely that I think I must now make a remark. The fact is that since the hon. member for Trois-Rivières has been speaking, one wonders what he is talking about. I can read the amendment to him, but where is it? He came for it a while ago but he did not bring it back.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I thank the hon. member for Lotbinière and I also take the opportunity to ask the hon. member for Trois-Rivières who is wondering a little to kindly restrict himself exclusively to the amendment.

**Mr. Rondeau:** I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that you are very indulgent to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lotbinière said that it was hard for him to understand; this does not surprise me, because they are rather hard of understanding in that area. This does not surprise us.

I repeat that for two weeks they have been stirring those things with a vengeance and prevented us from passing legislation which could improve a situation for all Canadians.

I appeal to them, if they have a little common sense left, so stop this unending twaddle and so that we can go on to some other serious business. They know themselves that this does not make sense. They have just shown us their weakness, their inconsistency and now is the time to put an end to this.

Mr. Speaker, I shall stop for a moment because I would not want to do as my friends over there—

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Shefford is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, may I point out that, a moment ago, you called the hon. member for Trois-Rivières to order. And now he is again out of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I was under the impression that the hon. member for Trois-Rivières was also rising on a point of order.

• (5:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Mather:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to ask whether anything can be done to protect the house from these phony points of order.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. Is the house ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I would really like to change the atmosphere of the house and bring it back to a more serious mood for I feel, that for the past fifteen days, we have had very earnest discussions, not just with arguments coming right out of our heads but coming from very competent people, whose briefs we had the opportunity to study, from medical books and reports of studies made on the subject.

All this was, indeed, done in earnest, more especially as the amendments we moved were accepted by the Chair and put into *Hansard*.

I am afraid some members are not in a position to discuss our amendments and to call them irresponsible, as they tried to insinuate.

The amendment under consideration is in no way questioning the quality of smaller hospitals. We are quite aware that a patient admitted to a 100 or 200 bed hospital, is attended by very capable doctors. After submitting his patient to all required examinations, in most cases, the doctor will have him transferred to a specialized hospital, not that he does not trust his own hospital but in order to provide his patient with the best possible care.



We have back home a 400-bed hospital which has an excellent reputation. Similar hospitals can be found throughout Quebec and Canada.

There are also hospitals with fewer than 400 beds, the personnel of which are extremely competent, but where it is felt preferable to call upon specialists if need be.

This is why, every week, we see people from Granby, for instance who having consulted our own doctors, are transferred to specialized hospitals in Montreal.

Now, the amendment before us this afternoon is not intended to cast a slur on small rural hospitals, but to give more weight to the provisions of the law on abortion, should they be adopted, unhappily.

It would not be normal, in a hospital of 150 to 200 beds, for a committee of doctors who have never performed abortions or who need the help of a psychiatrist, a general practitioner or a gynaecologist, and who do not have access to the services of those specialists, not to be able to send their abortion cases to those hospitals that have them.

Ordinary doctors would not be expected to give a final judgment before the committee to authorize abortion.

Now, I have here the testimony of a Liberal member, who is a doctor and who appeared before the committee on health and welfare in 1967. On page 46 of the proceedings, he himself expresses doubts about the efficiency and competence of the medical boards. Now I quote what the member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) had to say:

> —Those boards have been tried in the United States for four or five years. I will quote from the RN review of June 1966:
>
> Some years ago therapeutic abortion boards—usually made up of specialists—were organized in many hospitals to screen abortion requests. The boards have generally proved unsatisfactory for these reasons:

We are not questioning the skill of those hospital doctors, far from it, because it was found in the United States that some doctor committees have after a certain time fallen into routine and when an abortion case came up—and this was substantiated by inquiries that have been made—the foetus was killed and the papers were signed after by the committee of doctors.

This means that if we permit all the small country hospitals to make abortions, if they have qualified doctors to do so, there will be abortion committees throughout the country in every little village, and it will become

routine. The abortion legislation will then be known as a farce and a butchery for the Canadian people.

Those ideas are not ours, they come from experts. It may seem strange, but I rely much more on medical specialists than in the nonsense of the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, and we wonder on what side of morality he is. I am not afraid, Mr. Speaker, to express my moral principles in this house because I did so in my constituency. I will continue to do so and it will take more than the hon. member for Trois-Rivières to stop me.

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

The hon. member seems to be questioning my morality but somebody who once said: "My Lord, I thank Thee that I am not as other men. All the others are—

**Mr. Rondeau:** More nonsense! Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter for a question of privilege, this is one more stupid remark to add the hon. member's record.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Abitibi has dealt with serious points on which I want to make a few comments. First, I want to deal with the variety of specialists needed to decide whether an abortion should be done or not. It cannot be decided upon only by three ordinary doctors, but by a gynecologist, a pediatrician and a general practitioner.

• (5:10 p.m.)

But all hospitals have not such specialists. Why? Because a gynecologist cannot make a living in a 100 or 200-bed hospital, so he will go and settle in a big city where there is a 400-bed hospital. Why? Because he will find there a greater number of patients. That accounts for the concentration of specialists in the big cities.

We should give those specialists the opportunity to study those problems thoroughly. Before any abortion could be performed specialists should be invited to examine every aspect of the problem. According to the Hon. Jack Winters, the hospitals in which the greatest number of abortions are practised are those whose committees are the most lenient.

Now then, if any physician who is neither a gynecologist, nor a pediatrist, nor again a psychiatrist may settle the future of the foetuses of the nation, I say that the Canadian people—

**Mr. Mongrain:** I rise on the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.



**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières rises on the question of privilege.

**Mr. Mongrain:** The hon. member is discussing amendment No. 29. We are studying amendment No. 28, which refers to 400-bed hospitals. Amendment No. 29 refers to gynaecologists and psychiatrists. Therefore, the hon. member is out of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I do not think the hon. member for Shefford is out of order.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I am allowed only 20 minutes, because otherwise I could squelch those dumb cluck who keep on clucking from time to time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I know it is Wednesday; people may get excited and during the debate, rather unparliamentary language may be heard.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Nurses' Newsletters for March-April 1968, on page 69, deals with the definitions of hospitals and their competence. It reads as follows:

> As you can see, the three definitions rather push aside the denominational aspect and clearly indicate that the legislator intends to place the medical profession in a state of bondage.

We are told that physicians should be protected, but this legislation is an insult to physicians; medical science is questioned, and doctors are told that the only way to solve pregnancy problems is abortion which is, the most idiotic, the most atrocious and the most stupid way of all.

And this paper has not been submitted by members of the *Ralliement créditiste*. I am sure that the hon. member for Trois-Rivières received it, but he has never read it. I will continue to quote excerpts:

> Can it be hoped that the Canadian Council on Hospital Accreditation—

**Mr. Mongrain:** I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Mongrain:** I wonder how my hon. friend can say that I never read that document? I do not tell him what I read. I have read it, but I am trying to interpret it—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Mongrain:** —intelligently and not to—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order please. It is precisely to avoid these frequent calls to order that I pointed out a while ago to the hon. members, and especially to the hon. member for Shefford that people get excited and that certain unparliamentary terms are being used during the debate.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the old saw goes: The tree is known by its fruit. Therefore, I have judged the hon. member for Trois-Rivières by his achievements.

The committee goes on further to say in the same magazine, and I quote:

Is there any hope that the Canadian Hospital Certification Council will have any regard for the status of religious hospitals?

Is there any hope that a hospital board—considered in this definition and even in everyday life much more as an administrative than a medical unit—will be able to resist the pressures exerted against the religious freedom of its members?

Then, nurses question the efficiency of those medical committees and, what is worse, an attempt is being made to spread those abortion committees by setting up one in every small hospital in every town of the province of Quebec.

I continue:

Finally, by what kind of acrobatics will the Canadian government manage to put in a Catholic hospital a therapeutic abortion committee?

Mr. Speaker, many other testimonies would be worth putting on record.

The Humanist Association of Canada has already done a great deal to promote medicine and health in Canada.

It is said regarding "Accredited Hospitals", and I quote:

[*English*]

The stipulation that only accredited hospitals will be able to hear cases and that only such hospitals will be allowed to perform legal abortions limits severely the availability of avenues for help to those women seeking it.

[*Translation*]

What is meant by that is that, if abortion committees are to be set up all across the country, this will automatically favour abortion, because, instead of being considered in a responsible way, the matter will become one of routine. Instead of revalorizing medicine, we shall degrade it.

That is why we do not want just anyone to be authorized to procure an abortion or to decide that an abortion may take place. We do not want such authorizations to be granted to all doctors in Canada; we believe that this field of abortion should be entrusted to specialists who will study the psychological state of the patient.

Gynecologists could also study this important aspect of medicine, which is related to the reasons given for asking for an abortion.

How can a general practitioner be expected to make a decision on psychiatric, psychological and gynecological matters, if he has not specialized in those fields?

It is because we trust physicians and specialists that we want them to sit on those medical committees so that the decisions made will be most enlightened.

If we do not ask specialists to decide such matters, who shall we ask? Then, it would be the surgeon who usually takes out an appendix, tonsils or something else. Who, within the committee, will have the final say?

Unfortunately this is what happened in the United States. After a few years, after that practice is established, we shall find out that the foetuses will be destroyed and doctors will afterwards be called upon to straighten out the situation and sign the necessary authorizations.

It is in the name of medical freedom and competence that we object to the Liberal party and this bill degrading medicine in Canada. Let us keep on entrusting specialties to specialists. Let us not destroy our Canadian race for insignificant and non-existent reasons, since if we were to listen to every emotional reason which prompts a woman to want an abortion, half of the members would not be here today.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I contend that the Canadian nation is still too young to allow the Liberal party and Bill C-150 to throw half of its children in the gutters and rivers and to butcher them in our hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, that is why, in the name of medical freedom and competence, and of our regard for the profession, we ask that the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi be adopted.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I feel duty bound once again to take part in the debate on this amendment, especially after the interventions of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and the hon. member for

Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain). They help us focus our attention on the subject-matter of this debate, since they acquaint us to some extent, with their points of view. I do say to some extent, Mr. Speaker, for we have not yet heard arguments based on principles accepted by most people.

We feel this debate is dragging on, but we have no need for any particulars on the subject from the hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

We appreciate that we are discussing a matter that should not have been introduced in the house. Such is the position we have taken right from the beginning.

For the information of the hon. members, I may say that we would agree to adjourn this debate on abortion and, as suggested by the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, to proceed to the consideration of matters much more urgent, and of more consequence for the future of this country.

The government thought it was an astute policy to introduce this bill immediately after the Easter recess claiming that an immediate debate was necessary, and leading us to believe that we had to rush the passage of that bill in order to proceed to more urgent measures. We shall certainly not be fooled by such a childish game. Indeed, we are not deprived of intelligence to such an etxent. We were opposed to this debate and we have been proving, for the past two weeks, that it was useless.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. Now that he has been talking for three minutes, I would like the hon. member to tell us what he thinks of the amendment now under study.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, the many points of orders and questions of privilege which have been raised in the course of this debate have probably led me to make this digression and I do apologize for it. In any case, I promise I will do my best to be as brief as possible and to limit myself to 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment raises the question of accrediting the hospitals.

Should, this bill be adopted as a whole, we want to reduce as much as possible the harmful effects of abortion. We think that by reducing the number of hospitals where it would be possible to perform abortion and by setting the conditions under which these hospitals might be accredited for that purpose, we would have successfully dealt with one of the many means of alleviating its evil consequences.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the amendment from this point of view, we can understand it much better. Why should we curtail the number of hospitals and increase the number of beds in the "accredited" hospitals?

The experience in other countries where abortion was legalized justifies our attitude towards this amendment.

Recently, a paper published an article entitled: English concerned about abortion law.

Mr. Speaker, this article deals with the results of legalizing abortion in that country, I quote:

> The current application of the act authorizing abortion under certain conditions causes "serious concern, even to the advocates of the act", stated Richard Crossman, British Minister for Social Services, Monday afternoon in the House of Commons.
>
> The act, adopted by parliament in October 1967 and which became effective in April 1968, authorizes termination of a pregnancy when it threatens or harms the physical or the mental health of the mother, that of the child to be born or that of the other children.
>
> Mr. Crossman said that he was particularly displeased with the way in which the act was interpreted and applied in the private sector. Since June 1968, 22,000 abortions have been performed, of which more than a third in private clinics. The others were performed in state hospitals and paid for by social welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the last paragraph of the article which I have just quoted gives one of the main reasons which prompts us to propose the amendment now under study.

One of the main reasons there have been as many as 22,000 abortions since June 1968, is the increased number of hospitals where abortion may be procured. It is one of the reasons why we want to decrease the number of "accredited" hospitals. For this purpose, we are using the nefarious experience of other countries, so that we will not have to blame ourselves for the same mistakes.

And it says further, and I quote:

> —in which the act is interpreted and applied in the private sector.

We understand, Mr. Speaker, that those hospitals must be accredited or approved. The number of applications that will come in just to accredit or approve such hospitals will be great.

Then we will surely get to the unfortunate consequences which we denounce. We urge in all seriousness every hon. member to consider

all consequences, because there is an infinity of them. And to prove my point I will quote part of the submission of the Family Planning Centre of Montreal where we will realize once more—

[*English*]

**Mr. Woolliams:** May I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Calgary North on a point of order.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, we had some discussions concerning the taking of a vote on those matters that we have convered up to this time. All parties agreed. I do not know whether my friend has completed his argument, but in any event I wonder whether we are prepared to vote on the other motions now. Our agreement was to vote on the amendments on which the vote was deferred.

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I know that some hon. members would like to proceeded with the vote immediately.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The Minister of Justice on a point of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps the hon. member for Calgary North would repeat his intervention, because some hon. members did not hear it.

**Mr. Woolliams:** There was a definite agreement among the parties that we would take a vote on those matters which have been stood. This does not affect the hon. member who was speaking, unless he is winding up his remarks and wants the amendment voted on. But if this is not the case, it is my understanding that we should now vote on those matters which were stood.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may join in the point of order. I have had a few words with my Creditiste friends, and I think they are willing that we interrupt the debate at this point and take recorded votes on amendments Nos. 24 and 26. I understand, however, that they do not wish to end the debate on amendment No. 28 at this time. I think this is in keeping with the agreement that was arrived at among the parties. I would suggest, therefore, that the hon. member for Champlain might be given the privilege of adjourning the debate on this amendment at this point, so that he may come back to it on Friday, and that we have the bells rung so we may take the votes on amendments Nos. 24 and 26, as the hon. member for Calgary North suggested.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. Is the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) raising a point of order?

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. We heard the representations of the members of other parties when they said that a recorded vote should be taken on the amendments the study of which is already completed. We support that request for we want to participate in a positive way in the debate, even if some members on the other side do not agree.

However, I would like to point out that the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) has still a lot of things to say and that we would not like his time be cut for that. We would like him to resume his speech, after the adjournment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** It has been suggested that the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) should adjourn the debate so that he may be the first to have the floor when the sitting is resumed.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I propose the adjournment and I am very pleased to contribute in that way to bringing together the political parties in the house.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. We require the unanimous consent of the house to proceed in the manner suggested a short while ago. Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I had allowed the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to make our stand known. I would also like to point out that there is nothing folkloric about this

debate, in spite of what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said yesterday.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

By unanimous consent, consideration of amendment No. 28 is adjourned. The house will now revert to amendment No. 24 for the purpose of recording the division thereon. The question is on motion No. 24, (Mr. Woolliams for Mr. Valade) which reads:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the word "and" on line 5 on page 43 and the "period" after the word "practitioner" on line 8 on page 43 and inserting the following words: "and,

(e) that those means are employed before the period of implantation."

Is the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

The house divided on motion No. 24 (Mr. Woolliams, for Mr. Valade) which was negatived on the following division:

*Division*

YEAS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack
Asselin
Caouette
Comeau
Dinsdale
Dionne
Dumont
Flemming
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Grills
Laprise
La Salle
Latulippe
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Mazankowski
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rynard
Scott
Southam
Thompson—26.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Badanai
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Bell
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Broadbent
Brown
Buchanan
Burton
Caccia
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Clermont
Cobbe
Code
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Danforth
Danson
Davis
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Fairweather
Forest
Foster
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gilbert
Gillespie
Givens
Gleave
Goode
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Gundlock
Haidasz
Harding
Harkness
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howe
Hymmen
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Laflamme
Laing
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Lind
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacEachen
MacEwan
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
McCleave
McIntosh
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Mather
Mongrain
Monteith
Muir (Lisgar)
Munro
Murphy
Nesbitt
Noble
Noël
Nystrom
O'Connell
Orlikow
Otto
Ouellet
Penner
Perrault
Peters
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richardson
Ritchie
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rose
Roy (Timmins)
Ryan
Saltsman
Schreyer
Serré
Sharp
Skoberg
Smerchanski
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stewart (Cochrane)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thomson
Tolmie
Trudeau
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)

*Division*

Wahn
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Winch
Woolliams
Yanakis—147.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is now on motion No. 26 (Mr. Clermont) which reads:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or would be likely to" on line 4 on page 43.

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

• (6:00 p.m.)

**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:** Is it the wish of the House to proceed with the vote without the ringing of the bells?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

The house divided on motion No. 26 (Mr. Clermont) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack
Asselin
Caouette
Clermont
Comeau
Comtois
Dinsdale
Dionne
Dumont
Duquet
Flemming
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Grills
Laprise
La Salle
Latulippe
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Mazankowski
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Scott
Southam
Stewart (Cochrane)
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thompson—31.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Badanai
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Bell
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Broadbent
Brown
Buchanan
Burton
Caccia
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cantin
Chappell
Cobbe
Code
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Danforth
Danson
Davis
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Dubé
Émard
Fairweather
Forest
Foster
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gilbert
Gillespie
Givens
Gleave
Goode
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Gundlock
Haidasz
Harding
Harkness
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howe
Hymmen
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Korchinski
Laing
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Lind
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacEachen
MacEwan
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
McCleave
McIntosh
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Mather
Mongrain
Monteith
Muir (Lisgar)
Munro
Murphy
Nesbitt
Noble
Noël
Nystrom
O'Connell
Orlikow
Otto
Ouellet
Penner
Perrault
Peters
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richardson
Ritchie
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rose
Roy (Timmins)
Ryan
Saltsman
Schreyer
Serré
Sharp
Skoberg
Smerchanski
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stanfield
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Moncton)
Thomson
Tolmie
Trudeau
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Winch
Woolliams
Yanakis—143.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly on a question of privilege. In this afternoon's Ottawa *Citizen* there is a headline that reads: "Speaker Cuts Short 'Tenacious' N.D.P. Attack On Abortion Reforms". Obviously this is a mistake; it is not a correct reference to this party at all. If it is a reference at all, it is to another party. I think it is also unfair to Your Honour.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** It being after six o'clock this house stands adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

It being eleven minutes after six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

29180—520

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Thursday, May 1, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

## PRIVILEGE

### MR. MACQUARRIE—INFORMATION GIVEN TO PRESS BY MINISTER BEFORE DISCLOSURE TO PARLIAMENT

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege concerning the failure of the Postmaster General to table in this house the report of the consulting firm of Kates Peat Marwick and Company which was commissioned to study the workings of his department, and especially his action in discussing this matter with a reporter before making it available to members of this house.

In this morning's *Financial Post* the following appears:

> Communications Minister Eric Kierans is scheduled to table a remarkable document next week in the Commons.

There follows a commentary, and evidently an interpretation of this document by the minister. This growing tendency of members of the ministry to communicate to persons and groups outside this house information which should be properly conveyed to hon. members amounts to an erosion of the respect properly due from the executive to the people's representatives.

That this is not the first failure of the Postmaster General to give parliament information available to him is indicated by the fact that an earlier report of the same consulting firm was presented to the minister on November 19, 1968 and has not yet been tabled in the house or made available to members. On general principle I protest that such practices by ministers breach the privileges of parliament.

Any blockage in the flow of information to parliament in reference to the Post Office, a department about which there is currently such widespread and justifiable criticism and dissatisfaction among the Canadian public, is particularly reprehensible and indeed inexcusable.

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** As hon. members are aware, no one is more critical of the Post Office and of its operations than those who work for the Post Office. We examine its operations from a variety of different points of view. We intend to table the results of some of these studies.

The purpose of these various investigations and task forces is to enable us to find out our weaknesses and improve our service. We have already tabled some of these reports, some of which even criticize our own stamp designs. One of the reports mentioned when Mr. Baxter came in to see me concerned the environment in which the Post Office will have to operate throughout the next 25 years. I have read this report carefully. The firm commissioned to prepare it also analysed the probable impact of a changing environment on the present operation of the Post Office. In answering the questions put by Mr. Baxter I was armed with this type of information. I did say to Mr. Baxter that we intended to table this report. What is holding it up is this: We are getting it translated and I expect it will be completed by next week.

[*Translation*]

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### HEALTH, WELFARE AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

Seventh report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs—Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull).

[*Editor's Note: The text of the foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

### GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

#### RELEASE TO ARCHIVES OF RECORDS IN EXISTENCE FOR THIRTY YEARS

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce a policy to make available for research and other public use as large a portion of the records of the Canadian government prior to July 1, 1939 as would be consistent with the national interest. The cabinet secretariat and the departments and agencies of government are being asked to transfer to the Public Archives

official records which are more than 30 years old to be made available to the public under the normal rules of access in force in the Public Archives.

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Certain records will be exempted from public access, particularly those the release of which might adversely affect Canada's external relations, violate the right of privacy of individuals, or adversely affect the national security. However, it is the intention that a vast portion of Canada's records prior to mid-1939 will be transferred to the Public Archives during the current year, and that annual transfers be made in subsequent years.

While certain of the records to be made available to the public have already been transferred to the Public Archives, the majority are still in the hands of the cabinet secretariat and the various departments and agencies of government. The volume of files is such that it will take some time to screen and arrange for an orderly flow of documents to the Archives. Within these practical limitations, however, every effort will be made to provide public access to these papers as promptly as possible, beginning on July 1, 1969.

The general rule will be that, with the exceptions noted, all records over 30 years old will be transferred to the Archives and made available to the public. In addition, departments and agencies will be encouraged to transfer to the Archives records less than 30 years old, in so far as this would be consistent with the efficient operation of the departments or agencies involved. Although these more recent records would remain under the control of the minister concerned, they could be made available to the public under terms and conditions to be established by the responsible minister in consultation with the Dominion Archivist. As for records less than 30 years old and which are retained in the custody of departments and agencies, controlled access may be permitted in special cases, again under terms and conditions to be established by the minister in consultation with the Dominion Archivist.

[*English*]

Because of the nature of cabinet and cabinet committee documents and minutes, they will in no case be made available for public examination until they are 30 years old. Former Prime Ministers and ministers will, of course, be given access on request to such of those records as originated during their various periods of office, in order to refresh their memories.

Of particular interest in future years, beginning in 1970, will be the release of annual portions of records of the cabinet war committee for the period 1940 to 1945. In 1974, records of the deliberations of the cabinet will begin to be made available, the first formal recording of its proceedings having begun in early 1944.

In announcing this policy I should like to express the government's belief that it will meet with the approval of Canadian scholars, members of learned societies and others interested in the history of Canadian government. In a broader sense, it exemplifies the government's desire to stimulate interest and participation in the affairs of government by Canadians generally.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my approval of the statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who was kind and considerate enough to consult me, and I believe others, about this proposal which I hope will facilitate the work of scholars in our country. I do not know whether it will have any adverse effect upon journalists like Mr. Wilson and Mr. Westell, but subject to that sort of consideration I think it will certainly be widely approved in the country at large.

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure many members of the house will welcome the announcement made today by the Prime Minister on this very important subject. We feel that it is a step in the right direction that is considerably overdue. As some may recall, a bill was presented by a member on this side of the house at a former session urging something very much in the nature of what has now been put forward. While it is late and meagre, we do feel that action has been taken in the right direction.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, we, in the Ralliement Créditiste, approve the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who has just announced a new policy to make government papers, 30 years old or more, available for research purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the policy will enable men of letters and members of scientific societies in Canada to do their work much more easily and to write an accurate history of Canada.

[*English*]

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

U.S. PRESS RELEASE ON CANADIAN RECOGNITION OF MAINLAND CHINA—STATEMENT BY MINISTER ABOUT NIGERIA-BIAFRA HOSTILITIES—UNITED NATIONS INVOLVEMENT

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I rise for two purposes. The first is to table an exchange which took place at a press briefing given by the United States State Department spokesman on February 11, 1969, relating to the Canadian government's announcement of its intention to negotiate with the representatives of Peking for an exchange of diplomats; the second is to make a brief report, as requested by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), on the representations made by our ambassador in Lagos to the Nigerian government.

Representations Mr. Malone made included a reiteration of our concern at the reports of bombings of non-military targets in the rebel area, the question of a cease fire and ways of improving relief deliveries. General Gowon shared our concern at the reports of bombings of civilians and reaffirmed that strict orders had been given to avoid, where possible, civilian casualties. I am pleased to note that there has been a notable absence of reports of bombings for some time. As to a cease fire, it was confirmed that the situation with regard to a cease fire and a negotiated settlement remained unchanged. As I have told the house on many occasions, until conditions and terms exist which are acceptable to both disputants, prospects for an early cessation of hostilities will remain remote. With regard to relief, the High Commissioner reiterated the government's support for efforts to conclude agreed arrangements for relief deliveries by day into the Uli and Obilago airstrips.

I was also asked by the Leader of the Opposition about possible United Nations involvement. In that regard I believe it would be useful for the house to have the following excerpt from a press conference given by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on April 17 of this year. I quote:

> —the United Nations cannot be involved in a crisis situation which is declared by the member state concerned to be an internal matter under Article 2 (7). This point of view is endorsed and supported by the whole Organization of African Unity. So, in the face of this attitude by the Organization of African Unity, I do not believe that any member of the United Nations has any desire to inscribe the item, "The Situation in Nigeria", before a principal organ of the United Nations.
>
> If I may anticipate something, if any member state were to bring this item, "The Situation in Nigeria", before the Security Council or the United Nations General Assembly, I am sure that the item would not be inscribed on the agenda. So it does not make any difference whether any member state tries to inscribe this on the agenda or the Secretary General tries to inscribe it on the agenda. From a realistic point of view, any such attempt would not succeed because of the knowledge that the Organization of African Unity is against such a course as the inscription of an item on the agenda of either the Security Council or the United Nations General Assembly.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the information he has given to the house about suggestions made on behalf of the government of Canada to the government of Nigeria and for the statement he made about the United Nations. I cannot help feeling that here we have a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. As a member of the Commonwealth and of a group of civilized nations, it seems to me that Canada has a greater responsibility towards those suffering and dying in Nigeria than has so far been discharged. It is estimated that more than a million people have died as a result of that war.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government of this country should exercise its diligence in trying to organize, in consultation with other countries and particularly Commonwealth countries, an effort to terminate the war, bring about a ceasefire and a cessation of shipments of arms. They should make a real effort to terminate the suffering and dying that is going on in that country.

• (2:20 p.m.)

I am not minimizing the difficulties which exist, Mr. Speaker. I suggest in all seriousness that what is happening in Nigeria, the number who are dying as a direct result of the war is a very sad commentary indeed on the civilized nations of this world, of which this country has been proud to be part, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I say to the Secretary of State for External Affairs that his statement is totally unsatisfactory to those who are really concerned with seeking a solution to the problem in Nigeria and Biafra and seeking some alleviation of the terrible suffering by the people in Biafra.

First I wish to say to him, Mr. Speaker, that while I have the greatest respect for the Secretary General of the United Nations, his

word is not yet the last word on everything concerning that organization. Indeed I remind the Secretary of State for External Affairs that just about two years ago the Secretary General of the United Nations made a certain decision with regard to UNEF in the Middle East. Both the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs at that time did not hesitate to criticize that decision and action.

I am not satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that because the Secretary General of the United Nations, with his great experience and knowledge, says that something should be done a certain way, that this is the way it must be. I am not satisfied that it means that Canada or any other member of the United Nations should not make some attempt to have this matter discussed in the international forum. They should search for a possible cessation of the terrible fighting in Nigeria.

I did not have a copy of the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but as I listened I noted the fact that the Secretary General of the United Nations spoke about the Security Council and the United Nations General Assembly. I remind the minister that my colleagues and myself have asked him many times to inscribe this subject, not on the agenda of the Security General or General Assembly, but on the agenda of the Third Committee of the United Nations which deals with humanitarian, cultural and other matters. In my humble opinion, this matter should be put on the agenda of the Third Committee and discussed. This would be the starting point for an international consideration of the problem.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I am totally dissatisfied with the approach of our ambassador in Lagos. He has offered help under certain conditions. Canada is able to make assistance available now through various organizations for the building of the new airstrip which they are attempting to build in Biafra. There are also other ways to alleviate the suffering of those people.

I have said from time to time, and I now repeat the fact, that the civilized world has not reacted to the terrible fratricidal war in that country, the fact that a conflict like that can go on for two years—in two months it will be two years—with 1 million to 2 million people dying, mainly of hunger, and the civilized world keeps its hands off. All this reminds me of many instances in history where this kind of barbarity was permitted to go on, and everybody called non-intervention, with the result that the barbarity ended in colossal difficulties for the world as a whole. One of the matters of which the government cannot be proud is the constant excuses for inaction that the government has given in the case of the terrible war in Nigeria.



[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I believe everybody is deeply affected by what is happening in Nigeria.

However, everyone must at the same time recognize that the internal policy of that country is not the concern of Canada nor that of the United States.

Although some people protest because Canada does not go to Nigeria to re-establish peace and ask Nigeria to accept the Biafrans as they are, there are not many to protest, for example, against Russia invading Czechoslovakia and crushing those who want to be free.

Mr. Speaker, I say again that we would like to see an end to the Nigerian war. However, it does not come to an end and the only thing Canada can do, in my opinion, is to put before the United Nations an agreement proposal between the Biafrans and the Nigerian people. Their domestic policy is their own business.

In fact, we would not accept that these people interfere in ours. We are ourselves involved in domestic feuds, without bloodshed yet, but what assurance do we have that we will not be facing such situations in the future.

I say again that these countries' domestic policy is their own business, and that Canada, as a so-called peaceful nation, can encourage them to settle their differences and advise them, but it not desirable to interfere directly in their domestic policy, because that is no concern of ours.

[*English*]

## DRUGS

### ANNOUNCEMENT RESPECTING COMMITTEE INQUIRY INTO NON-MEDICAL USES

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the government plans to establish a committee of inquiry to examine into and make recommendations respecting the non-medical use of drugs and related substances in Canada.

The establishment of this committee of inquiry reflects the grave concern felt by the government at the expanding proportions of

the use of drugs and related substances for non-medical purposes. This committee will consist of five members and be directed to pursue the following objects: (a) to marshal from available sources, both in Canada and abroad, data and information comprising the present fund of knowledge concerning the non-medical use of sedative, stimulant, tranquilizing, hallucinogenic and other psychotropic drugs or substances;

(b) to report on the current state of medical knowledge respecting the effect of the drugs and substances referred to in (a);

(c) to inquire into and report on the motivation underlying the non-medical use referred to in (a);

(d) to inquire into and report on the social, economic, educational and philosophical factors relating to the use for non-medical purposes of the drugs and substances referred to in (a) and in particular on the extent of the phenomenon, the social factors that have led to it, the age groups involved, and problems of communication; and

(e) to inquire into and recommend with respect to the ways or means by which the federal government can act, alone or in its relations with government at other levels, in the reduction of the dimensions of the problems involved in such use.

The committee will have the authority contained in Part 2 of the Inquiries Act and be assisted, as required, by officials of appropriate departments and agencies of government. It will be authorized to invite, receive and consider submissions from organizations and individuals.

It is anticipated that the committee will make an official report of its progress within six months of its establishment and periodically thereafter, with a final report to be presented within two years.

• (2:30 p.m.)

**Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth):** Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to show our commendation of the move made by the minister. I think this is a necessary and worth-while endeavour to set up this committee. I believe also the reporting which is supposed to commence in six months is a good move. We will certainly follow the actions of the committee with interest.

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, we in this party also welcome the news that a committee of inquiry is to be established. Across this country there is a great deal of concern about the use of drugs of this kind. Unfortunately very little hard evidence is available yet to substantiate some of the claims made in connection with certain drugs. I believe the time is long overdue for this investigation. I would suggest however, in view of the fact that this inquiry committee is just being set up now it would be a very desirable thing if the minister would delay passage of Bill S-15, or at least those sections having to do with hallucinogenic drugs, particularly marijuana, until such time as the evidence on which the legislation is based is in.

A number of us are not by any means convinced there is evidence available yet to support severe sentences such as are envisaged in this legislation, particularly in respect of marijuana. I am not in favour of the widespread use of marijuana, but I feel we would be in a much better position to proceed with such legislation if this committee of inquiry would report before the legislation is passed.

## PRIVATE BILLS

### ATLANTIC MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY—MOTION TO EXTEND FILING LIMIT

**Mr. Philip G. Givens (York West)** moved:

That the petitions of The Canada North-west Land Company (Limited), of Nova Scotia Savings & Loan Company, of Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and that of Thomas Ledwell Doyle, of the City of Moncton, New Brunswick and six other persons, praying for the passing of an Act incorporating "Atlantic Mutual Life Assurance Company" and, in French, "La Compagnie mutuelle d'assurance-vie Atlantique", filed after the time limit under Standing Order 90, be referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders together with the Twelfth and Thirteenth Reports of the Clerk of Petitions thereon presented to the House on Friday, April 25, 1969 and Thursday, May 1, 1969 for any recommendations the Committee deems advisable.

Motion agreed to.

## TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

### BELL CANADA—MOTION TO DISCUSS ALLEGED DISREGARD OF INVESTMENT RETURN REGULATIONS

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to ask the house to agree to a motion regarding Bell Canada. Late yesterday, Bell Canada issued its quarterly report showing that it has exceeded for the second time the 6.8 per cent limit placed on its

return on invested capital by the federal government's regulatory board. The 7 per cent reported by Bell Canada is a clear case not only of disrespect for the legal process, but also of continued exploitation of the Canadian taxpayer. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Schreyer):

That the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications be authorized to meet forthwith and proceed as quickly as possible to investigate, analyse, and hear from officials of Bell Canada on their apparent disregard of the rate of return limits placed on them by the government's regulatory agency.

**Mr. Speaker:** According to the terms of Standing Order 43 this motion requires unanimous consent of the house. Is there such consent?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** The motion cannot be put to the house.

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ON INDIAN RESERVES—DEBATING TIME

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the fact that today is an allotted day the house normally at five o'clock would have proceeded to deal with the item of business Notices of Motions. The first such item had only one minute remaining to it. In other words, a vote likely would have taken place with regard to the production of a document entitled "Local Government on Indian Reserves".

In view of the fact that here in Ottawa this week there is a meeting of native Indian delegations from all across Canada, I wonder whether the house would be agreeable to making a special order to deal with that item at five o'clock and add to the balance of the day any time so taken by the vote on that motion, so that it would not interfere with the allotted day debate. I would so request.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I think we would be willing to accept this, provided any order made contains a provision that any time required to take the vote would be added to the time for the debate now proceeding under the appropriate Standing Order. It is my understanding there are so many people with complaints against the government's agricultural policy that we should give them all an opportunity to be heard.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** In light of what the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has said, I do not think we should interrupt the established proceedings for today.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** Let it be shown that the Liberals object.

## IMMIGRATION

### ALLEGED SECRET GUIDELINES NEGATING EFFECTIVENESS OF REGULATIONS CONCERNING U.S. DESERTERS—CHARGE BY UNITED CHURCH MODERATOR

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to inquire whether the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) intends to make a statement to this house as a result of his exchange with the moderator of the United Church and certain allegations made by the moderator and his reply.

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder whether this is a proper point of order. It seems to me that the hon. member might wish to ask this question during the question period. I realize that by that time we would have passed the period for motions although the consent of the house could then be obtained to revert to motions. However, the point having been made perhaps the minister might reply.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I did have an exchange of telegrams with the moderator of the United Church. I think both documents speak for themselves and that further comment on my part is unnecessary.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

### MAINLAND CHINA—U.S. REACTION TO CANADIAN RECOGNITION

**Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) reiterated on at least two occasions his intention to table a statement by the Secretary of State for the United States, Mr. Rogers, dealing with Canada's negotiations and attitude on the recognition of China. He stated that Mr. Rogers statement had been published. He has tabled a state department

release of February 11 without identifying it as a statement by Mr. Rogers. I would ask if it is in fact the Rogers statement to which he referred on two occasions or whether it is a statement by a subordinate official. If it is a statement by a subordinate official, I ask him now if he will table the Rogers statement if in fact the Rogers statement exists at all. I also ask him again whether there was a note from the United States expressing grave concern at Canada's move and whether he will inform the house concerning its contents and his government's reply if any.

• (2:40 p.m.)

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, it had been my impression that the statement which I tabled in the house today had in fact been made by the Secretary of State for the United States, himself, because this was what was in my mind when I answered the questions the other day. On inquiry I found that the secretary of state himself had not made any statement whatever on this subject, and therefore I thought I should table the statement that came from the state department, presumably representing the views of the secretary of state even if he was not the spokesman.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might say a few words about the order of business for tomorrow and next week. I think there might be general agreement that any recorded division required on the amendments to the Criminal Code be not held tomorrow, but rather that the divisions be postponed until Monday next. If this is agreeable to the house it might be possible to make such an order. That is, should the consideration of any amendments at the report stage of Bill C-150 be concluded tomorrow, any recorded division required thereon shall be deferred until Monday next. As I say, perhaps if there is general agreement that could be made an order of the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it so ordered?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### INDIAN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF INTENTION AS TO LEGISLATION

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, but in his absence I will direct it to the Minister without Portfolio from Port Arthur. I should like to ask him whether it is his intention to introduce legislation in the month of June to amend or repeal the Indian Act, or is it merely the intention to issue a general statement of government policy in June? I ask this question, sir, in view of the various statements made by the minister on this subject both in the house and at this week's conference.

**Hon. Robert Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** The whole review of our policy with regard to the Indian people is the subject of intense examination now. As the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has stated in the house on previous occasions, that policy, including any reference to the Indian Act or any component part of it, will be made known within a few weeks time, we hope and expect in the month of June.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since it seems to be very difficult to get a straight answer to what was intended to be a straight question, can the minister say whether it is the intention of the department to repeal or amend the Indian Act, or is it the intention simply to make a statement of policy during the month of June?

**Mr. Andras:** No final decision on that matter has yet been made.

RESOURCES TO PREPARE RESEARCH MATERIAL ON ACT AMENDMENT

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister and the department accept the proposal of the representatives of the Indian people that they should be given the resources necessary for research to allow them to prepare and submit a draft Indian Act, rather than merely to comment on a draft that may be presented to them by the department?

**Hon. Robert Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, this proposal was made

by the Indian representatives attending the consultation meetings here in Ottawa yesterday and it is under serious examination. An answer will be made shortly.

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the minister would not consider it a better course to deal first with the legitimate grievances of the native people before starting to play around with amending any laws?

MEETING OF INDIAN DELEGATES WITH STANDING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the cancellation of the meeting between the Indian delegates attending the conference in Ottawa and the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, will there be a later opportunity before the departure of this group from Ottawa to meet with the committee?

**Hon. Robert Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** When the delegation met with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development at the beginning of this conference on Monday morning, the minister, I think quite appropriately, made it quite clear that the agenda, the format, the items for discussion and the meetings with everybody concerned were to be decisions made by the Indian delegates themselves. When the matter of meeting with the standing committee was referred to them yesterday afternoon, they chose to defer a decision on that. I think we would have to consult with the chairman of the committee and the Indian delegates themselves as to whether they wish to meet with the committee before the end of the session. It would be entirely up to them and subject to the convenience of the committee.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

GOVERNMENT POLICY ON TREATY RIGHTS

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have one further supplementary question. Will the minister give a firm commitment—to the same sort of applause, I hope—as to the government's policy concerning treaty rights before the Indian people are asked to prepare or approve a draft Indian Act, and if so, when can we expect that kind of firm commitment from the government?

**Hon. Robert Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** I think we can give a firm commitment that the treaty rights of Indians, their feelings about treaty rights, and other such matters, are the subject of intense examination. Their feelings have been made very well known to the government, and a major portion of the review of the policy that is under way.

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the minister a question with reference to treaty rights. Can he say whether the review and consideration that is taking place would include the bringing of Indian treaties before parliament—treaties that were made between the Indians and the British Crown prior to Confederation, so that the Indian rights under those sacred treaties shall be upheld, to use the words of some treaties, "so long as the sun shines and the rivers flow?"

**Mr. Andras:** I do not think I can elaborate on the answer I just gave except to say that this is a difficult and grievous problem that has been with us for at least a hundred years and through the tenure of the right hon. gentleman's term of office. I think he introduced certain measures which were commendable, and we are trying to do our best to do the same.

**An hon. Member:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) always applauds. At some time he will be identified by the Prime Minister.

When the minister said that these treaty rights have been under consideration or in doubt for a hundred years, would he not agree that it was within very recent years that the Supreme Court of Canada decided that the treaties made previous to Confederation were not binding on the government of Canada or the people?

**Mr. Andras:** I do not think I could elaborate any further, except to say again that the subject is under intense examination.

I think that the policy statements which will come in a few weeks' time will clarify the matter and answer the right hon. gentleman's question.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** They are meaningless.

## THE MINISTRY

INQUIRY AS TO REPLACEMENT FOR FORMER MINISTER OF TRANSPORT

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my

question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the resignation of the former minister of transport took effect at midnight last night, has a Minister of Transport been appointed, and if not, how soon does the Prime Minister expect such an appointment to be made? In the interim period what minister will be responsible for matters relating to transport and housing.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** The Minister without Portfolio who was acting minister remains acting minister, Mr. Speaker, until I make an appointment.

## HOUSING

POSSIBILITY OF REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the government proposes to raise the ceiling on the mortgages that are outstanding and on the amount of money that can be lent by the treasury to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, is it the intention of the government to ask parliament for any additional appropriations for housing over and above those that are now outlined in the estimates?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I do not know the answer to the question. I will consider it and see if it will be necessary to present additional estimates to the house.

[*Translation*]

## AGRICULTURE

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME TO FARMERS OF SAGUENAY-LAC ST. JEAN AREA

**Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct to the Minister of Agriculture another question which has been asked to the four members from the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area—and I am sure of them—at a meeting with the farmers.

Could the minister tell the house whether it is his intention to allow the C.F.U. in the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area to be officially accredited as the negotiation unit for questions regarding our area, especially as far as the guaranteed income of farmers is concerned?

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder whether the hon. member's question could not be asked during the debate which is to begin within a moment. If it is urgent, however, we could answer it immediately. But I point out to the hon. member that it would be better to wait for the debate to start.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

## IMMIGRATION

ALLEGED SECRET GUIDELINES NEGATING EFFECTIVENESS OF REGULATIONS CONCERNING U.S. DESERTERS—CHARGE BY UNITED CHURCH MODERATOR

**Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the continuing charges that Canada's immigration policy operates in certain areas on secret guidelines, which is, as termed by the moderator of the United Church an immoral and intolerable evasion of public responsibility, and the minister's public reply that such statements are ill-founded and erroneous to the point of irresponsibility, will the minister inform the house as to what actually is the policy of the Department of Manpower and Immigration with regard to U.S. immigrants?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the policy has been made clear on a number of occasions and I am afraid it would not be possible to deal with it on the orders of the day. We do admit members of the armed services of other countries. If such persons apply in this country and satisfy normal immigration criteria they are admitted regardless of military status. Since January, 1968 a number of such persons have been admitted.

The hon. member should bear in mind that until January, 1968, no member of the armed forces of any country could be admitted without discharge papers. With respect to applicants at the border or overseas, the immigration officer is expected to exercise overall discretion in determining admissibility.

**Mr. Thompson:** In view of the seriousness of the charges being made, would the minister consider issuing a white paper or some document explaining the background in more detail than he has yet given, and table it in this house?

**Mr. MacEachen:** The estimates of my department were under consideration in the house not so long ago and we did have an opportunity to discuss the question on that

occasion. I was prepared to answer all inquiries. The estimates of the department will be before the committee very shortly and I will be delighted to answer any questions on this subject, and particularly to deal with the unfounded charges contained in the telegram from the moderator of the United Church.

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister one or two questions. I should like to ask him, first, whether in view of the fact that he has made a statement to the press by way of a press release, and has in the past refused to make a statement on the subject on motions, he would now be ready to make such a statement in the house, provided hon. members were prepared to revert immediately to motions? If the minister is not ready to do this now, will he undertake to make such a statement on motions tomorrow?

**Mr. MacEachen:** I do not think it is good procedure to expect a statement in the house on the occasion of a reply to a telegram.

**Mr. Lewis:** In view of the fact that the minister made one statement about these alleged guidelines on March 5, to which his reply to the moderator of the United Church referred, and another statement in a press release yesterday, I ask him again whether he proposes to disregard the rights of parliament and the right of the people—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. That is, of course, not an admissible question.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** The minister indicated the other day that he would not make a statement with regard to this policy. Then he issued a press release. Surely he is prepared to read that press release in the house and table it so that it may become a parliamentary document? Surely a statement in this house should prevail over a press release?

**Mr. MacEachen:** The press release should not be developed into an historic document. It was merely a copy of the reply I made to the moderator of the United Church. The telegram from the moderator has been made public and I felt that the reply ought to be made public, too. It was made public in the form of a press release. I would be delighted to table copies of the press release. I believe they have been made available, but I will be delighted to table them.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

[*Translation*]

## CRIMINAL CODE

REQUEST FOR REFERENDUM ON BILL C-150

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the great number of requests from thousands of Canadians of all classes and religions, would the Prime Minister look into the possibility of calling a referendum on the famed omnibus bill?

[*English*]

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

NEWFOUNDLAND—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT BY MINISTER

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** I have a question for the Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister now inform the house when an announcement may be expected concerning the proposed regional development program for Newfoundland—I hope the hon. gentleman does not think I said "Prince Edward Island" this time—bearing in mind the serious financial difficulties facing that province? I ask this question in all sincerity because this is a very critical situation.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has asked his question.

[*Later:*]

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister is ready, now, to answer the question I put to him. Perhaps I could repeat it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I gather the minister is now ready to reply to the question put to him by the hon. member a few moments ago. I assume he heard it.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, my department is in constant touch with the Newfoundland government to find the best ways possible of helping the province and promoting its economic development.

[*English*]

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** I am glad to know the minister is alert to this serious problem. My supplementary question is based on a statement made in Newfoundland yesterday by the premier of that province to the effect that if he does not get some

action from the minister and from the department soon he will withdraw his support of the Liberal party—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That is not the first time he has said that.

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** Can the minister assure us that when he does arrive at the nature of the program of development for Newfoundland he will honour the house with his statement first, before giving it to Canada's only living war lord of Confederation?

## AIR CANADA

STRIKE OF MECHANICS—DEPARTMENTAL INTERVENTION AS CATALYST

**Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova):** I have a question for the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. In view of the reported suggestion by one of the parties concerned that the Department of Labour be the catalyst initiating future talks concerning the Air Canada dispute, would the minister tell us whether he intends to follow this suggestion in order that the parties may resume negotiations as soon as possible?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** As I have indicated on one or two occasions the Department of Labour would be very pleased to be a medium of communication through which both parties could resume negotiations. The appropriate time however at which to resume these negotiations, and the moment at which I intend to provide this medium of communication, is when both sides have convinced me, either privately or in writing, that such talks would be fruitful. In other words, if both parties retain such rigid positions as they have so far shown on monetary issues, talks at this moment would in my opinion serve no purpose.

**Mr. MacEwan:** Has the minister received requests from the parties concerned to set a time for continuing negotiations?

**Mr. Mackasey:** There has been no formal request either from union or management for any assistance from the Department of Labour since the talks broke off last Sunday. If they were to contact me I would be very pleased, but I reiterate to them that it is no use having talks unless there is some modification by both sides of the positions they established so firmly on Sunday evening.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## CONSUMER AFFAIRS

HEARING AIDS—INQUIRY AS TO AVAILABILITY OF REPORT

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** My question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Nearly two weeks ago I directed to the minister a question prompted by the action of an Ontario judge in convicting a hearing aid dealer for defrauding the public by selling $45 hearing aids for $360. I inquired when the minister's investigation into the hearing aid racket would be completed. In the minister's absence the question was taken as notice by his Parliamentary Secretary. I wonder whether the hon. gentleman is now ready to answer.

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** As I indicated in a written answer to a question on the order paper, I hoped to have a report ready by June. However, I am now advised that I shall probably not receive it by June due to the large number of associations and groups organized on behalf of the hard of hearing, which wanted to submit briefs and prepare submissions for consideration by the people working on the report.

[*Translation*]

## CRIMINAL CODE

REQUEST FOR REFERENDUM ON BILL C-150

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister.

Since he would not even consider replying to the question asked by the hon. member for Témiscamingue, can he tell us whether a referendum on the omnibus bill would have the same effect as the one that was held by his excellent friend the former President of the French republic?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. That question is hypothetical and therefore out of order.

• (3:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

## CANADA DAY

SUGGESTED HOLIDAY TO ADVANCE NATIONAL UNITY

**Mr. Colin Gibson (Hamilton-Wentworth):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. In view of the urgent need to advance national unity and display our Canadian flag, will the Secretary of State announce a holiday in June or July to be

known as Canada Day, as requested by Kinsmen's Clubs and other agencies throughout Canada?

## WATER RESOURCES

### INCLUSION OF POLLUTION CONTROL IN NEW MEASURE

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In the water act that is to be brought in shortly, is it the intention of the government to include provisions concerning pollution control?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, it is our intention to bring the water act into the house for first reading before the end of the session. Hon. members will then see what government policy has seen fit to include in the measure.

**Mr. Aiken:** A supplementary question. Does the government intend in one way or another to take the lead in a pollution control program for this country?

## IMMIGRATION

### ALLEGED SECRET GUIDELINES—POSSIBLE APPEARANCE OF MINISTER BEFORE STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration arising from an earlier answer he gave. Do I take it from the minister's answer that he would be glad to appear before the Labour, Manpower and Immigration committee to answer any suggestion that this negates his earlier commitment to the house to submit a statement to it based on his current review of immigration policy?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. This question appears to me to be an argument, but perhaps the minister might like to reply to it to the extent that it is a question.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to appear before the committee and subject myself to any questions. That does not rule out the possibility of a statement being made in the house when the review that I have undertaken has been examined and a decision reached by the government.

[Mr. Gibson.]

**Mr. Broadbent:** A further supplementary question. Could the minister indicate with any degree of precision when this review will be completed?

**Mr. MacEachen:** My hon. friend knows that reviews have uncertain terminal dates.

## FISHERIES

### REPRESENTATIONS TO UNITED NATIONS SUPPORTING CONTINENTAL SHELF POLICY

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In a recent speech made in Seattle the Minister of Fisheries suggested that each nation's authority over its commercial fishing—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It seems to me that too many members are getting into the habit of prefacing their questions with references to statements made outside the house or reported in the press. According to the rules, questions have to be asked directly. If hon. members would go to the trouble of reading the precedents, particularly Beauchesne, as to the form questions ought to take, they would see it is out of order and not in proper form to ask questions in this way. The hon. member should ask his question directly.

**Mr. Crouse:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the pronouncement of the Minister of Fisheries, has the Secretary of State for External Affairs made representations to the United Nations in support of a continental shelf fisheries policy?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the whole question of the law of the sea in all its aspects is before the United Nations in various committees. There the Canadian point of view was expressed on a number of questions. The question of jurisdiction over fisheries, as the hon. member knows, is now a very active one in Canada. Indeed, the Minister of Fisheries has proposed that there should be some new laws and international approaches to this subject, and I hope that they will get widespread support, including the support of hon. members opposite.

**Mr. Crouse:** A supplementary question. Is it the minister's intention to make representations to the Warsaw meeting of the 14-country international commission on the northwest Atlantic fisheries, which meets in June,

requesting support for a continental shelf fisheries policy?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. If we are dealing with an event which will take place in the month of June, I would think that the question might be placed on the order paper.

## CONSUMER AFFAIRS

### INQUIRY AS TO SETTING UP OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, since the minister has been speaking about activity, I wonder when we may expect the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to announce the appointment of the commission relating to prices which was forecast as long ago as last December and about which I have asked umpteen times in the house, but with no result?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, as I have said a number of times, I welcome the interest and support of the Leader of the Opposition in regard to this commission, which I hope to announce shortly.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

### PASSPORTS—EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS IN PROCESSING

**Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. To further speed up the processing of passport applications, would he take advantage of the availability of students for summer employment and place the department temporarily on a two or three shift basis?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I have been talking with the administration about measures of this kind. There are some very real difficulties involved, because of the limitations on a number of key personnel, in the proposal to have shifts. We have already moved to an overtime basis and I have asked the director to consider whether he could move to at least a two shift basis. This is under serious consideration.

### DIPLOMATIC EXCHANGE WITH THE VATICAN

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, today is May Day and I should like to address my question to the Prime Minister. It arises from the May Day message of His Holiness Pope Paul VI, calling upon civil governments everywhere to seek to stop the exploitation of man by man. Has the Prime Minister sufficient feeling about this matter to want to respond in some appropriate way?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have sufficient feeling about it to respond, and I hope that we will have the support of the hon. member's party when we take further steps to open up negotiations with Vatican representatives.

[*Later:*]

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether his comment a moment ago indicates that the government of Canada has decided to proceed with an exchange of representatives with the Vatican.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, as the house knows, we opened this question for debate some months ago in this country and have received representations from all sides. What I indicated a moment ago was that I welcomed this additional support from the N.D.P.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Prime Minister what is the score in this debate at the present time?

### MAINLAND CHINA—U.S. PROTEST NOTE RESPECTING CANADIAN RECOGNITION

**Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Did Canada receive a note from the United States expressing strong reservations with regard to Canada's intention to open relations with China, and was that note replied to by the minister or any official of the government?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in reply to a similar question, I would have to check the records. The Secretary of State of the United States made oral representations to me and I gave the Canadian government point of view. Even if such representations did exist, I would not table them, of course; they would be privileged documents.

**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister be so kind as to check the records, as he suggested, and to advise the house and the Canadian people?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

[*Translation*]

## CRIMINAL CODE

REPRESENTATIONS ABOUT ABORTION AND HOMOSEXUALITY

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** I would like to put a question to the Prime Minister. Did he receive a petition signed by more than 70,000 family heads concerning abortion and homosexuality?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I did not receive such a petition, Mr. Speaker, for the whole debate is taking place in the house. In my opinion, the members were elected to represent the people and it is their duty to express their views.

**Mr. Fortin:** I would like to put a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As it is very likely that the Prime Minister will receive this petition, does he intend to read it at least?

[*English*]

## PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER

APPOINTMENT OF OMBUDSMAN

**Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice and it is direct. When does the minister expect to introduce legislation to establish the office of ombudsman? I ask him now because yesterday an ombudsman was appointed in Quebec and last week one was appointed in Hawaii. I think the federal government should follow suit.

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member certainly gets around. The whole review of the rights of the citizen against the administration and the bureaucracy is being pursued actively by the department from the point of view of administrative law and the structure to implement it. I cannot add anything more at present.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

DECISION OF DESIGN COMMITTEE ON NATO COMMEMORATIVE ISSUE

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Postmaster General. Did his recently appointed design advisory committee advise him on the department's current official cancellation message which notes the 20th anniversary of NATO, or did this commemoration stem directly and solely from the minister's enthusiasm?

[Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys).]

## IMMIGRATION

ALLEGED SECRET GUIDELINES—POSSIBLE APPEARANCE OF UNITED CHURCH MODERATOR BEFORE STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and is supplementary to others which have been asked this afternoon. Considering the seriousness of the minister's charge, that the moderator of the United Church of Canada has indulged in irresponsibilities, and in view of the minister's offer to appear before the committee when his estimates are considered, would he also favour an invitation being extended to Dr. McClure, so that he may appear before that committee as well?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, that is up to the committee.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I asked whether the minister would favour the invitation being given.

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

APPLICATION OF S.O.68(1) TO INTRODUCE MEASURE THROUGH MOTION FOR COMMITTEE

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio from Port Arthur relating to questions already asked on several occasions. In view of the serious situation that has developed in attempts to obtain new legislation dealing with Indians, who are reluctant and hesitant about accepting legislation prepared by the government, would the minister and his colleagues consider making use of Standing Order 68 (1) which provides that a bill may be introduced upon a motion to appoint a committee to prepare and bring it in? If the Indian people are given an opportunity to be consulted and to engage in research, we might be able to bring forward legislation within a short time by this means.

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, part of the review is consideration of the best methods of providing opportunities for consultation between the parties. The hon. member's suggestion is worthy and will be given full consideration.

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

"DON MESSER'S JUBILEE"—STATEMENT BY MINISTER OUTLINING REASONS FOR DISCONTINUANCE

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State. Has the C.B.C. decided to stop fiddling around and leave that to a master entertainer?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, I had a conversation with officials of the C.B.C. and I can now state the reply. It is that the C.B.C.'s decision to discontinue the program on the nation-wide network was made after a careful review of several factors, including the diminishing size and nature of the program's audience, the desirability of change to improve the over-all schedule and the potential of the program "Singalong Jubilee" from Halifax which will have a more flexible format. While the C.B.C. recognizes the great contribution made by the Don Messer program over the years, it feels that the proposed change is in the best interest of the over-all network schedule. That was the C.B.C.'s answer, Mr. Speaker.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame.

## COMMUNICATIONS

BELL CANADA—ALLEGED DISREGARD OF INVESTMENT RETURN REGULATIONS

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Postmaster General. Does his department intend to make representations to the Canadian Transport Commission and bring to its attention the failure of Bell Telephone to limit its profit to the 6.8 per cent authorized by the Board of Transport Commissioners, or will it ask Bell to reduce the rates it charges customers?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Orlikow:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister's department oppose the application of Bell Telephone to the Canadian Transport Commission to increase its profit margin to 9 per cent?

**Mr. Kierans:** Mr. Speaker, the C.T.C. was given power by this house. It is the appropriate body to make decisions. Its members have the ability to make judgments and decisions on their own.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister of Communications not consider that he has a responsibility to the house and to this country to see that the order of the Board of Transport Commissioners is carried out?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest that the question as asked is argumentative.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I put the question another way. Since the profit margin for Bell Telephone has been set at 6.8 per cent, does the minister intend to take any action about that ceiling being violated?

**Mr. Kierans:** Mr. Speaker, parliament has entrusted the Canadian Transport Commission with power, authority and responsibility in this matter. If the house wishes to take away that power and responsibility I suppose an appropriate bill would have to be introduced.

## DRUGS

REQUEST FOR PERSONNEL OF COMMITTEE INQUIRING INTO NON-MEDICAL USES

**Mr. R. L. Whiting (Halton):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is he now in a position to name the members of the commission who are to study the use and abuse of drugs?

**Mr. MacInnis:** He ought to be.

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** No, Mr. Speaker, not at the moment. The government is actually considering the membership of the inquiry. I hope in the near future to be in a position to advise the hon. member and the house about the composition of the committee of inquiry.

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS

**Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. It relates to the statement he made on Tuesday about a program to provide summer employment for students. Are steps being taken to allocate students for farm assistance to offset the shortage created by the cut-back in foreign students who would otherwise be

available under the auspices of the International Exchange Association?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, we have continued the agricultural exchange program but we have reduced the numbers involved because we want to provide employment opportunities for Canadian students. The concrete step we are taking is to make these job offers that become available first to our Canadian students so that they will have the first chance.

## EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—PROPOSALS TO PREVENT STARVATION

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In light of reports of increased starvation in Biafra resulting from the fall of the city of Umuahia and in light of indications that there is likely to be a long war, has the government of Canada any new proposals to alleviate the increased starvation?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think the hon. member is asking for a rather general statement. We have almost reached the end of the question period. Perhaps the hon. member might put his question in such a way as to invite the minister to make a statement on another occasion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice but I see that he just left his seat.

[*English*]

## AIR CANADA

STRIKE OF MECHANICS—COMMUNICATIONS REQUESTING GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

**Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour which is supplementary to the one asked by the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacEwan) relating to the Air Canada strike. Will the minister say whether he has received letters and telegrams from the Canadian people asking him to take action on the strike, and settle it?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder whether the question as asked is proper. I do not think it is proper to ask simply whether the minister has received letters, telegrams or representations.

**Mr. Allmand:** May I rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I received three telegrams suggesting that I join the New Democratic party, one suggesting that I was a communist, three others, I believe, suggesting compulsory arbitration, and several serious telegrams from other groups of people. Certain union groups within Air Canada are protesting the use of non-union personnel within the company. That, I think, is hardly conducive to good industrial relations for the future within the company.

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** Are we to take it from the minister's answer, Mr. Speaker, that he will be activated and stimulated in proportion to the number of letters and telegrams he receives from Canadians in such a national emergency?

**Mr. Mackasey:** It will take more than a telegram to get me to join the N.D.P.

## THE MINISTRY

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER FOR YORK WEST

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Is he now prepared to appoint the hon. member for York West to the cabinet?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member has asked that question. It is such a refreshing change from the endless questions he has asked about Devco. I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition and the friends of the United Mine Workers have finally exercised greater control over the members of the Conservative party, particularly the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond. I understand the union has scorned his destructive attitude toward—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Stanfield:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago Your Honour suggested a proper course of conduct to a member of the opposition. I suggest the answer given by the Prime Minister was possibly amusing—I do not know.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Did you think the question was serious?

**Mr. Stanfield:** I was about to rise at the time Your Honour made the suggestion to the hon. member to suggest very seriously that ministers and the Prime Minister might set an example to the rest of us in the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. MacInnis:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the Prime Minister asking whether my question was serious or not? If he does not think the appointment of the hon. member for York West is a serious matter and if he does not believe me, then he should ask the member for York West.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question period expired some moments ago.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to add to the point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I do so by drawing Your Honour's attention to a portion of Standing Order 39(1). It deals with this question and I quote an important part of it:

—but in putting any such question or in replying to the same no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain the same;—

I submit that Your Honour is perfectly right in calling on members who ask questions to comply with that part of the Standing Order, and I think ministers should be asked to do the same.

**Mr. Trudeau:** On a point of order—

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder whether there is any point in pursuing the matter much further? It is obvious the rules apply to members on both sides of the house, either members of the opposition or members on the government side asking questions of ministers. I am sure hon. members realize that the rules, and particularly the rule referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, apply to cabinet ministers. I thank hon. members who from day to day try to assist the Chair respecting this rule.

## TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

REQUEST FOR DEBATE ON FIFTH AND SIXTH REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Before the orders of the day are called, Mr. Speaker, would you permit me to direct a question to the government house leader concerning the business of the house? In view of the fact that the motions for concurrence have not been passed by the house in regard to two reports, the fifth and sixth, of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications and, more particularly, as the Transport and Communications Committee has not met since early last week, will the government house leader inform the house when he intends to bring forward these two measures for debate?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, it is of obvious importance to the house and parliament generally for the current debate on Bill C-150 to be brought to an end. The equivalent of 15 sitting days has been devoted to the second reading and report stage of the omnibus bill. Until the filibuster on this matter can be brought to an end, it is impossible to plan any of the future business of the house for the balance of this session.

**Mr. McGrath:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, each time this question is directed to the government house leader he refers to a filibuster. It is a legitimate debate. I remind the house leader that many Liberal members have participated in that debate, as well as members of the opposition.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think we should call orders of the day.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE CAPITAL TO AGRICULTURE

**Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex)** moved:

That in the opinion of this house the government has failed to deal with the seriously deteriorating net income for Canadian agriculture, as a result of which farmers in all parts of Canada are unable to obtain the necessary operating capital to finance the 1969-70 crop year.

**Mr. Baldwin:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before the debate begins I wish to advise Your Honour there have been discussions among members with regard to the course of conduct of this debate. I am happy to propose now for the consideration of the house an amendment to the appropriate Standing Order so that the length of speeches would be limited in this way: The first speaker for each party to have 20 minutes and thereafter each speaker to be limited to 10 minutes. This would permit a wider participation in the debate. I am sure it would not

detract from the strength and value of the debate. It may well be that the house will accept this proposal.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** I take it that the members of the opposition would like to hear from my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, at some length with respect to the government's proposals. I wonder whether the proposed amendment could be amended by stipulating that the minister might be given the opportunity to speak for 40 minutes and otherwise the rule would apply as suggested by the hon. member?

**Mr. Baldwin:** I recognize the seriousness of the subject, but this proposal would probably prevent three members of the minister's own party from having the opportunity to speak. The whole purpose is to have wider participation. I am sure the minister would be glad to give members of his party who would be brave enough to participate in the debate an opportunity to say what he otherwise would have said in the additional 30 minutes.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I misunderstood the motion. My understanding was that the opposition wanted to hear the government's proposals in this regard. I regret the fact that my colleague is not to be given the extra time.

**Mr. Baldwin:** He is entitled to 30 minutes in the debate as the Standing Order is now. Surely he can contract the 30 minutes to 20 minutes. This is all we are asking. If this cannot be accepted, the proposition must fail.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** The Minister of Agriculture is prepared to agree to this. I must say I regret that his time is to be cut down in this way, but we are prepared to agree.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to those concerned in this part of the house. Could we agree on 30 minutes for the first spokesman of the Conservative Party, 30 minutes for the minister, 20 minutes for the spokesmen of the other two parties and 10 minutes for the balance of the speakers?

**Mr. Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Danforth:** Mr. Speaker, the motion of non-confidence before the house this afternoon was not drafted without a great deal of serious consideration of all of its implications. Certainly there is no conceivable opportunity to defeat the government with its numerical superiority in the house at this time. But if the motion serves to draw to Your Honour's attention and that of hon. members opposite the very serious plight of all segments of the agricultural industry today, it will have served its purpose.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I am supported in moving this motion, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Southam). The reason I asked for his support, which was granted quite eagerly, was to emphasize that this problem exists in all parts of Canada, from the east coast to the west coast. It is a problem on which public attention has been focused because of the dire position of the wheat growers and grain growers of western Canada and of the farmers of eastern Canada, but the economic problem is not confined to them.

I was rather alarmed, indeed shocked, to learn when travelling in the west that a minister or ministers of the Crown in meeting with farmers there had implied that one of the reasons no solutions were being put forward by the government to alleviate the farmers' economic problems was that they could not obtain the understanding, the consideration or the sympathy of eastern Canada. I reject that theory in its entirety. It is the old one of divide and conquer. We in eastern Canada are very much aware of the problems in the west. The only major difference is that many farmers in the west are unable to dispose of their crops while farmers in eastern Canada, although they can sell their crops, in many instances must sell them below the cost of production. Therefore Canadian farmers in general are directly concerned with the government's agricultural policy, and they have every right to be concerned because it directly affects their livelihood.

Many grave criticisms have been expressed by leaders of agricultural groups about the lack of policy of the government, about the confused policies of the government, about agricultural policies that seem to be working toward opposite ends. Surely after almost seven years in office the government should be able to indicate to the great agricultural industry where it thinks its place should be in our economic life, what its long-term and short-term goals should be, and what the future is for the young Canadian farmer. These are questions that should be answered.

But whenever questions have been asked in the house over the last few months by members of opposition parties we have heard the old refrain that agriculture has never had it so good, that production has increased, that many new products are being produced, that the gross national income is higher than it has ever been, that inventories on farms are at their highest in history. And then there was the ridiculous observation by a former minister of agriculture when he attempted to indicate how good things were for Canadian farmers by saying that never before had the farmers of this nation borrowed so much money.

In answering these allegations I draw the attention of hon. members opposite to the steady parade of farmers to the banks and other lending institutions, seeking money not only to run their operations but to live on and to clothe and educate their families. I draw the attention of hon. members opposite to the growing total of accounts receivable held by business firms dealing with farmers. I draw their attention to the rural and weekly newspapers where they will find page after page after page of paid announcements of sales of farm machinery and livestock by countless farmers who have simply said, "We have had enough and we must get out." I draw their attention to the drop in sales experienced by businesses connected with farming, to the drop in sales of fertilizer in certain areas, to the drop in sales of new farm machinery, new farm equipment, chemicals and all the other things that are normal to the agricultural business. Surely the farmers of this nation deserve an indication from the government either that they are no longer considered a viable part of the Canadian economy or that the government will take its full responsibility toward them by saying, "We feel you are indispensable; we will take the responsibility of providing an economic climate for you that will enable you to derive from your capital investment and labour a return comparable with that received by all other segments of the economy."

To indicate the tremendous confusion in the government's approach to agriculture I shall deal with a few specific commodities. I shall not deal with wheat and feed grains because some of my colleagues and members of other parties no doubt will do so. As an example, look at the dairy industry. Here is an industry in which there is a tremendous investment. By its very nature it must be considered in the context of a long-term economic plan, but within the last five years we have had five separate and distinct government policies for that industry.

We have a National Dairy Commission whose sole purpose seems to be to curtail Canadian production so that it will just meet the demands of our domestic market. But when we travel across the country we see thousands of pounds of imported butter simply because some sections of the country are unable to provide for their own needs. A quota system was set up that was supposed to put farmers on an equal basis from coast to coast. But quotas totalling millions of pounds have now been transferred from the west, an area that does not produce all its own dairy requirements, to eastern Canada where we normally produce more than we consume. This does not seem justifiable, practical or reasonable. In addition, the way subsidies are being implemented means that many small dairy businesses are being forced out of business, and it is becoming financially impossible for a young farmer to enter that business.

• (3:40 p.m.)

What about the greenhouse industry? We had a pronouncement by the minister that this industry was in difficulty and that people should be encouraged to leave it. We are not dealing with just hundreds of thousands of dollars in this industry. We are dealing with an industry in which millions of dollars are invested. This industry was based on government action. The fact that the government has not placed tariffs against the importation of specialized food has made it practically impossible economically for the industry to develop in a profitable way. In its desire to have cheaper food and bring down the cost of living the government is jeopardizing this entire industry.

What about the tobacco industry? Here we have a multi-million dollar industry which has brought untold wealth to the provinces in which this product is grown. We have the impossible situation of one government department spending thousands of dollars in experimental work in order to increase production and quality while another department of the government issues propaganda designed to stop the use of this product and curtail the industry. Here the government has a golden opportunity. By shifting its emphasis in research, surely to goodness it could provide methods by which, if there are dangerous components in tobacco, they could be removed to the benefit of the industry, the government and the people.

What about the poultry industry? In Canada we have a poultry industry which is endeavouring by the organization of national commissions to regiment and control the marketing of its produce in an orderly fashion. This is being done at the request of the provincial and federal governments. We know right now that, unless the government proposes to change its policy, importations of poultry, eggs and other allied products will flood into this country from other nations and take up any slack in our market.

Let us look at the canning industry. We had a strong viable canning industry from coast to coast. We were proud of the quality of the pack and proud of the fact that the industry provided an income for hundreds of farmers and their families in almost every province of this nation. What has happened? The government has allowed the importation, especially of fruits and some vegetables, into this country to a degree that is forcing the industry right out of business. We are told that we must allow this because of our agreements and tariff commitments. The fact is that the government in every instance has failed to take any step to protect Canadian industry.

It is not good enough to make excuses. It is not good enough to procrastinate until the damage is done. It is not good enough to come into the house and say, "We cannot, because". I point out that every nation in the world today with excess products is selling them and a lot of this surplus is coming into Canada. Surely it is time we took our place among the trading nations of the world and traded on our terms and not just on their terms.

There was a task force hearing. Government policy was held up because we were to have a congress to which the task force would report. I have a great deal of admiration for the work the task force has done. I compliment those responsible for setting up the congress and for the manner in which the meetings where carried on. One thing that disturbs me, however, is the fact that the task force seemed to be directed wholly to the one proposition of getting the government completely out of agriculture and letting it stand on its own feet.

I have before me a book about the size of Eaton's or Simpsons-Sears fall and winter catalogue. It contains 385 pages devoted entirely to the government's involvement in agriculture. Now we see at all levels of government a move toward complete abandonment. We are now at cross-purposes. We heard the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) get up in the house and announce a change in hog premiums. This was good; it was asked for by the industry. We were told it was designed to increase the quality of hogs in Canada. It was acceptable and reasonable. I take issue with it, however, because within 90 days the minister announced another policy which was not based on the report of the task force and was not announced after the congress met. It was not done in consultation with the industry. It was designed solely not to increase the efficiency of the hog producers but simply to save the government X million dollars for no other reason than that it wished to have nothing to do with the agricultural industry.



This brings me to the subject of tariffs. It has always been a source of amazement to me and to other hon. members that whenever a tariff question comes up and one of our industries finds itself in economic chaos the government merely says it is aware of the problem. We are told by members of the government that they have listened to the representations and are in sympathy with them but cannot do anything. They tell us there are agreements and that we must wait upon the Gatt threaty. We have to wait for its conclusion, we have to wait for its inception, we have to wait for its deliberations. We must wait. This is not good enough.

Last fall we were involved with the problem of Ontario corn. That was a serious situation. Of course the industry made representations and I must say, in all fairness, that the minister was most sympathetic. But for nine weeks the minister took no action. It is true that he caused meetings to be held. He did confer with officials in the United States where the corn was coming from which was causing us trouble. The minister made a deal with the United States whereby in exchange for the dropping of the duty on seven tariff items coming into Canada they would undertake to protect us from importation of cheap corn. Seven to one—that was not good enough. What the farmers and the people of the nation did not know was that the implementation of this protection in respect of corn would only be in effect for seven weeks. As of January 1 it expired. We are right back where we were. Unless action is taken immediately we will be in the same trouble this year.

Let us compare this situation with the actions other nations take against us. Whenever we encroach on the privileges and

rights of producers of other nations they do not wait weeks or months; they do not even wait for hours. When we go into their markets we find that, with perhaps an eight-hour warning, conditions are changed and we are faced with a tariff increase which means an almost complete ban on importation of our products. We on this side contend that it cannot always be that way. We believe that trade must be a two-way street. If we are treated in this fashion, surely we have the right to treat others in the same way. Why must our farmers always pay for the mistakes of others in respect of international agreements?

• (3:50 p.m.)

I now come to the matter of credit. The only policy of any major proportion which the government has initiated in its entire life has been the increasing of credit to farmers. The increase of credit to farmers does not solve any of our major problems. All it does is increase their debt, increase land values, increase the value of the machinery they must buy, and place them in a position in which it is almost impossible to survive. And what does the government do? After initiating greater credit it established a policy, as it indicated in the house and at the congress, to put off the land what is calls inefficient and small farmers. Such a policy defeats the purpose for which credit was initiated in the first place.

Syndicate loans were supposed to be the answer. We were going to have larger corporate farms subsidized by government money which would be used to establish viable economic units. What does the implementation of the new estate tax do? It takes away the farmer's incentive to build up a corporate farm. This is why the farmers of this nation have no confidence in the government. This is why the farmers of this nation say that the government has no policy, or a confused policy. This is why the farmers of this nation cannot and will not make any money under these conditions. Surely the time is now for the government to act. Surely the government knows what is going on in the west and what is going on in the east. It knows how bad farmers' credit ratings are.

The farmers of this nation are sick to death of investigations, delegations, deliberations, conversations, and procrastination. Is it not time that we had some legislation? Even hon. members opposite must realize how serious the situation is and how urgent it is that solutions be applied now. This must be done if a great segment of the Canadian economy is not to fall into economic chaos and fade into oblivion. I commend this motion to hon. members.

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, on completion of what I wish to say in the new few minutes I will propose an amendment to the motion now before the house. But first I should like to say that I agree with the motion. I think it is time that we had a full discussion of the situation of Canadian farmers. The government and members on this side of the house must seriously consider the situation of the farmers, what is to be their place in the affairs of the nation and, perhaps even more important, whether some segments of the industry will have a place as owner-producers in this country.

One of the most important documents dealing with the situation of farmers in Canada was prepared by a group set up by the government of Ontario. Its title was, "The Challenge of Abundance". The challenge of abundance is really the challenge that faces the people of this nation in regard to farming and agriculture as we come to the end of the 1960's and in a few months move into the 1970's. The problem is not that the farmer is unable to produce food as cheaply as he did 30 years ago. The fact of the matter is that he produces it for much less in terms of real and constant dollars. It is not that he does not have the know-how and the savvy. He is second to none anywhere in the world in his know-how, savvy, and understanding of the land, of the tools he uses and of the economic climate in which he operates.

The real problem is to be found in the heading of the report to which I have referred—the challenge of abundance. The real problem is what our society is going to do with the knowledge, the know-how, the resources and the people we have at our beck and call. It is they who make us potentially one of the best fed nations in the world. I do not say that this is true for every Canadian. I suspect that as I speak here this afternoon there are millions of Canadians who do not have all the food they want and all the proteins they need for their health. I suppose that there are many expectant mothers who do not have the food that is essential for their health. I suppose there are many children in this country who are not as well fed as those who live in well to do, middle class homes. So there is this contrast. I will in no way

attempt to describe what is happening in other parts of the world.

What is happening to our farmers as we face this challenge of abundance? One of the first things that happened after I came here as a member of the house last fall was the arrival of an array of tractors in front of the House of Commons, driven by the corn growers of Ontario. I spoke to some of their owners who were large producers. They do not lack the know-how with regard to the production of corn. What they sadly lack is a net income which would enable them to continue to operate effectively as producers.

As the previous speaker said, a solution has not been found. The representatives of the corn growers are still making requests to appear before the Standing Committee on Agriculture to state their position. I am sure they would not want to spend the time and effort to come here to appear before that committee unless their problems still existed. I suspect that in southern Ontario there is a a time bomb that will go off one of these days right in the lap of the government. Perhaps I am wrong; we will wait and see.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The Standing Committee on Agriculture has just returned from a trip to western Canada. We travelled right across that western land to Vancouver Island and we had an opportunity to see what was happening in the western part of this nation. I hope that in due course we shall do the same in the east. What did we see? We saw the same situation that was described in the Ontario report concerning the state of affairs in Ontario. We saw evidence of the challenge of abundance. People came before us representing the farming industry. Farmers came before us. I suspect that the tree fruits industry of British Columbia could produce a great deal more than it is producing at present. But the industry has organized supply management and is successfully maintaining a level of income for its people. We talked to very efficient egg producers. One of them had a blackboard upon which he put his costs. I believe the facts he put before us were true. I have been on many farms; he looked to me like an honest, family farm operator. He showed he was losing two cents a dozen on every dozen of eggs he moved off his farm.

We went to other places. We saw a barn with the number "8" on it. It was part of a factory operation. New forms of agriculture are developing today; we are moving into a phase of factory operations. We were told about one concern which had plans to move to the coast and set up a factory designed to produce 25,000 hogs per year. Mr. Speaker, we need a factory operation to produce hogs in Canada like we need a hole in the head. Farmers in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Quebec and the Maritimes have shown they are entirely capable of producing the amount of pork needed in Canada.

Then we came back and looked at the prairies. The house has been told of the situation which exists on the prairies. We split up into groups and went from farm to farm. We saw the actual situation there, not statistics—wheat piling up and not being moved to markets, farmers with inadequate incomes whose financial position made it doubtful that they could go ahead and put in another crop. What is worse, they really did not know what they should put in, what would be demanded of them by the people of Canada or the markets of the world. These farmers are operating in a no man's land so far as policy is concerned. The big question was: Where do we go from here?

I spoke of the challenge of abundance. I am convinced that we must develop a policy as a people which does not leave our farmers in a never-never-land wondering what their future is to be. I have often expressed concern about farm credit policies and the means by which young people can take up farming. But really, Mr. Speaker, the primary question is: Why should they? What is their future likely to be? Is it certain or uncertain? This is the real problem. The government and the people of Canada must realize that there is an emergency on the prairies as well as a situation which calls for long-term planning. The government must recognize that it cannot leave the problem as it now exists unanswered or regard it simply as a piece of unfinished business. We must produce both emergency and long-term solutions. Indeed, we have no choice.

The least we can do at the moment is establish a two-price system for wheat sold on the domestic market for human consumption so that farmers may receive a minimum of $3 per bushel for all wheat used in Canada for human consumption, and provide that the premium per bushed received over and above the International Grains Agreement price in the current crop year be distributed to all permit holders on the basis of the unit quota. This would at least recognize the fact that the grain farmer is a part of this nation and

entitled to treatment at least as good as that accorded to industry, which is protected by tariffs, or to the dairy industry which is protected by subsidies.

In addition, I believe we must recognize there is an emergency that must be dealt with immediately. Cash has to go into the hands of these farmers if they are to carry on business and if the social structure is not to collapse—I am thinking of the schools, roads and churches in the small communities of western Canada. There is much more at stake here than simply the livelihood and business operations of individual farmers.

The president of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union stated in the west last week that it would take $175 million in federal aid to prevent the collapse of the grain industry in western Canada. I suspect he is right but I do not expect that the government will make such an amount available. I would have to be a flaming optimist to do so, having lived in the west and having watched this government for some time.

Nevertheless I should like to place before the house and the government the concrete proposal that as an emergency measure the government immediately make to all grain farmers an income deficiency payment of 20 cents a bushel on all wheat marketed in the 1967-68 grain crop year so as to put purchasing power in the hands of the farmers of western Canada. The maximum amount which any farmer might receive would be based on a 5,000 bushel delivery to the Canadian Wheat Board in the crop year to which I have referred. This policy should apply also to oats and barley in cases where a grower has delivered these grains rather than wheat.

This would not be enough but it would certainly help to meet the situation which is now at crisis point. I see in this chamber some of the men who toured Saskatchewan from farm to farm during the trip we made in the west, and they will surely agree with me. In the long term we shall be obliged to look at different solutions. We shall have to assess what the market actually is and study the channels open to us for the disposal of our wheat. I believe we should move away from the straight commercial approach we have followed up to now and turn to bilateral sales, to barter.

We must find out who needs this food and devise ways by which it may reach them. This means right here in Canada, in my book, and it applies also to those who live beyond our borders but who are none the less part of the human race. Hitler is supposed to have said that if he won the war and isolated North America, the people there would smother in their own fat. Unless we look outside our borders, we may do this. We are rich. But even rich people do not live alone; they have a host of other people to cater to their needs and serve them.

• (4:10 p.m.)

We must also be very concerned about the policy of the Canadian Dairy Commission in regard to the small dairy producers. Their needs are being neglected. They are being squeezed out. I have received letters from producers in my constituency asking for consideration of their problem, but according to the replies I have received from the commission this type of producer cannot be assisted under the regulations. I say to the government: This is not good enough.

I know one small grain producer in western Canada who is also a cow-calf man who produces some calves that go to feed lots in western Canada. He has to depend on his returns from the cream industry as well as from his calves in order to survive. Yet this state of affairs in western Canada today is being ignored. Representatives of the government of Manitoba attended one of the meetings of the standing committee and claimed that dairy producers were being discriminated against, that quotas were being transferred east.

**Mr. Harding:** The minister denies it but it is true.

**Mr. Gleave:** He may deny it. I am not interested in where quotas are transferred to. What interests me is that the needs of this type of producer are being totally ignored by the dairy commission. The minister must remember that western Canada does not have a one-crop economy; there are cattle farms, livestock farms, grain farms and mixed farms. The Meadow Lake area is not just a grain producing area; neither is Saskatoon-Biggar. Let the government remember this and look at farming in its totality instead of following the bits and pieces approach that has unfortunately been taken up to now.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), the following subamendment:

That the motion be amended by inserting therein, immediately after the words "Canadian agriculture," the following words:

"which in the prairie provinces is due in the main to declining grain prices and reduced delivery quotas."

[*Translation*]

**Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak on the non-confidence motion of the Progressive Conservative party, which reads as follows:

That in the opinion of this house the government has failed to deal with the seriously deteriorating net income of Canadian agriculture—

I would also like to talk about the amendment of the New Democratic party which refers to the situation of agriculture in the Prairies.

I shall deal with the subject in general, while acknowledging the merits of the amendment of the New Democratic party. The subject is a current issue in our regions. Had it been possible, we would have liked to add the following words to the amendment: and has neglected to recognize the right of farmers to be consulted about government policies which are always arrived at unilaterally.

As soon as the dairy policy of the current year was announced, I warned the minister that it would give rise to protests.

Today, Mr. Speaker, since our allotted time is 20 minutes, I will not refer to certain notes which I had jotted down, in order to deal exclusively with the protests. I will speak only about the farmers of my area.

In my opinion, the government has the obvious proof that the farmers are really unhappy, and rightly so, under the circumstances. We have heard that the farmers' income has decreased. This will not please them. If any producer were dealt with in this manner, strikes would necessarily occur.

Fortunately, farmers are not completely given to protests and do not react as others in various fields. I congratulate them for holding on. I hope that the government will finally review its position and that the commissioners of the Canadian Dairy Commission will take my comments into account, because I note that since the minister's last statements on the farm policy, nothing has changed.

It is impossible to exert any influence on the Canadian Wheat Board, and make it understand that there are some marginal cases. The only thing that matters is the administration of the law.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we shall have to use judgment as far as the interpretation of the legislation is concerned instead of enforcing it indiscriminately. It is rather easy to enforce a legislation; it is more difficult to interpret it in such a way as to be fair with everyone.



Of course, we are the spokesmen of the farmers. They do send us their complaints. Some among them believe that we have the right to discuss the government policy. I shall point out to them that we do not have any more rights to do so than the back-benchers on the government side. The policy is all settled when it reaches us, without the opposition parties having been consulted. We are obliged to bear with the dictatorship of the department.

Then, when we go into our ridings, we are the ones who get it.

As a matter of fact, I have received so far more than 100 letters. I shall quote a few taken at random. They show not only to the minister but also to the Canadian Dairy Commission—since we are interested in industrial milk—the merits of our recommendations.

This is a letter dated April 18, sent to me by Mr. Jean-Baptiste Laprise, of Albanel, Quebec, and I quote:

Sir, as you have always defended the farmer in the past, I am asking you to do everything possible to intercede with the Prime Minister, Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, and the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Olson, who is primarily responsible for the new dairy policy which is for us, farmers, a disaster, an enormous reduction in our income which we cannot accept, considering the increasing cost of living, so that the latter will amend his dairy policy which, in my view, does not make sense.

I have before me another letter, this time from Saint-Félicien, which proves that I got some from almost all parishes. Here is what that letter says, and I quote:

Dear Sir:

Recently, I learned of the new dairy policy of the federal government for the year 1969-70 and I was taken aback by its lack of seriousness.

With the increase—

The letter goes on in the same vein and bears the signature of Mr. Rosaire Lavertu, of Saint-Félicien, Quebec.

I have here another letter, Mr. Lucien Leclerc, of Albanel, which I shall read also:

Sir:

I am extremely displeased with the new agricultural policy for 1969—

• (4:20 p.m.)

A similar letter is signed by Mr. Hilarion Charbonneau, R.R. No. 5, Mistassini.

And another one from Mistassini is signed by Mr. Florent Imbeault, Range No. 4.

I am quoting these letters to prove to the minister that protests have been made and if he does not receive any himself I think that I shall send him photostat copies of these letters, for his information.

Here is another letter from Albanel signed by Messrs. Henri and Lionel Marcil, and I quote:

I ask you to support the milk producers and their claims against the dairy policy ... of the government.

And finally this one from Girardville, another agricultural centre, and I quote:

Dear Sir:

Now that I have examined the new dairy policy for the year 1969-70, I must tell you that I am very disappointed and I wonder what will become of us.

They want more efficiency on our part and first quality products—

I have here a three-page letter which does not contain only sweet words, signed by Mr. Maurice Blais, from Albanel, and another from Sainte-Hedwidge, an agricultural area, signed by Messrs. Ulric and Armand Paradis, who protest along the same lines as also do Messrs. Édouard Fortin, Benoit Lavoie and Joseph Bouchard, from Albanel, as well as Mr. Élie Langlois, from Sainte-Hedwidge. They all think it is nonsense to reduce income while the cost of living is spiralling.

Mr. Speaker, the best supporting evidence of my allegations is the meeting held in Saint-Jérôme on Monday, April 28, 1969, to which the farmers had invited the area's four members of parliament. The conclusions of that meeting prompted me to direct questions today to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson).

Here is the wording of the document submitted on the occasion of that meeting, and I quote:

To the members of parliament,

The farmers of the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area were simply dismayed upon the announcement of the federal dairy policy for 1969-1970.

Such a policy meant above all for them a reduction of their incomes while almost every day they have to put up with an increase in their production costs or in the cost of living.

They disavow such a policy which they consider backward and discriminatory. The document we submitted today is a working document which we beg you to analyze thoroughly and which, we expect, you will use as a guideline for the steps to be taken in order to amend that policy, to the satisfaction of the manufacturing milk producers of the area, the province and the country.

The Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean farmers are happy that you have agreed to meet them and hear their grievances.

That document is signed by Xavier Fortin of the Saguenay Federation of C.F.U., Léopold Harvey of the Manufacturing Milk Producers Union, J. Arthur Guay, of the Saguenay Co-operatives, Paul-Émile Gagnon, president of the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean Dairy Co-operative Association.

And we are given tables which show the decrease, for instance, in the production of a farmer who usually produces 50,000 pounds of milk per year. Last year, his gross income was $3,945, whereas this year he will only make $3,735; this represents a loss of $210.

Looking at another table, we see that the producer upon whom a quota of 100,000 pounds is imposed, and who produces 200,000 pounds, will lose $420. As for the producer whose quota is 250,000 pounds, and who produces 400,000 pounds, he too will lose. Each one of them has added to his herds. For three years now, there has been a clamor over television and radio for economic units, for quality production. That is what our farmers have done.

Today, because our farmers have worked well, they are being punished. The one upon whom a quota of 250,000 pounds was imposed, and who produces 400,000 pounds, will lose $740 this year. The other whose quota is 250,000 pounds, and who produces 350,000 will lose $430.

Mr. Speaker, all these tables were given to us at the meeting last Monday. Those people added the following text to their report:

In the light of those examples, we note that:

1. The policy ensures a decrease in income for every category of producers, whether they be small, medium or large.

2. The subsidy quotas remain the same; this penalizes the most productive producer, because his surpluses of milk, above his quota, will cost 52c. to be exported instead of 21c. like last year.

3. The subsidies remain the same, paralyzing the efforts of the producer who had hoped to increase his production and productivity enough to enable him to live off his farm.

4. The present policy will eliminate many manufacturing milk producers, but the federal government does not announce any parallel policy allowing the farmer to make a reconversion or, in some cases, to get out of agriculture with any possibilities of integration into the labour market.

5. The federal government does not care about the farmers or the recommendations made by national agencies representing producers, in the formulation of its policies. For instance, how can the federal government announce a policy designed to assure $4.85 per hundredweight of milk for 1969-70, the same as for 1968-69, when for the same amount of milk the price of finished products remain the same and subsidies are decreased.

• (4:30 p.m.)

6. The present policy gives a good idea of the will of the government to abandon gradually the subsidy policy for manufacturing milk, and without taking any steps to insure maintenance of prices to producers.

7. The decrease of the subsidy means nothing else but a reduction of the amounts the Agricultural Prices Stabilization Board has decided to affect to the dairy industry.

8. Once more, the federal government has found the means of balancing its budget at the expense of one of the least privileged classes of society, when tremendous expenditures are allowed, because they are allegedly inevitable, for national defence purposes. Agriculture is also an essential sector of the economic life of a country.

9. The federal government allocates only 3 per cent of its budget to agriculture compared to 10 per cent in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it seems it is high time for the government, which is always anxious to follow the lead of the United States in the field of agriculture, to do so in this case.

And this year, the federal government finds that 3 per cent is too much and cuts it.

Our position as to the dairy policy of the federal government:

1. Producers agree on control of their production; they also agree to provide for the needs of the market. They do not accept control without planning, which is cause that often, the best producers give up the job while the less enterprising ones stick to it.

Here is one question among others.

What is the specific purpose of the state when it grants subsidy quotas? Is it trying to arbitrarily discourage producers or to organize production on a rational basis?

2. We are not against the elimination of a certain number of farmers, but we want those who will remain in business to know where they stand.

And the second question:

What has the federal government done to give orientation to the manufacturing milk producers? And what is your program for the next five (5) years?

3. We are not against the elimination of a certain number of manufacturing producers.

Those, in some cases, will operate a conversion of their farming and, in other cases, will give up farming. We say that one who has to convert his farming must get satisfactory help to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I have not got the time to read in full this wonderful document because I know that my time is about to expire, but I wish to quote, in conclusion, what is added by the farmers:

We ask for a minimum price of $5.35 per hundred weight of manufacturing milk based on a test of 3.5 pounds of fat. This price represents the $4.85 price announced in 1968-1969, plus a reasonable

[Mr. Gauthier.]

percentage taking into account the increase in 1968-1969 of the production costs and the cost of living.

And with these words I end my speech, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity afforded by this debate today for two reasons. First, I think it is useful to have an opportunity provided to members of this house, after they have had a chance of assessing the situation with respect to agriculture, to give the government the benefit of their views as to what kind of policy, taking into account all of the consequences of adopting that policy and what would be most acceptable to the farming community. Second, I think it is useful because it is well for us to give consideration to the substance of the motion in such a way that we put it in perspective.

I know a little about this because I used to sit on the other side of the house. It is very easy to complain about everything without having to assume the responsibility for finding and administering solutions. I do not criticize members of the opposition, farm organizations or anyone else for taking that course, but I think it is fair and reasonable to say that when you have the responsibility for implementing policies you must look at the situation with a slightly different perspective.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say I concur in one statement that has been made so far in this debate, namely, the tremendous value of agriculture to the economy. There is no question in anyone's mind about that. We then go to the next stage and try to analyse the problem in sufficient depth so that we understand the root cause of the problem depressing the agricultural economy today.

I noted that the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) borrowed the phrase, "the challenge of abundance", the task force in Ontario. I believe the greatest underlying reason for the present price structure and the low prices of many agricultural commodities in Canada today is the tremendous potential production in almost any commodity. It is so great, that whether it is cereals, dairy products, oil seeds or whatever, if there is an effort on the part of Canadian farmers to produce that product, in a very short time it will be in a surplus position which automatically damages the price structure. For some time after that we then continue to produce against the surplus. There are one or two commodities in the country that

are exceptions to that rule, but generally speaking I think it applies.

I am sure hon. members will agree we not only have a tremendous capacity to produce as much as there is effective demand for but substantially more than that. Indeed, this is what has happened in Canada with many commodities. I might also say it is not only in Canada that this has happened. If one looks at the figures compiled recently by the O.E.C.D., one will see this production pattern taking place, in cereals and dairy products particularly, in many other countries of the world. The serious problem of over-production is also common to many fruits and vegetables. I wanted to say that at the outset, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want anyone to accuse me of saying that the farmers never had it so good. There are problems. We recognize those problems.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The motion this afternoon refers to "the seriously deteriorating net income for Canadian agriculture." It indicates that as a result farmers in all parts of Canada are "unable to obtain the necessary operating capital to finance the 1969-70 crop year." As I said, I think one would be less than realistic if one did not recognize that there are problems of farm income. These problems, of course, must be faced by agriculture from year to year, in many cases from commodity to commodity, depending on certain national aspects of the situation and also on the international context of affairs. However, to assert that farm income has seriously deteriorated and that Canadian farmers will be unable to finance their operations may, I suggest, in relation to recent history, not be quite consistent with the facts.

Unfortunately we do not have net farm income figures from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for the first quarter of this year. However, we do have those for 1968, or at least we have a preliminary estimate. This estimate indicates that net farm income in Canada for 1968 will be about $170 million more than in 1967. In the absence of data in respect of farm income for the first quarter of this year, perhaps the best indicator of the present position of farmers is current farm prices. I am the first to admit that this is not always directly related to farm income, but I am sure hon. members will realize that there is a relationship. So I would like to place before the house certain information in respect of prices of various farm commodities in order that hon. members may judge for themselves whether the income situation is deteriorating in what is claimed is a serious, almost disastrous manner.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the problem we get into is that I am sure that in any year since Confederation one could single out some commodity in some area, and sometimes more than one commodity in more than one area, and show that there was a very serious situation. But what I am trying to do in the few minutes I have available is to outline the whole of the picture, or as much of it as I can, respecting farm prices so that it will be in perspective.

Dealing first with livestock products, and I deal with them first simply because livestock and livestock products represent a total of 55 per cent of the income of farmers, as of today choice steers were selling in Toronto at $32.50 a hundredweight, up $3 or almost 10 per cent over a month ago, and up $5.20 per hundredweight over a year ago. I do not hear my hon. friends opposite cheering that, and at least that is something positive and good within the economy.

**Mr. Korchinski:** What about wheat?

**Mr. Olson:** I will get to wheat in a moment. For Grade A hogs the increases are not as great on a percentage basis but they are still significant. Grade A hogs today at Toronto were quoted at $32.25 compared with $31.08 a month ago, and $27.55 a year ago. This represents an increase over a year ago of $4.70 per hundredweight, or about 17 per cent. Eggs currently are returning 45.5 cents for Grade A to producers—this is at Toronto—compared with 33.5 cents on May 1, 1968.

**Mr. Korchinski:** Not in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Olson:** I do not know whether the hon. member for Mackenzie is very interested in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, but at least he should keep his peace long enough so that he can hear some of the facts. If he has anything to contribute later, hon. members might be interested.

I do not intend to detail all the other commodities but, for example, apples are bringing higher prices than they did a year ago. Corn is up over May of last year, and butter is higher than it was a year ago. Cheddar cheese is one of the others that is up, just to mention a few. Since hon. members are interested perhaps I would quote some figures.

Lambs at Toronto on May 1, 1964—that is after the Conservatives had their chance to

do something—were selling at $29 per hundredweight. On May 1, 1969, they are selling for $35.50. Grade A eggs, as I pointed out, are returning 45.5 cents to producers at Toronto and on May 1, 1964, they were selling for 29.5 cents. So far as apples are concerned, a box of fancy McIntosh apples was selling on May 1, 1964, at $4.38 and is now selling at $7.88. At that time butter was selling at 54.3 cents a pound and today the producer gets 68.2 cents a pound. Cheddar cheese on May 1, 1964, was selling at 35.3 cents per pound and today it is 46 cents a pound. On May 1, 1964, choice steers were selling in Toronto at $24.25 per hundredweight. By May 1, 1968, they had gone up to $27.25, by April 1 of this year to $29.50, and on May 1 had reached $32.50. I think these things should be drawn to the attention of hon. members—

**Mr. Korchinski:** Tell us about wheat.

**Mr. Clermont:** We have agriculture in eastern Canada too, and we want to hear about it.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Could we have order in the house? It is difficult enough to hear what the minister is saying, but it is even more difficult with cross-interjections.

**Mr. Olson:** Turning to cereals, Mr. Speaker, the situation is somewhat different, but it is inconsistent with the statement that farmers will be unable to finance the 1969 crop year. For example, the government took action last fall to double the amount made available to farmers in western Canada who had been unable to market their cereal grains. The extent to which farmers have appreciated this action is indicated by the extent to which they have taken advantage of it. To date this year some 83,000 farmers have received cash advances totalling $148 million—

**Mr. Korchinski:** Tell us about wheat.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member for Mackenzie could keep quiet long enough for other hon. members to hear these figures. As I was saying, to date some 83,000 farmers have received cash advances totalling $148 million. This compares with 45,000 farmers last year and an amount of $47,280,738.

The crop insurance program, which a short time ago was amended in order to provide a higher level of coverage, is proving to be, I think, somewhat of a boon this year to those who have met with crop difficulties, and has brought a measure of stability that will assist farmers in their financing. While total figures are not yet available, it is estimated that in 1968 approximately $16 million will have been paid to farmers under crop insurance schemes. This compares with $2.8 million a year ago.

• (4:50 p.m.)

The potato farmers of eastern Canada, particularly the Maritime provinces, this year are facing income problems brought about by heavy supplies and resulting low prices. The government has taken some steps to correct both the income and the supply situation through the institution of a starch diversion program. While to date the result in terms of price increases has not been what might be desired, the program will permit the marketing of a very significant tonnage of potatoes which otherwise could not be marketed at all. It is also encouraging to note there has been some firming up of the market price of potatoes in the last few days. So I think a review of these statistics is helpful.

Before I turn to comment on the solutions which have been suggested, perhaps I could substantiate the claim I made that Canada is not the only country in the world facing problems of this kind. For example, in the *Globe and Mail* of April 30 we find the heading, "Wheat Export Talks Fail In Australia." It states that an effort was made by the Australian Wheat Council and it has failed to agree on measures to restrict Australian wheat output to bring prices more in line with export demand. I am sure hon. members have read this story which is from the *Financial Times* of London. It reads in part as follows:

> In the absence of concrete action the federal minister has appealed to farmers to exercise restraint. He said any grower would be foolish if he went blindly ahead without recognizing the problem of disposing of what he produced.

The story continues in another place as follows:

> The United States has already reduced its wheat acreage allotment, and preliminary indications from Canada suggest that farmers have shown some restraint. However, without similar moves in Australia and Europe, a question mark must remain over the present international wheat price structure.

Since that story about Australia came out there has been another one. This is from the *Globe and Mail* and is a reprint from the New York *Times* service dated May 1. The headline is "Australia Announces Wheat Quota". It says:

> The Australian government last night announced its first wheat production restrictions as a result of the world glut and record Australian crops.

Farther along it says:

> The coming season was expected to break last season's production records, but the government could not afford more credit advances on production and storage facilities could not cope with any greater production.

So that is no great comfort; it does not add very much to the income of Canadian producers. But it does put the problem in its proper perspective. I suggest this is the way it should be viewed.

**Mr. Korchinski:** Are you going to talk about the farm income picture in Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Olson:** There have been some suggestions made. I should like, if I may, to deal particularly with the situation concerning wheat, but I think it is also fair at this point to talk briefly about some of the other problems that have been raised and some of the suggestions we are actively considering to deal with them. For example, there is the dairy surplus problem which has been raised by a number of hon. members. The fact is that we are providing a subsidy to the extent of $1.25 per 100 for 3.5 milk and something like $37.42 per pound for butterfat. It was discussed and agreed with the dairy industry several years ago that whatever costs were involved in taking the surplus in excess of domestic consumption and selling it on the international market—the difference between the support price and the actual price received—would be paid by the producers.

**Mr. Korchinski:** The minister has dealt with every problem but the real one and that is the problem of the grain producers.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I wonder whether the hon. member for Mackenzie would agree that in all fairness we should hear the minister and, hopefully, we will have the opportunity to hear the hon. member for Mackenzie later.

**Mr. Olson:** In anticipating the production levels, the trends we have for the ensuing dairy year would indicate there will be very serious increases in production that will lead to unmanageable surpluses. Indeed, if the production pattern set in March for skim milk powder changes over the next 12 months we could have a production of something like 420 million pounds. We use much less than half that amount in Canada. We are having great difficulty now selling our milk powder in the international market even at 35 per cent or less of what we are paying for it at the support price. What we hope will be the result of the policy we announced a few days ago is that we can maintain the same level as last year, that is, a $3.60 pay-out by the dairies based on 20 per cent powder and 65 cents for butterfat plus $1.25 which brings it to $4.85. We have to calculate and anticipate the cost of disposing of the surplus. We hope that by raising it to 26 cents for quota milk and 52 cents for over-quota milk as a disincentive to produce over-quota we will bring production in line with the demand. So this is the reason. I know it is not the most palatable kind of thing, but I think we have a responsibility to look into the future and try to rationalize the industry in line with effective demand.

The second point is that two speakers today, the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth) and I believe the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave), raised as one of the problems involved in the dairy policy the matter of regional quotas and the fact that the prairie provinces, for example, were bringing in from other provinces a certain amount of butterfat and also milk powder. It was suggested there is something unjust about our not setting up regional quotas for dairy products. I remind these gentlemen that I have had representations for a long time from the maritime provinces urging that we do this for that area in respect of butter and milk powder from Ontario and Quebec. The question I must ask is whether this is simply for dairy products or are they willing to accept regional quotas and restrictions of this kind in respect of the marketing of other products. For example, would Manitoba like action of this kind in respect of eggs when they export a very large percentage of their total production? Would Prince Edward Island like to accept that policy in respect of potatoes when they export a very high percentage of their total production?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I see that the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar would like to pose a question. I remind him that the minister has the floor and it is up to the minister whether or not he will receive a question at this time.

**Mr. Olson:** I am sorry, but I do not have time to answer questions now. If there is any time at the end I shall be glad to try to answer them.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar is rising on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Gleave:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to the minister—

**Mr. Olson:** It is not a point of order to point out to the minister—

**Mr. Gleave:** Mr. Speaker, the minister referred specifically to myself. I merely wanted to point out to him that I placed the emphasis not on regions but on discrimination against the small cream shipper in western Canada.

• (5:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Olson:** Whether or not that is the interpretation, I understood the hon. member to suggest there was something manifestly wrong with dairy products going from one region to another. However, this is the principle that is involved. It is easy for him to take any particular area, pick out some particular commodity and say that we should have regional restrictions so that the whole market there can be guaranteed for the producers.

**Mr. Gleave:** I have not said that.

**Mr. Olson:** Perhaps the hon. member has not been saying that but many people have; the hon. member for Kent-Essex certainly has.

**Mr. Danforth:** No.

**Mr. Olson:** If we are going to set up regional quotas of that kind and restrict the market, if we are going to have legislation to make that possible, then it will not only be confined to such products as suit people in any particular region of the country. Right now we have been engaged in discussions with the provinces to see whether we cannot find a satisfactory basis for setting up national marketing legislation. Of course this is one of the problems that has been raised. However, the situation differs in different parts of the country. The maritimes would accept it for dairy products but not for potatoes. Manitoba would probably accept it for dairy products but not for eggs. Alberta would accept it for certain commodities, but I am sure it would not accept it for its beef, almost all of which is marketed some place in Canada.

I hope that together with the provincial governments, which under the constitution are responsible for supply management and quota control, we will be able to reach an arrangement so that the producers themselves will have a greater and more effective voice in the marketplace. I am convinced that if the producers have a more effective voice in the marketplace, for example, with regard to potatoes, the prices would not have to be as low in the maritimes as they are today. The two provincial governments which are primarily involved, namely, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, are attempting to introduce the necessary legislation. We hope that we can find some way in which this can be complemented by national legislation so that the end result will be effective. I see I am running out of time.



**Mr. Horner:** You have not said anything yet.

**Mr. Olson:** The only people who think I have not said anything must have their ears closed because I have been pointing out the general problems as I see them and putting them in perspective.

**Mr. Horner:** I am waiting for solutions.

**Mr. Olson:** These are not all of the problems. There are many serious problems in agriculture. I am sure the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) will agree that we are not having much of a problem with beef marketing these days.

**Mr. Horner:** You think not?

**Mr. Olson:** The question has been raised whether or not we should introduce a two-price system for wheat. When I sat on the other side of the house I said many times that I agree with that principle as long as other countries do it. We have the right to do it in self-defence.

**Mr. Horner:** In Alberta we have been waiting for the implementation of that principle for ten years.

**Mr. Olson:** I made this proposal to the Conservative government when they were in office. I did so time and time again.

**Mr. Horner:** We adopted the principle.

**Mr. Olson:** I still agree that we have the right to adopt the principle in self-defence. But I know also that it carries with it some problems. If we were to do this we would have to set up tariffs which do not exist today, with respect to bakery products, for example. There is no tariff on bread coming from the United States. We would have to set one up or we would put our bakers out of business. I am sure that my hon. friend across the way realizes this. We also have to consider what would be most advantageous on balance.

**Mr. Korchinski:** Acreage payments.

**Mr. Olson:** We have to consider the fact that only about 10 per cent of our wheat crop is used for domestic consumption.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the minister but the time allotted to him has expired.

**Mr. George Muir (Lisgar):** Mr. Speaker, this afternoon in the short time allotted to me I intended to speak about some of the problems in western Canada, particularly in western agriculture, but after listening to the rosy picture painted by the minister I am wondering whether we are talking about the same part of Canada. In its recent tour of western Canada the Standing Committee on Agriculture heard expressed again and again what has been apparent to all western members for some time—the concern which exists in that part of the country today about the lack of grain sales and the corresponding desperate need for cash with which to carry on the necessary farm operations in the new crop year, operations which, by the way, will be commencing with the advent of spring weather.

The minister quoted figures to show that farm income for 1968 was reasonably high. He failed to mention that the cash advances last fall contributed to the income figure. He also mentioned that the number of cash advance payments made to the farmers last fall had doubled. The need for this money only proved that western agriculture is indeed experiencing a crisis. To compound the problem, this spring the final payments on wheat, oats and barley were almost the smallest ever. They will not be sufficient to pay the grocery bills from the first of January until the time farmers receive their cheques.

Because of the glut of wheat on the farms and in the elevators of the country our farmers have been advised by the task force on agriculture to switch their production from wheat to other crops. To our harried farmers this advice poses some serious problems. First, there is the very real danger that in switching to other crops they will only compound the problem by producing embarrassing surpluses in other cereal grains. Second, by reducing in favour of other than cereal grains wheat acreage, the quota on which the farmer may deliver his wheat is reduced, making it even more difficult for him to reduce the surplus wheat which he already has in store.



In view of the assistance which farmers have rendered the national economy by providing a much needed balance of payments in our foreign exchange, particularly in 1963 when, according to the Governor of the Bank of Canada, they thus averted an economic crisis—I think the foreign exchange thus gained amounted to $480 million or more—and in further consideration of the loss of wheat delivery quota that would result from any reduction of wheat acreage that is sown in other than cereal crops, surely it is incumbent upon the government at this time to assist farmers in their efforts to reduce the wheat acreage. This can be done, as has been done in the past, by a wheat acreage reduction payment. It can be achieved by making a payment to the farmers for each acre on which wheat is not sown, based on the 1967-68 permit book record, up to a maximum which the government considers necessary to achieve a wheat crop of manageable proportions. At the same time this would provide the farmers with necessary funds to help finance their spring operations. The land taken out of wheat production would either have to be left fallow or be sown to grass or forage crops in order to achieve this objective.

I feel that this action is not only justified on the basis of past experience but essential to the national well-being in that many of our competent farmers are being forced to the wall because of their inability to finance on a six-bushel quota that is now extended to a two-year period. With large stocks of unsold grain upon which cash advances were taken in order to pay harvest expenses, our farmers are entering a new crop season with their hands tied for lack of working capital.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I hope the government will give consideration to the proposal I have put forward, one which has been endorsed by farm leaders and farm organizations as a means of bringing temporary assistance to our farmers and of enabling them to finance the production of this year's crop. At the same time, I wish to point out that the regaining of our lost share of the world wheat market must remain the primary objective not only of our wheat marketing agencies but of the government itself. After all, it is the government which has the power not only to bring some flexibility to our marketing program but also to allow extensions of credit which could make all the difference in effecting sales. At best, the wheat

acreage reduction payment proposal could be regarded only as an interim provision designed to assist western agriculture to maintain the stability necessary to overcome a period of extreme stress.

Having regard to the mounting cost of farm operations because of inflation, something for which the Canadian farmer can in no way be held responsible, I believe it is not only fair but in the best interests of the nation that further continuing compensation be provided to our farmers for helping to bear the brunt of the government's cheap food policy. There are many ways in which this can be done by means of government action. Surely the government has people who are smart enough to figure out ways and means of assisting our farmers through this difficult period. If not, it is time they allowed someone else to run the country.

The government should take another look at the value of our special crops in terms of reducing wheat acreage, and should provide the oilseed industry with long overdue protection against the flow of cheap vegetable oil and oilseed entering this country at prices which bear no relationship to the cost of production. This situation could be resolved by placing on the imported product either a value comparable with that placed on United States cottonseed oil or, as an absolute minimum, one equal to the Canadian price for soya beans. Sunflower seed growers in Manitoba and soya bean growers in Ontario will then have at least a chance to compete with a foreign product which is obviously being delivered in Canada at prices below an acceptable cost of production.

The hardship at present being experienced on the prairies is not just a figment of someone's imagination, and I am sure the minister must be aware of this despite the rosy picture he has painted. For the benefit of his colleagues in the government I think I should emphasize that a combination of circumstances beyond the control of our farmers has created a situation in which many of those engaged in agriculture in the west find themselves in a precarious position.

Briefly, these circumstances were as follows: First, there was a disastrous loss of markets which left Canadian producers with 20 per cent of the export market whereas they had previously held 40 per cent. Favourable whether conditions throughout the world's wheat producing countries and, indeed, in countries which do not normally enter the export market, added millions of bushels to the world wheat surplus. An unusually wet harvest caused further problems for Canadian farmers inasmuch as an estimated 350 million bushels of grain were harvested in a tough or damp condition. Our farmers did a Herculean job attempting to dry their grain, assisted to some extent by the grain handling facilities made available to them. There is no doubt, however, that a significant amount of this out of condition grain was lost as a result of spoilage, particularly in areas where frost had affected the quality. The cost of handling this grain has been out of proportion to usual harvesting expenses and has added a further burden to an industry short of cash.



For six long months, representatives of our national farm organizations, federal members, provincial premiers and other western leaders have been seeking an assurance from the government that something would be done to alleviate the effects of hardship on the prairies owing to loss of grain sales. Time is now running out for those farmers who desperately need help to finance their spring operations. Surely the minister will not shrug this off as opposition propaganda.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. Muir (Lisgar):** I just have a few more words to say and I will be finished.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Does the house agree to allow the hon. member to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Muir (Lisgar):** Surely the minister will not refuse to give credence to the word he is getting from some of the government's own supporters in the west that action must be taken and taken quickly to relieve a serious economic situation.

In conclusion I should like to add a footnote to my remarks a telegram which I received just before I entered the chamber. It reads:

April 30, 1969

Three hundred farmers attending meeting Manitou April 28 in resolution urge payment 15 dollars per acre on acreage taken out of wheat production as compared to 1968 permit holders record to maximum 100 acres.

F. E. Sprung
Secretary of Meeting

I think this telegram speaks for itself, and there is nothing I need add in this regard to what I have already stated.

**Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make on this motion. Statements have been made recently both inside and outside the house to the effect that the government is showing indifference and disregard with respect to farmers and agriculture in Canada. I should like to take a few moments in which to set the record straight. The time spent in this house on agriculture since the session began last September amounts to more than has been spent on any other sector of our economy or on any other subject. The debate today only continues this tradition.

We have passed a lot of legislation having to do with agriculture. I can name many of these measures. There was the measure providing for increased cash advances, and the figure was then raised for the special purpose of enabling farmers to dry grain. There was the Farm Improvement Loans Act, the Farm Credit Corporation Act, the Farm Syndicates Credit Act, the measures concerned with pests and pesticide control and compensation to farmers for losses caused through the contamination of their crops or animals.

As a farmer and a private member on the government side of the house I think it is incumbent on me to draw attention to some of the services and assistance which are being provided on a continuing and in many cases an expanding basis for the farmers of Canada. A few of these services, I am quick to admit, were instituted by Conservative governments during those brief periods since 1930 in which the people of Canada entrusted them with the affairs of our country. But most of them were initiated by Liberal governments and are being continued and improved by the present government. Most fair-minded farmers will, I believe, be willing to agree that this is so.

I believe the Liberal government is guilty of not doing a better job of letting people know what has been done and what is being done. May I take just a minute or two, Mr. Speaker, to set out some of the services and assistance now being provided to the farmers of Canada.

They include a tremendous program of research and information, the inspection and grading of new products, marketing and production research, the programs of pest and disease control. The prices of a variety of products, including wool, eggs and hogs, have been stabilized at a cost of about $140 million a year if one includes the dairy division. There is the Canadian Livestock Feed Board which protects both our livestock and the feed grain industry. The Wheat Board has now been placed on a permanent basis as the result of the action of the Liberal government. The Board of Grain Commissioners provides services connected with the grading and inspection of our grain. The Prairie Farm Assistance Act provides assistance to farmers who have suffered partial or complete crop failure, to an average cost of about $9 million a year.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Then there is P.F.R.A. which provides for irrigation, community pasture projects, dams and so on. There is crop insurance, on which the federal government pays half the administration costs and 25 per cent of the premium costs. Then there are grants to a multitude of agricultural associations, such as the seed growers, the 4-H movement, livestock associations, plowing associations, various fairs and what have you. This represents a total expenditure of at least $300 million per year by way of assistance to farmers in all parts of the country.

Then there is the Canada Grains Council which was recently established by the government and which I think augers well for the future. Then there is the Canadian Congress on Agriculture and, last but not least, the tour of the western provinces just concluded by the agricultural committee of the House of Commons.

Then we have the emergency wheat reserves legislation which last year put at least $37 million into the coffers of the Wheat Board. Over the years it has put in amounts varying from 5.9 cents a bushel to 12.9 cents a bushel. These payments have been made ever since the Liberal party inaugurated that program in 1956 under the wheat reserves act. This year there was also put into the coffers of the Wheat Board at least $7 million on account of the support the government provided for the price of wheat during the 11 month period in 1967-68 when there was no effective international grains arrangement. If you add those two figures together, Mr. Speaker, a sum of at least $44 million or $45 million has been provided compared with the total final payment on wheat to the farmers of $60 million. In other words, if it had not been for those two payments to the Wheat Board in 1967-68, the final payment on wheat last month would have been not 12 5 cents a bushel but 4 or 5 cents a bushel.

**Mr. Horner:** That is the farmers' own money coming back to them.

**Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia):** This storage payment comes from the pockets of the taxpayers of Canada, as does the floor price for wheat which cost $7 million.

The motion before us refers to the deteriorating net income of Canadian farmers. I hope you will forgive me, Mr. Speaker, if I refer in particular to the severe financial crisis in western agriculture but that is the area with which I am most familiar, one in which I think I can claim some experience and, I hope, at least a little knowledge.

Let me first outline some of the events leading up to the present situation. Farm marketings of wheat for export have varied a great deal in the past ten years, from the crop year 1958-59 to 1967-68 inclusive. In the first five years of that period exports of wheat and flour averaged 323 million bushels per year. During the next four years the average was 520 million bushels per year. Last year, the tenth year in this period, exports dropped to 335 million bushels.

On the strength of the forecasts and predictions made over the past several years by Canadian and international food experts, economists, government officials and politicians of various political parties, grain farmers have increased their efficiency in the production of grain. They have enlarged their units to make them more economical. They have purchased larger and more modern machinery and have built new and better grain storage facilities. In so doing, and on the strength of the advice that they received, many of them have gone into debt. Now, as a result of reduced markets, falling prices and rising costs, they find themselves unable to meet their debt obligations in a great many cases. They also find themselves short of cash to pay their operating expenses.

At one time farm requirements were relatively small. Merchants and machinery dealers 40 or 50 years ago used to extend credit to the farmers, and this helped them to finance their most modest requirements. This is no longer possible. The service industry has been forced to go on a cash basis to a large extent. Farm inputs have a much wider variety and a much greater volume now. I believe it is incumbent on the people of Canada to come to the rescue of our food producers and the industry that has contributed and does contribute far more to Canada than the ratio that its numerical proportion has to our national economy, as well as to our export trade. Agriculture is still one of Canada's most important industries, and maintaining this industry in a healthy condition is essential in order to keep our national economy from faltering, as history shows is the inevitable result of depressed conditions in the agricultural sector.



Before I enumerate some suggestions I should like to make, may I briefly expand on one suggestion. I refer to the so-called two-price system for wheat. I believe there is an overwhelming argument in favour of some such system which would give farmers a fairer return on at least that part of wheat production that is used for domestic human consumption. Other sectors of the economy, such as the manufacturers, professional people and labour, have effective methods of increasing their incomes, but these methods are not available to the farmers. Wheat prices are very little higher than they were 20 years ago, whereas the price of commodities and services required by the farmers has practically doubled in the same period. Therefore a special domestic price for wheat is amply justified.

There are, however, some possible difficulties associated with such a two-price system. For example, there is the possibility of our being accused of dumping. Other countries might impose sanctions on Canadian exports in other sectors of our economy if they successfully proved that we were dumping our agricultural products or selling them in other markets at a lower figure than we sell them at home.

There is also the question of bread imports. At the present time I am given to believe that in certain cities near the United States border U.S. bread sells at less than the price of Canadian bread. If we increase our bread prices and the United States does not, there will be a problem to be faced there. We might also expect to have policing problems with a two-piece wheat system, with a price differential of $1, so far as millers and other processors are concerned. In addition, the costs of administration naturally go up because a two-price system would have to be carefully administered. There would also be what to my mind is the most serious problem of deciding how to distribute the proceeds of a two-price system for wheat. I do not think the wheat producers themselves have agreed on how the proceeds should be distributed among them.

I have consistently spoken in favour of a two-price system for wheat at every opportunity, especially since I became involved in federal politics about a year ago. In my first speech in the house I called on the government to give early and sympathetic consideration to some such system of paying the wheat farmers a fair price for domestic wheat. I have mentioned this many times since and I renew my plea today.

My first suggestion, which is most necessary in order to find both a long and a short term solution to the farm income problem, is that sales efforts by all agencies concerned with marketing farm products should be increased by making maximum use of all selling techniques in both the domestic and export markets. To that end the government should support and strengthen the Wheat Board system of marketing by making whatever legislative changes may be necessary to allow the Canadian Wheat Board to expand its export sales.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the house would give me permission to conclude my remarks?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member does not have unanimous consent.

**Mr. Stanfield:** In fairness, Mr. Speaker, one of our members was given a minute extra, so it might be appropriate for the hon. member to have the same courtesy.

• (5:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia):** I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members. I suggest that the government support the floor price of wheat at the level of the minimums of the International Grains Arrangement. I suggest also that the government introduce a wheat acreage reduction program which would compensate farmers reducing their wheat acreage, with greater incentive to be given to those who convert that acreage to pasture and for the growing of forage crops. Greater incentives should also be given to farmers farming in areas in which grades of wheat low in protein are produced. Also, the government should provide farmers with higher returns for wheat used for human consumption in Canada by authorizing the Canadian Wheat Board to charge higher prices for such wheat or by such other methods as will achieve the same result.

As an interim measure to help in alleviating the current shortage of operating funds, I suggest that the government consider making an immediate payment of ten cents per bushel, in lieu of the two price system, on wheat delivered in the 1967-68 crop year. As hon. members will see, I am less optimistic than was the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) who mentioned 20 cents per bushel. I suggest that the immediate payment ought to be ten cents per bushel, with a minimum payment of $250 to any farmer and a maximum of $500 per bona fide farm operator.

My further suggestions are that the government institute a special program of assistance on an interim basis to farmers operating small, uneconomic units; that the government provide for more research into the problems of agricultural markets and forecasting as well as into the problems of alternate uses for farm products; that the government continue and expand its support for credit sales of farm products; that the government take steps to prevent any increase in the tolls charged on the St. Lawrence seaway; that the government consider the advisability of placing the Canadian Wheat Board under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture and that the Wheat Board be asked to review the operation of its quota system with a view to making it more equitable and effective.

I shall suggest, too, that the government ought to take steps to insure the equitable distribution of box cars and the best possible use of our grain handling and transportation system; that the government continue to promote the improvement and use of the Hudson Bay route; that the government investigate the alleged dumping of vegetable oil on the Canadian market and take the necessary action to prevent it, and that the government take all necessary action to restrain rising costs and prices of products and services used in agricultural production.

My other recommendations are that the government take steps to provide for some direct producer representation on the Canadian Wheat Board and that the creditors extend extra time to farmers required to repay loans made under the Farm Improvement Loans Act and the Farm Credit Corporation Act. Of course, I am speaking of those farmers who will find it difficult to meet their payments this spring. These suggestions,

Mr. Speaker, may or may not form part of the recommendations contained in an early report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

My concluding remarks, Mr. Speaker, are to tell hon. members that an emergency situation is facing Canadian agriculture.

**Mr. Horner:** Why didn't the hon. member say that in the first ten minutes of his speech?

**Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia):** The emergency situation facing Canadian agriculture has been brought about through no fault of the industry. Its roots lie, in part at least, in national policy that has existed almost since Confederation. I have suggested some constructive measures that the government might adopt. I am fully confident that the government will take early and effective action, and for that reason I will not support the motion.

**Mr. Stanfield:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I agreed to allow the hon. member extra time, thinking he would take half a minute or a minute at most to finish. He has taken longer. I think we should observe the limits of debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member actually took three minutes more than his allotted time. Perhaps that may be taken into account when another hon. member seeks permission to go beyond his allotted time.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to learn that today's sitting would be spent on a discussion of agricultural problems and especially of the Canadian farmers' situation.

I hope that our discussion, which I trust will be objective, will lead to some solutions, so that farmers may have the security to which they are entitled and to which they have aspired for a long time.

We have already heard the comments of several government members on the matter. We are told repeatedly that the government is trying to do something, that its intentions are of the best. The situation was the same seven or eight months ago. The speeches will go on, and the previous speaker will again take the floor. As a matter, of fact, he does not in the least think that the government has done nothing. In his opinion, it has accomplished a great deal. I agree, of course, that a government is always elected to do something.

[Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia).]

I suggest we should ask: has the government done enough? Can it do more and better? Even with the best intentions in the world, we remain convinced that what has been done is not enough. This is obvious when we study the farmers' situation.

I will be told: This is not easy, or; we have problems. But should we let things as they are just because there is no easy solutions? Should we let matters take care of themselves in due time? Should we be satisfied by simply saying that it is difficult?

As a member from eastern Canada, and more particularly from the province of Quebec, I hope that other Quebec M.P.'s, especially those on the government side, will take advantage of this day not only to recommend to the government to do something but also to compel it to act.

One could say that, from time to time, during the meetings of the caucus, members speak louder and express their viewpoints. But I think we have today a special opportunity to tell the government what the farmers need. I believe the people are expecting that not only opposition members but government members as well will put forward strong and specific proposals whereby farm people would be appreciated once and for all and would get the recognition to which they are entitled.

Considering that one third of the Canadian labour force is related directly or indirectly to farming and has to work under intolerable conditions at the present time, and considering also that the situation is disastrous for the national economy, I think we must find solutions to the problem and ensure that they will have lasting results.

The present problems are somewhat similar to those that prevailed four or five years ago. Travelling across Canada, one finds the same conditions everywhere. No doubt that production costs have considerably increased but income is not much higher, so we are finally faced with overproduction.

I would find it hard to understand that a country as well known as ours where the workers are willing, generally, to work towards their common goal, would let 30 per cent of its population live in poverty while it experiences overproduction it is unable to consume as it should in its best interests.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I have already said and I repeat it that there were problems of consumption and production in Canada.

In my opinion, if the government must make any effort, it must try to find some formula for the consumption of that production. It will also have to consider reviewing the matter of our imports. We should also perhaps ask the government to adopt another philosophy and compel it to act differently.

It will surely have to assert itself a little more forcibly from time to time, as far as high finance is concerned. Some agreements concerning imports were concluded a few years ago and as a result of some developments, it would be advisable to review those agreements. We are back from a trip in the West. Once more we noticed that there is overproduction in that region. Both the East and the West have similar problems, that is the cost of production and income.

Because of the importance of that industry in Canada, I feel that the government should now have a guarantee policy. It should guarantee the purchase of our production and find outlets for it. Maybe the role played by the agencies which promote the sale of our products abroad should be revised. Above all, we must ensure the security of our producers.

It is now impossible, since all the hon. members who made the trip acquainted themselves with the problems of farming, not to appreciate those facts.

In the circumstances, it would be useless for me or for the other hon. members to discuss that problem for weeks. It was said a while ago that much time has been devoted to agriculture since the beginning of this session. In fact, we have been content with wasting our time. We have passed some pieces of legislation, we have found a formula allowing our farmers to borrow on a larger scale, to get deeper into debt. They will need a long period of time to pay back their loans. We found it enough to grant them five or six extra years to reimburse the money borrowed. I do not think it fair. That is not the proper way to provide help to our farmers.

The government should establish a guaranteed price policy. I have already suggested that without any results. I had thought that we might be able to help our producers in getting labour from the Unemployment Insurance office, without depriving the unemployed from their unemployment benefits. This measure would enable the producers to get cheap labour, which would, by the way, reduce production costs.

It had been felt that the idea was not so bad after all, but, I have not heard about it since.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that together we should find a solution with the sole purpose of giving back to the farmers the guarantee and the security they need.

I do not believe that in view of the importance of the question, the present government can hesitate longer.

I still believe in the objectivity of everyone of those who represent the ridings of Canada. Thus, with a firmer and more objective attitude, thanks to this day of debate, which has allowed us to study the problem together and to find rapidly a solution, the minister will be able to announce us shortly what steps he intends to take and the farmers will be satisfied.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, one of the purposes of this debate is to try to obtain from the government benches some indication of their opinion of the condition of Canadian agriculture at this time, and in particular the state of agriculture in western Canada. In this respect, the debate so far has been very confusing. Two members of the Liberal Party have spoken. One said he conceded agriculture in western Canada was in a state of emergency or crisis. The minister said he would consider the situation as "I wouldn't want to say the farmers never had it so good". This is a grudging admission by the minister that perhaps there is a small problem.

If the minister wants my opinion as to what the situation is, I say without fear of exaggeration that it is one of crisis proportions. Surely, the minister must be aware of that. The minister does not have to take only the word of members on this side of the house. He can ask his colleague from Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) or some of his colleagues who toured western Canada with the Committee on Agriculture. I recall that two weeks ago when the Wheat Board representatives appeared before the committee, two members from eastern Canada said in so many words that they considered the situation facing western farmers to be tragic and one of emergency. Those were the words they used. Surely, they must have meant what they were saying, unless they were playing to the press gallery.

The minister should admit it is time the government took some concrete action and

presented to parliament some specific proposals on how to meet this serious situation. Quite frankly, the list of proposals the hon. member for Assiniboia put on the record a few months ago are, in themselves, all right, but I daresay this is probably the third time the hon. member has circulated that list. To what avail? What point is there in a supporter of the government enumerating a list of good ideas? He reads them into the record at a committee meeting; he reads them at a Liberal constituency meeting and probably appears before the minister on bended knees. The minister says, "I would not want to say that the farmers never had it so good". The hon. member for Assiniboia may as well save his energy.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Assiniboia is rising on a point of privilege.

**Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said I read this list of suggestions at a constituency convention, but that is not true.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. This is not a question of privilege.

**Mr. Schreyer:** Earlier this afternoon, the minister put on the record certain figures indicating the number of farmers who were taking cash advances in western Canada. I will be one of the first to say that the cash advance legislation introduced by the Conservative government in the late fifties was a very worth-while piece of legislation. I think hon. members of the Conservative party will acknowledge that the C.C.F. had also been trying to impress on a former Liberal government of the late fifties that such legislation should be implemented. It was incredible that the minister would cite the figures showing how much had been taken up in cash advances as something of which to be proud. To me, that is one of the best means of showing there is a serious cash position on the prairies. The more that is taken by way of cash advances, the more we should be worrying and shuddering about the prospects for repayment.

The number of farmers in Manitoba who took advantage of the cash advance legislation last year was very small. This year, I am informed the number of farmers who have taken out cash advances has increased by a factor of 10, ten times as many as was the case in preceding years. To me, that is a sign of danger. The minister should not point to that as a defence.



I realize part of the problem facing agriculture in the west has to do with declining international sales, plugged markets and declining prices. I suggest to the minister there are some specific steps that should be taken. The government must try to help the Canadian Wheat Board in its task of promoting the sale of Canadian wheat. I suggest the sales staff of this organization should be supplemented. How many men are actually engaged as salesmen exclusively of the Canadian Wheat Board? It is a very small number. The number should be increased, either directly under the aegis of the Wheat Board or indirectly by using Canadian trade personnel at Canadian trade bureaus overseas as supplementary agents of the Wheat Board.

• (5:50 p.m.)

At a time of crisis, that is the least that should be done. For how long are we going to continue with a state of affairs in which the actual transactions for our entire export sales of wheat are dependent upon five or six international concerns? The minister knows to which ones I am referring—the Dreyfus Corporation, the Bungy Corporation, the Carghill Corporation of Minneapolis, and one or two others. To them, it is of little concern whether they are handling Canadian wheat or some other country's. The government has not taken the initiative to see that a Canadian corporation is established that would become engaged in precisely this kind of work. I suggest this should be done.

There is nothing to stop the minister from impressing upon his cabinet colleagues the seriousness of the situation, and the amount of money required to tide the prairie economy over this most difficult of times. There is nothing to stop him from getting the agreement of his colleagues to assist whatever entrepreneurship exists in Canada to set up an international trading agency.

I am sure the minister has enough facts and figures to back up his case. Why isn't he doing it? He is not in a weak position. He is one of the few Liberal cabinet ministers from the prairies. He is one of the few Liberal members of parliament from the prairies, and his colleagues must surely know that unless he is given some co-operation and authority there will be even fewer after the next election.

There is one other matter which I must refer to at this time. It is the way in which

the minister, inadvertently or otherwise, distorted what was said by my colleague relative to the matter of dairy quotas. To my knowledge, no one in this party or in the party to my right suggested that we were in favour of regionalization of dairy production or wanted to see any barriers against the interprovincial movement of dairy products No one said that.

But the minister must admit that since the establishment of the National Dairy Commission something serious has come to light. I refer to the fact that over the past two years the prairies' share of the national dairy quota pool has declined by 11 per cent to 12 per cent. The minister may say that, relatively speaking, dairying is not all that important to the prairies.

**Mr. Olson:** I did not say that.

**Mr. Schreyer:** But what is important is that it is a complementary operation for many farmers, and in fact is a main operation for many western farmers. A year such as this shows the importance of a supplementary cream shipping or milk shipping operation. If this trend continues whereby the prairies' share of the national quota pool continues to decline, then fewer farmers out west will have an opportunity to continue in dairy farming as a supplement to their grain operation.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to interrupt the hon. member because his time has expired.

**Mr. Schreyer:** I have just one or two more sentences.

**Mr. Speaker:** Has the hon. member leave of the house to finish his final sentence?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Schreyer:** I just want to point out to the minister that according to the quota summary issued 12 days ago by the Wheat Board, the most recent available to us, there are in the province of Manitoba even at this late date in the crop year 60 per cent of the shipping points still on a unit or one bushel quota. This is further proof that the hon. member for Assiniboia is right; something must be done, and done soon.

**Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate and second the motion of nonconfidence in the government on its agricultural policies, or I should say lack of policies, I wish to point out that I do so in all seriousness. There are many emergencies in Canada today. One can think of the housing situation and the recent resignation of the former Minister of Transport over lack of government action. I want to suggest that if immediate action is not forthcoming then the Minister or Agriculture (Mr. Olson) had better resign too. Then, perhaps the government will come to life.

Look at the unemployment situation, at the high cost of living, the water and air pollution problems, postal services and many others. But paramount and most important is the emergency facing our economy in the field of agriculture. Just recently our Standing Committee on Agriculture made a tour of the four western provinces. Some 35 briefs were presented to us, including representations from the premiers or ministers of agriculture of the western provinces. At this point I would like to congratulate in particular the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool on organizing one of the most effective tours of Saskatchewan with regard to agriculture for committee members, and on the work it did in bringing farmers' problems to the attention of the committee.

Not only did we hold meetings in some of the major cities, but we also went out to farm homes where representative farmers were even prepared to open up their books, show us their income tax statements, and demonstrate in general the standard of their economy. If nothing else beneficial came from this there was the effect of the tour on Liberal members of the committee who had been criticizing us for being too vociferous, and sometimes too partisan, over the past several months in bringing agricultural problems to their attention. This tour made them finally realize that there was a basis for our complaints. As we went from place to place, it was interesting to note the sympathy that developed in their minds for our points of view and for the problems facing western Canada.

I should now like to quote one or two passages from the brief prepared for the committee by the Hon. W. Ross Thatcher, Premier of Saskatchewan, whose comments I think are important because of his political affiliation. They give positive proof of the position of western farmers.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I understand the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth) wants to rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Danforth:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is that since there is a time limit on our speeches this afternoon, and since the hon. member who has the floor has only a few minutes more left, maybe Your Honour would be disposed not to see the clock until he has finished.

**Mr. Speaker:** If this is the disposition of the house, the Chair will turn a blind eye to the clock.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Southam:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my contribution will be short in keeping with the rules we have agreed upon. In his brief the Premier of Saskatchewan said:

> The economic circumstances of a majority of prairie producers are desperate.

He referred to loss of sales and said:

> The farmer's first problem is caused by an inability to market a large proportion of his grain.

He went on to state:

> Presently quotas at most elevator points are the lowest in a decade. Thus the cash position of the farmer is extremely serious.
>
> On the prairies, we must literally market or perish.

All the briefs received by the committee indicated that never before has the cost-price squeeze taken such a firm hold on our farmers. Some underlying causes are; (1) loss of markets, and particularly the temporary lapse of the International Wheat Agreement which brought about this serious situation; (2) high cost of machinery and repairs; (3) higher taxes; (4) lower farm prices; (5) tight quotas and low sales; (6) the burden of drying huge piles of damp grain; (7) higher interest rates.

• (6:00 p.m.)

The eighth cause, to add insult to injury, is the new Estate Tax Act. In fact, it was startling to note, in a recent position paper the task force prepared for the agricultural congress that completed its four day conference several weeks ago at the Chateau Laurier here in Ottawa, that the net income, on the basis of the average capital investment, for the farmer in Canada for the last full year under review was only 1.32 per cent. Putting it another way, it represents a return of only 40 cents per man-hour of labour to the farmer.

I was never one to criticize without making some specific suggestions to improve a situation. Therefore, I should like to make a few suggestions. These are some I have already outlined to the chairman of the agricultural committee who was with us on our recent journey across western Canada.

My first suggestion is it is my belief that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), accompanied by the Ministers of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), Agriculture, (Mr. Olson), and possibly External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), together with several advisors from each of their departments, should immediately journey to Washington to have an emergency discussion with their counterparts with a view to setting machinery in motion to see to it that the terms of the recent International Grain Agreement be activated to the full.

I make this suggestion in all seriousness because our great neighbour to the south, during the Kennedy Round discussions several years ago in Geneva, was instrumental in persuading us to allow the wheat agreement to lapse. Then, they were the first offenders when in August 1967 they dumped a large amount of grain into some of our traditional markets at 22 cents below the agreed price. I think this was a gross violation. I think they should co-operate now by being the first to help us initiate this new world agreement.

My second suggestion is that various trade policies should be developed by our own Department of Trade and Commerce with respect to the sale of wheat such as long term, low interest credit arrangements, especially to emerging nations, and reciprocal trade agreements with prospective or current importers of our wheat.

Thirdly, I believe a close examination should be made at once of our Board of Grain Commissioners grading formula with a view to bringing it into line with the grading practices of our competitors and demands of our importers.

The fourth suggestion is that, as an immediate one year emergency measure, acreage payments should be made to the farmers under the quota and permit book system similar to the action taken in 1958, 1959 and 1961. A maximum of $60 million should be allotted for this purpose. This would assist a farmer in buying needed seed in those areas of the west where his crop was frozen or supplement the purchase of fuel or other necessities for spring planting.

As my fifth suggestion, I believe the principle of a two-price system should be inaugurated at once. This would supplement the temporary acreage payment in the future and

the benefits from it would begin to be felt in the agricultural economy next year.

My sixth suggestion is that serious consideration should be given to establishing a fully Canadian based commodity sales organization to handle, on behalf of the Wheat Board, our wheat, oats, barley and rye, flax and rape seed for that matter, rather than depend on the several major commission houses situated in the United States and Europe that presently carry on this business for us.

I suggest as the seventh point that a transport controller or co-ordinator be appointed who would see to it that the agricultural industry got its fair share of the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National rolling stock in times of emergency, similar to that which we experienced this fall and winter in moving grain to the west coast.

Suggestion number eight is: Consideration might be given to the establishment of one or two terminal elevators in Europe and Asia of reasonable grain carrying capacity which would provide storage for grain that would be readily accessible for the market, should speedy delivery be a factor in making a sale.

Suggestion number nine is that marketing research should be greatly activated.

I could go on to mention a number of others, but because my time is limited I shall conclude with this suggestion. I think if these suggestions were effected we would have a greatly improved industry. What concerns our farmers, in a state of sorrow and disbelief, is the apparent indifference to their plight. Liberal speeches always seem to leave the implication that the farmers never had it so good. An example was the speech by the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon and that of his colleague the hon. member for Assiniboia, (Mr. Douglas), although the latter in closing his remarks did admit there is an emergency in agriculture.

The Prime Minister is also callous and indifferent in respect of agricultural problems. We might remember his reply to the Liberal farmers in Winnipeg on December 20 in respect of the selling of wheat. We might think about his flippant answers in the house yesterday as recorded at page 8167 of *Hansard* regarding passports. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that we must have action now, not six months or a year from now.

## 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 does not insist upon its amendment made to Bill C-155, An Act to provide compensation to farmers whose agricultural products are contaminated by pesticide residue, and to provide for appeals from compensation awards, to which the House of Commons had disagreed;

And also, a message informing this House that the Senate does not insist upon its amendment to Bill C-157, an Act to regulate products used for the control of pests and the organic functions of plants and animals, but insists upon the principle thereof and has substituted therefor a further amendment, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

It being after six o'clock I do now leave the Chair.

At 6.10 p.m. the House took recess.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE CAPITAL TO AGRICULTURE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Danforth and the amendment thereto of Mr. Gleave.

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this debate today concerning agriculture because of the concern I feel for this industry and this way of life in Canada.

Recently I took part in the tour of western Canada by the Committee on Agriculture during which we visited agricultural areas and saw many facets of this industry in the four western provinces. I should like to point out that this visit was to the grass roots level of agriculture in western Canada and that it was approved by the government. I believe that many of the cries which we hear that the government is not concerned with the problems of the people of western Canada, and of farmers, is just not true. The government members of this committee took an active part in the western tour, and I think it needs

to be pointed out and emphasized, that it was the Liberal government that approved and encouraged this trip.

**Mr. Stanfield:** How pathetic can you get?

**Mr. Foster:** If the government were not concerned with the problems of western Canada, I can assure you that they would never have agreed to the visit by the standing Committee on Agriculture because this visit draws attention to the problems in agriculture.

In our trip to western Canada, I was particularly impressed by the diversification of agriculture that we saw in Alberta. Although grain farming is an important part of this industry in that province, agriculture there is generally much more diversified than in Saskatchewan. Dairying, beef farms, hog and poultry production as well as cash crops such as sugar beet, make for a more balanced agriculture in that province.

We visited the Kinsella experimental farm where important experiments in genetics are being carried out to develop more hardy strains of beef producing animals. These experiments are also aimed at improving the conversion factor of feed to beef. At Lacombe in southern Alberta we visited the federal government experimental farm where the federal government has spent millions of dollars over the last half a century to aid western agriculture. I say to the opposition: Is this the kind of federal government aid to agriculture in which you have no confidence?

Federal government aid to research has always been an important key to improved production. Surely, the members of the opposition who travelled with this committee cannot be voting against the federal government's policy of increasing aid to research in the production of better cereal grains. In British Columbia, the standing Committee on Agriculture visited the terminal elevators where millions of bushels of wheat are shipped annually to the Pacific rim countries of Japan and China.

At the Saskatchewan Pool elevators we saw a Toyota ship tied up which was loading wheat for Japan. A few days previously this ship had come from Japan loaded with a cargo of Toyota cars, and I think we should realize that trade is a two way street. Our foreign customers must sell to us in order to be able to buy from us. Perhaps we should spend a little time considering whether the jokes we make about small foreign cars are really appropriate in this day when we so desperately need world sales of wheat, especially to the countries that make small cars such as Japan, Germany and England.

In British Columbia, I was most impressed with the way the producers of agricultural products such as milk, eggs, broilers and orchard crops have organized their production and marketing more efficiently than in any other place I know in Canada. The term "supply management" was one that we heard most often in British Columbia, and perhaps this is the key to the future success of agriculture in Canada. We are a country that can produce a surplus of agricultural products beyond what we can consume ourselves or what we can sell on the foreign markets. I believe that the future success and stability of the agricultural industry in Canada depends on supply management, so that we produce what we can sell and we sell at a fair price which will reward the producer adequately for his labour and investments.

This is not to say that there are no problems in agriculture in British Columbia. We heard many briefs in this province, and the Committee on Agriculture will be making recommendations on these problems to the House of Commons and to the government. Perhaps the most important part of this trip was our visit to Saskatchewan because this is the province that produces a major share of Canadian wheat. The biggest problem lies in over-production of wheat and insufficient sales on the foreign market, coupled with excess moisture in last fall's crop.

I must congratulate the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool which organized for the 30 committee members some 24 meetings in small towns across the province which were attended by some 18,000 farmers. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool field men were excellent hosts for the committee members and organized every detail of the tour in that province most satisfactorily. Not only did the committee members meet hundreds of farm people at formal meetings but they visited as well individual farmers to review their problems right on the farms. I visited farms where 30,000 bushels of wheat were stored.

I must say that in the hundreds of briefs that were presented in this province, many serious and practical suggestions were made to the Standing Committee on Agriculture. These included recommendations for a two-price system according to which the consumers of Canada would be

asked to pay an extra 1½ cents for a loaf of bread so that some $50 million of added income could flow into the grain agriculture of western Canada. I note the minister announced, after the meeting with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture last week, that he is going to give this suggestion his serious consideration. The idea of the two-price system has found support in the three western legislatures of Canada as well as among farm groups and wheat pools which have advocated it for many years. Other suggestions included a floor price for wheat to the level of the International Grain Arrangement price. There may be merit in this solution on a short term basis. This was done successfully for some months in the interim between the last two international grain arrangements.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Other recommendations include the transfer of many millions of acres from grain production to the production of beef cattle and other crops. This solution may have merit and I believe it should be implemented on a controlled basis, with caution. Right now we have one part of agriculture in western Canada sick. I would not want to see the same fate befall other sections of agriculture because of over-production.

I believe that the best long term solution to the problem of wheat in western Canada lies in increased wheat sales to other countries. The Wheat Board has done a great deal to bring about orderly marketing of wheat in western Canada and everywhere we went we found support and encouragement for the Canadian Wheat Board. We must strengthen this organization. We must provide the necessary legislative changes to allow it to merchandize this product under present-day conditions in the market places of the world. If it takes more salesmen, let's get them. If it takes better credit arrangements, let's provide them. If it takes improved shipping and transportation systems, let's create them.

I am convinced from what I have seen in western Canada that most farmers have passed through the transition stage of establishing larger more economic units and now only require markets for their product to be in a sound position. By contrast, many of our eastern farmers in Canada are still not in this position. The Agriculture Committee will be making a tour of eastern Canada next month and I would like to speak to the problems of eastern agriculture in more detail after—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**An hon. Member:** Carry on.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Will the house give consent for the hon. member to continue?

**An hon. Member:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** There is no unanimous consent.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning it was my pleasure to attend a meeting with representatives of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and to take part in a serious, earnest discussion of the affairs of an industry which appears to be in serious difficulties. This discussion took place with responsible representatives of an important industry. It is very hard to realize that this is the same industry as that which was discussed by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) in the house this afternoon. Having taken part in that discussion yesterday and having heard the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in the house yesterday, I have concluded that one of the most urgent needs in the country today is to wake up this government, if that is possible.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Seldom a day goes by without a new example of the devastating impact of the brilliant intellectual approach of the government, including the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture, on the economic problems of this country. Yesterday, of course, the Prime Minister left us all dizzy—I think that would be the word—by the succinct assessment he made of the state of the economy. When he was asked by my hon. friend from Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) when we could expect some decision concerning the deterioration of the economy of western Canada, the Prime Minister replied: "Mr. Speaker, as indicated by the increase in demands for passports, the economy is booming more and more." It is small wonder that the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) has resigned because the Prime Minister is unable to understand the day to day problems of the Canadian people. As for the Minister of Agriculture, this afternoon he seemed to be second in complacency only to the Prime

Minister of the country. I would almost go as far as to say that he was of more help to the government when he was in opposition, rushing to the defence of the government with points of order, than he is on that side of the house.

In his speech this afternoon, the Minister of Agriculture denied the very existence of the problem set forth in the resolution before the house.

**Mr. Olson:** I say categorically: that is false.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, the minister denied the existence of the problem stated in the resolution presented to the house.

**Mr. Olson:** I did not deny the existence of problems in agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I think the minister had better keep his seat if that is the best he can do. He is not charging that what I said was incorrect. What I said a moment ago was perfectly correct. The Minister can shake his head if he likes. Unfortunately for him, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) shortly afterward pulled the rug from under his feet, such as it is. The problems in agriculture are admittedly complex. The minister said it is easy for the opposition to criticize. I admit it is easy for the opposition to criticize this government and its agricultural policies. But even that is not as easy as the practice followed by the government of keeping everything under review.

It is not a matter of producing policies and solutions. What the government does used to be called procrastination; it used to be called indecision. Now, they have initiated a new name for it, a review. Everything is under review.

**Mr. Smerchanski:** That is progress.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Take inflation, for example which places such a heavy burden on this country. What has the government done? About eight months after the election they produced a white paper which two or three people could have produced in two or three hours. This recommended, not a solution, not a real attack on inflation, but the appointment of a continuing study group to advise the government of the day on the question. Here we are, Mr. Speaker, some four or five months after the white paper was tabled in December, and the government even now has failed to produce the study group to advise it about what to do with regard to inflation. It is a fiasco rather than an orderly, meaningful program to cope with inflation. The only thing this government, including the Minister of Agriculture, has created so far is uncertainty and confusion.

Take the feed and grain situation, for example. Everyone is confused as to why—

**Mr. Smerchanski:** Is this in eastern or western Canada?

**Mr. Stanfield:** Eastern Canada.

**Mr. Smerchanski:** This debate is about western Canada.

**Mr. Stanfield:** What is the policy with regard to the dairy industry? It is, of course, to squeeze out the little fellow. But even so, they have not taken the trouble to produce a well-rounded program with some hopeful alternative for the little fellow to adopt, involving a useful place for him in the economy. It is a half-baked policy which the minister is pushing through. I shall not bother to discuss potato prices with him. I think he realized, judging by his feeble defence this afternoon, what the difficulty is. Farmers are going through a difficult period of adjustment, particular in the part of Canada from which I come. They recognize that changes must be made but they do not have substantial capital to help them make these adjustments, and they are well beyond the financial resources of the provinces.

When these matters are discussed with the Liberal government, however, the only answer we get is talk about conferences or task forces. The truth is, I am afraid, that those in charge of this government, those who are really in the seats of power, have what might be called an urban complex. They do not have an urban policy, but they have an urban complex. They believe farmers are on the way out, that farmers' votes will decrease and that by the time they appoint and work their way through two or three more task forces there will be no more farmers to worry about anyway.

**Mr. Smerchanski:** And that is progress.

• (8:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Stanfield:** Since the government has no policy, it sends the committee on a trip west. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) expects the other members of the agricultural committee and the house at large to be grateful for that favour conferred by this great Liberal government.

It may be that there is a necessity in some parts of the west to transfer, over a period of time, operations to some other crops, but this is a longer term problem. The problem now is how to get through this year. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), as well as members on this side of the house, emphasized that point. We are facing problems because prospects for marketing are poor. We have lost our share of the international market over a period of years, and we are all familiar with the long, sad history of this.

We suggest, indeed urge, that immediate assistance for our farmers is necessary. Various forms of assistance have been proposed in order to keep them in business for this year. As far as the west is concerned, I understand the Richardson newsletter has indicated that the outlook this year for our grain markets is poor. I see that the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon (Mr. Lang) is in his place. I hope he will rise and do here what he said he would do when he was out west. He was going to come down to Ottawa and fight for the west.

Where is his colleague, the Minister without Portfolio from Winnipeg (Mr. Richardson), who announced that he would come to eastern Canada and tell the east what it should do about the west? Where are these paper tigers? I hope they rise in their places tonight and tell the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) what he should do about our agricultural problems. I am looking forward to hearing this brave spokesman for the west rise in his place to tell the government and the Minister of Agriculture what they should do.

Certainly, our agricultural industry is in a state of flux; there is no question of that. There is no need for anybody to minimize the difficulties. Although the Minister of Agriculture spoke in this house this afternoon, at a time when everybody realizes our agricultural industry is in a serious condition, he did not make one proposal or even recognize the need for making one proposal, with regard to coming to the assistance of our farmers in their present emergency. If we on this side of the house cannot do it, I at least hope that the Minister without Portfolio and his colleague the other Minister without Portfolio will succeed in waking up the Minister of Agriculture in order that he will take some action and put some proposals before this house.

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, the topic before us tonight is one of extreme gravity and seriousness for this country.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Lang:** I am pleased to know that, following the suggestion I made in the house the other day, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) has begun reading the speeches I made in western Canada and is beginning to understand what I had to say about the fundamental nature of this problem.

The truth of the matter is that when the opposition refer to the serious problem of farm income, they are indeed touching on a very real problem. The great tragedy, however, is that they do not yet understand the fundamental nature of the problem.

**Mr. Horner:** Go back to law.

**Mr. Lang:** They understand its superficial aspects. They understand that on a given day the farmer is short of income. But they do not realize how the problem that is really facing agriculture is a fundamental one that has been ingrained into our national society for fully 100 years. I say that in the hope, just a hope—a pious hope—that the opposition may perhaps listen to what I say, and also that the people of the country will listen.

The problem facing agriculture today is serious, but the pattern and the seriousness was just as great and as present in the days a few years ago when crops were good and prices were a little higher. The fundamental problem was there then, as it is here today. This problem was in no way tackled by previous governments, and I make no apology at all on behalf of the government for the fact that we are taking some months to consider appropriate steps to cure a problem that has existed for years and years.

The nature of the problem is really this, that the farmer, along with other unprotected segments of society—and I should like to emphasize that, for he is not alone—has been losing ground because of the power of those who are able to claim in our society more for themselves than justice alone would allow. This power that they have allows them to claim more for themselves than justice alone would allow.

I should like to refer to the kind of power about which I am talking. I am talking about the power in this society of ours to raise prices above their proper level.

**Mr. Horner:** Name them.

**Mr. Lang:** To attack this problem, my colleague, the minister—

**Mr. Horner:** Name the groups you are talking about.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. Hon. members know that each member is restricted to ten minutes, and I will ask for the co-operation of all hon. members of the house in this debate.

**Mr. Lang:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford), is introducing an income and prices commission which is designed, in its way, to attack this problem. All hon. members know how firm the long tradition of the Liberal party has been to work toward freer trade in this country and how more determined than ever the government is to move in this direction. And move in this direction we have, and this is not a small matter.

I speak also for other members of the house about other power groups in the country. I would remind hon. members about the powers, of the unions, the capitalists and the industrialists, with their patents, monopolies and control over resources, to demand a higher price than is reasonable, are the factors causing the fundamental problems of agriculture. These are the factors which are ever increasing the costs in the agricultural industry, so that although in recent years the farmer's cash income has been rising, his position has been growing steadily worse.

I remind hon. members of that because people in eastern and central Canada are apt to refer to the cash income position of the farmer as improving year after year. This does not reveal the fundamental problem that the costs farmers have to bear, either for the production of their income or for their own living, are rising at a much faster rate.

When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) referred the other day to a labour dispute and to the fact that an income increase for one group above productivity must be borne by other people in the country, he was referring to the problem that is facing the farmer and other unprotected segments of society in this country

• (8:30 p.m.)

**Mr. MacInnis:** He did not say so.

**Mr. Lang:** I hear a member of the opposition say, "He did not say so." Perhaps that shows that members of the opposition have not begun to realize the gravity of the situation. They do not know the magnitude of the situation or the seriousness of the problem which must be tackled in a global way.

We have not been unmindful of the problem, Mr. Speaker. One of our first pieces of legislation during the current session increased cash advances available to the farmer. We hoped, to some extent, to pay him for the wheat remaining in the bin on his farm. I said at that time that that legislation was not a long term solution to the problem of the farmer. I said to hon. members opposite that the problem had to do with price. It was a question of income compared to rising costs. When I drew these facts to their attention hon. members opposite, particularly those from western Canada, complained about this or that or the other small difficulty, and I said that by not directing their attention to the solution of the fundamental problems they were doing a real disservice to the agricultural community of this country. I also pointed out that power to obtain a greater share of income than was fair or reasonable was a major problem to be tackled in this society. I was referring to those who could obtain increases in income as a result of their power in society and not as a result of increased productivity. That is the problem.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Lang:** I hear hon. members of the N.D.P. applauding. May I remind them that later in that debate I drew to their attention the fact that it was high time the trade unions of this country used their significant power not to demand higher and higher wages but lower and lower prices which, after all, they could demand just as easily.

This government is conscious of these problems and is attacking them in a steady and responsible manner. I do not apologize, as a member from the West, for having taken time in attacking problems which have been mounting in this country for too long. I am delighted to be a member of a government that is willing to tackle them.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. The hon. member for Huron.

**Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, was a member of the standing Committee on Agriculture. When we toured the west and saw the situation out there, I was amazed. The position of western agriculture is very, very serious. Perhaps I ought to put

on the record a few of the statements contained in briefs that were presented to the committee. The first brief read, in part:

The economic circumstances of a majority of prairie producers are desperate.

The farmers' first problem is caused by an inability to market a large proportion of his grain.

For the past several years, export sales have fallen off sharply. As a result, in the last crop year, farmers were only able to deliver six bushels per acre.

I understand that for the year previous to the last crop year deliveries were down to three bushels. The quotas are even lower now.

I continue quoting from the brief:

On the prairies, we must literally market or perish. We call on the federal government to take every conceivable step, to increase foreign sales.

In particular, we ask for an extension of export credit facilities.

The brief then referred to the cost-price squeeze:

The second problem of the prairie farmer is caused by the so-called cost-price squeeze.

Mr. Chairman, since the end of the war, annually throughout Canada, there has been a consistent upward trend in prices, wages and incomes. Year after year, sharp wage increases have been demanded and given, to virtually every union handling the farmers' products.

— the longshoremen
— the railroaders
— the maritime unions
— the dock workers
— the elevator operators, and so on.

One such settlement a few years ago, gave 30 per cent in one contract, to the longshoreman—and they have had substantially more since that time. Many of these wage increases were given after direct intervention, persuasion and pressure by the federal government. In every case, the farmer has been obliged to absorb a substantial portion of these huge wage increases. I think it should be realized by the committee, that in Saskatchewan since 1949, average wages and salaries have increased 146 per cent. The cost of machinery and other basic materials which the farmer must buy has doubled, in the same period—

But while all this has been happening, the farmers' selling price for wheat has remained almost static ... In other words, at a time when inflation and escalating costs have never been so serious, the farmer has had virtually no increased returns. The result of course has been, that thousands of our farmers have been obliged to leave farming. Thousands of others are caught in an economic squeeze, that monthly becomes more desperate ... Mr. Chairman, the very basis of the prairie economy is agriculture. We do not believe that the nation is treating the wheat farmer fairly.

I wish to quote also from another brief. It reads:

We are disturbed when we read statements made at the agricultural task force congress where Prime Minister Trudeau told those present that agriculture must choose now whether it wants more government involvement in agriculture and at the same time he also stated that the government of Canada does not anticipate supporting agriculture from the Treasury Department. Mr. Olson, Minister of Agriculture, also suggested that agriculture must look to its own salvation and must look forward to discontinuation of what government subsidies it now enjoys.

We ask why the government of Canada can give incentive grants or other assistance to large corporations or other industries but want to discontinue any assistance to agriculture.

I now wish to continue quoting from the first brief from which I read, at page 6:

Other governments provide vast and complex systems of holding up the price which the farmer receives. In the United States, the government actually pays the farmer for keeping land out of production. Almost every nation in the world pays the farmer, some kind of subsidy.

In France, for example their best wheat sells for $2.42 a bushel; in the Netherlands the price is $4.04 a bushel; in west Germany the producer receives $3.01 a bushel; in Japan the producer receives $3.56 a bushel; in India the producer receives $2.83 a bushel.

**Mr. Côté (Richelieu):** Is that in U.S. funds?

**Mr. McKinley:** I believe so. Normally, I believe we have enjoyed about 25 per cent of the world's export market for wheat. In 1952-53 we had about 40 per cent of the market, but in 1967-68 our share was down to about 18 per cent and the prospects for the future do not look bright. When visiting the west I saw grain stacked in bins. Those farmers had no money, having taken advance payments which they used for living expenses. At present, although they may want to plant their crops, they cannot do so because of lack of money. Some farmers could borrow the necessary money, but many cannot.

The Prime Minister and other ministers have said that the farmers of this country are always crying. Maybe that's true, but I do not believe it is. I think farmers know when they are well off. When our farmers are well off everybody else does all right, too.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. McKinley:** And let me say this, Mr. Speaker. If it is true, the present agricultural situation reminds me of the story in which the boys looking after the sheep kept crying wolf. Most of the time there was no wolf, but one day the wolf came. The wolf is

here now, and nobody is coming to help. He is about to eat up the sheep. In this case, the farmers of this country are the sheep.

When we were in British Columbia I was happy to be able to move a motion that affects Ontario farmers even more than it affects British Columbia farmers. It had to do with equalizing the tariff on eviscerated or dressed poultry and live poultry which is coming into this country at an increasing rate. I understand that Professor Cavers, the former head of the poultry department at the University of Guelph—and his opinions are respected throughout Canada—thinks that United States producers are gearing up to send increasing quantities of live poultry into Canada. They will do so because the tariff on live poultry is only two cents whereas on eviscerated poultry it is five cents. The standing Committee on Agriculture approved my motion unanimously, and agreed that this matter ought to be brought to the government's attention in order that immediate action might be taken. Such action would increase the two-cent tariff on fowl, broilers, turkeys, and poultry to 4 cents, equal to that on dressed poultry.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I am happy to know the Standing Committee on Agriculture is going to tour eastern Canada later this year, because everything is not rosy in this part of the country. I shudder to think what will happen to eastern agriculture if the western farmers, in order to get grain markets, feed all their grain to livestock. What will happen to eastern agriculture? Eastern farmers will be out of business, yet that is what western farmers are doing at the present time.

The eastern farmers have many millions of dollars invested in efficient equipment to handle this job. They are doing a tremendous job. If the western farmer is forced, through lack of grain sales caused by the ineffectiveness of the present government, to feed this grain to livestock the eastern farmers will be in serious trouble. If this happens, it will only be a matter of two or three years until the other segments of the economy are affected. This has been proven down through history.

Some people say only between 7 and 9 per cent of the people are employed in agriculture. I think in the production of agricultural products, processing, distributing and all down the line, approximately 40 per cent are engaged in agriculture. If agricultural products are brought in from other countries, either frozen or canned, 40 per cent of the people in this country will be unemployed.

I plead with the government to take action at the present time to avoid a future disaster. A small amount of action and real consideration of this problem will prevent any serious consequences that might be ahead for this country.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean):** Mr. Speaker, as a member from a Quebec constituency, whose population is largely engaged in agriculture, I feel it is my duty to speak in this urgency debate on the agricultural situation.

In so doing, I am moved by a twofold feeling, Mr. Speaker. To begin with, I am rather pleased to take the floor because the farmers, in my region as in the rest of Canada, deserve that we give them our attention. But, at the same time, I am filled with grief when I see the extremely difficult situation which these people have been facing for a long time.

There is much talk in this house of the grain producers of the Prairie provinces and, undoubtedly, they are in a rather desperate situation this year.

However, the problem is not insurmountable for them, because some of them can take up cattle breeding and thus liberate that land used for grain-growing.

Mr. Speaker, such is not the case with the milk producers of the central provinces, particularly the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean region, which I represent in this house, along with three colleagues.

In my constituency, most of the farmers are engaged in the dairy industry, because of the difficult weather conditions. Indeed, they have to switch to dairy production or give up farming altogether.

Over the past years, various farm authorities have advised them to expand their operations in order to increase their production and to modernize it in order to improve its quality. That is what they have done.

In my constituency, over the past ten years, their number has decreased by half, so that today they number only about 2,300, with an annual production of about 235,000,000 pounds of milk, which represents approximately 100,000 pounds of milk per producer. They borrowed money to make improvements, and they badly need their income to hold out.

That is why, even though I recognize the difficulties which production surpluses cause the Department of Agriculture, I must protest on behalf of the 2,300 producers of my area and others in Canada, against the new policy announced by the Canadian Dairy Commission on March 31 last.

I protest all the more as this new policy seems to have been adopted without consultations with representatives of the producers concerned, as to other solutions which might have been applied in the circumstances.

I heard a moment ago the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) quote the brief submitted to us Monday by the representatives of agricultural associations in his area. I shall not quote parts of the same brief, but I must say that, in my opinion, most of the grievances expressed there are well-founded.

More than 400 dairy producers came to that meeting, Mr. Speaker, to support their leaders, and the least I can say is that they were not very happy. They said so very clearly.

Nobody questioned the fact that the price situation had greatly improved in the last years, especially since the establishment of the Canadian Dairy Commission, but the setback they will suffer this year because of the new policy seems unacceptable to them. For them and for farmers in my area, that represents a loss of about $280,000 this year, and that, in an area already suffering from an 18 per cent unemployment rate. That is not likely to solve our problem.

Mr. Speaker, if in the last two years some 39,000 farmers went out of business in the dairy industry, we could at least have tried to reduce the surplus production through some other policy than the present farm policy or migration from the farms by producers, which will certainly continue. Besides, we should ask ourselves whether every effort is being made in order to find markets for our milk surplus.

As I have only ten minutes left, Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks I would like to give an example of the disastrous effects of the new dairy policy. This applies not only to my district but to the province of Quebec and the country as a whole.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Four years ago, at Saint-Coeur-de-Marie, in the Lac-Saint-Jean area, a young man of 30 bought a 200-acre piece of land with money he had saved when working in the Chibougamau mines; he also acquired a herd. However, as he decided to increase it, the Canadian Dairy Commission came into existence. He was given a quota based on his first year of operation, that is a production of 100,000 pounds of milk. Now, with the new policy, after having increased his production to 300,000 pounds, this young man is placed in the position where he would have to pay the Dairy Commission $50 a year. He would thus not make any profit and would even have to pay in order to operate his business. This is inconceivable. I therefore wonder how it will be possible to solve the problem of milk surplus.

The answer is not easy to find, of course, and it is impossible to find a quick solution to this problem while trying to stay within reasonable costs. We are told that in 1969 the Canadian taxpayer will pay around $125 million in subsidies to that industry and that the population as a whole, will pay another $100 million, because prices will be higher, since there is an embargo on imports.

I suggest that, on a trial basis, a committee be appointed which would be made up of representatives of producers as well as representatives of the department, who would have the necessary powers to negotiate a reasonable agreement, at least temporarily, with a view to settling this problem. If the producers were a party to this agreement, they would probably be more ready to cooperate in the implementation of these directives. For a while, it would probably cost a few millions more, but one could hope, at least, for a final settlement of the problem. Perhaps subsidies could be further reduced, even eliminated; that would be ideal, of course, and the net income of the producer would not be reduced as much.

I strongly urge the minister to seriously consider the setting up of that mechanism of negotiation, at least as an experience, because it is imperative to find a solution to this problem.

I cannot close without commenting on the recent changes in the method of classification of hogs in my area. Under the previous system, 40 to 60 per cent of hogs were getting a premium, but since the new standards went into effect at the beginning of the year, this rate has declined to 35 per cent.

However, recognizing the value of the new system, producers have accepted it without too much opposition, hoping to adapt themselves to it rather quickly, that is over a period of 12 to 18 months. But hardly four months later, these requirements were changed, which resulted in getting premiums

for only 18 per cent of the hogs at the slaughter-house.

Even if the price has substantially increased on the market, as everyone agrees, the fact remains that, because of the disastrous situation during the three preceding years, producers need this surplus to make up for accumulated deficits.

The least that could have been done would have been to wait a few more months in order to allow the producers to get used to this new system.

As I often get the chance to speak with the minister, I shall continue to use my influence with him, because, as I know him particularly well, I am aware of his great ability in the field of agriculture and of his very great concern for the human problem which the present agricultural situation implies. I believe that the human problem is primarily the one with which we should be dealing.

[*English*]

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in this debate initiated by the official opposition, and pleased that the debate has taken place because of the minister's apparent lack of understanding of the exact conditions in western Canada. Of course, I mean the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), although having listened to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) this statement could also apply to him.

Surely, when we see a Social Credit government in the province of Alberta, a Liberal government in the province of Saskatchewan and a Conservative government in the province of Manitoba combining their thinking, getting together, and coming here to ask for a two-price system for wheat, urging the federal government to take a look at the severe conditions in western Canada, the seriousness of the situation is underlined.

I wish to quote briefly from the brief presented by the Premier of Saskatchewan, a Liberal premier, to the Standing Committee on Agriculture during the course of its tour of the western provinces. The Minister of Agriculture, who has been a Liberal for only a short time, may learn something from this brief. In it the premier said:

> Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan may I say that in our opinion the western grain industry faces a major crisis.

Could anyone make that more clear? Today, I listened to the speech made by the Minister of Agriculture. He dealt with the subject of livestock, and said how great that industry is. Good as it is, it is thanks to no help from him, and thank heaven for that. Surely, because the livestock industry is in good shape, this does not necessarily mean the whole economy is in good shape.

I see the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt (Mr. Lang) on the edge of his seat as if he had something knowledgeable to say.

**Mr. Lang:** Not to you.

**Mr. Horner:** He has just made his speech, and it was just as if he were lecturing some first year law students at his university. I don't hold it against him for retaining his ability to lecture law students, because I am sure his constituents will wish him back at university after the next election. He talked about the power blocs. Has he spoken to his colleagues, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) with regard to power blocs, after the great and generous wage settlements he made during the last number of months? I mention this in view of the fact that the longshoremen in Montreal struck for a 33 per cent wage increase a number of years ago and started a chain reaction among other labour unions. Now, the Minister of Labour has settled another dispute with them and given them another 21 per cent. In a period of five years, therefore, they have increased their income by some 54 per cent.

The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) talked about power blocs, their strength, and the economic advantage they have over the agricultural industry. I say to him, speak to your cabinet colleagues and retain your lectures for your law students.

**Mr. Lang:** Even you are learning.

**Mr. Horner:** The Premier of Saskatchewan went on to say:

> The economic circumstances of a majority of prairie producers are desperate.

So, beyond a shadow of a doubt we have a major crisis in western agriculture.

Today, I listened to a 30 minute wandering speech by the Minister of Agriculture, and after some pressure from this side of the house in the final two minutes of his speech he dealt with the subject of a two-price system. Until then he had dealt with apples, potatoes, the livestock industry, the hog industry, chickens and eggs. He skated around the main problem. I didn't even know he was a hockey player. He would not have touched on the main problem had there not

been pressure placed on him by members of the opposition.

The Minister of Agriculture accused the Opposition of presenting the problems but never the solutions. We want some solutions from him. He should have some idea of what his capacities are, and the capacities of his government. He spent 30 minutes saying that there was no crisis, no problem.

**Mr. Olson:** I did not say that.

**Mr. Horner:** Then, he went on to say how great things were. I accuse him of being a second C. D. Howe. Everybody in western Canada remembers C. D. Howe's approach to farmers. He tapped them on the stomach and said, "It looks like you are doing all right." That is what the Minister of Agriculture sounded like.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** He sounded like Jimmy Gardiner to me.

**Mr. Horner:** Jimmy Gardiner is another typical example of someone who made that type of speech. The minister dealt at length with cash advance legislation, saying that 83,000 farmers had taken advantage of it and that the amount of money involved was $148 million. That, to me, vividly illustrates the problem.

Some ten days or two weeks ago the Standing Committee on Agriculture toured the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, do you know that some 18,000 or 19,000 farmers turned out to the meetings, that 25 per cent of the farm population turned up at halls and heard the representations made to the Agricultural Committee?

**Mr. Lang:** What percentage?

• (9:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Horner:** Twenty-five per cent of the farmers of the province showed up at halls and spent afternoons and evenings trying to get to the root of the problem and see what solutions could be suggested. Certainly, this shows there is a major crisis in the industry. I was disappointed that the minister did not even recognize the problem, let alone attempt to solve it. He dealt in a vague way with the difficulty of a two-price system. I do not believe there ever has been a piece of legislation introduced in this house that did not confront the administrators with a problem. I well remember when the cash advance legislation was first introduced. It was said that it was impossible to administer and that it would undermine the Wheat Board. A two-price system would bring about problems, but the principle can be recognized and payment can be made under the two-price system. The two prices were paid in two previous cases and could be paid now. That is the number one solution I would like the minister to announce immediately. Then, he or the Minister of Trade and Commerce should announce an initial floor price for wheat of $1.70 a bushel, the same as it was last year, to restore some confidence in the industry.

Then, if the International Grains Agreement is not continued or is not reinstated, the government should announce that the minimum price in that agreement shall be the minimum price for Canadian producers, including the final payment they receive. The Minister of Agriculture could then make great steps toward lengthening the shipping season at the port of Churchill. This would mean another 11 cents a bushel for the prairie producers because of the lower shipping costs. Lloyds of London sets the limit on that shipping period. I think the Canadian Wheat Board should set the limit.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

**Mr. Horner:** I beg the indulgence of the house to carry on for another minute.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Does the house give unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, I am not pleased to take part in this debate because it should not be necessary. I was not pleased to see some 20,000 people turn out at 24 different meetings in Saskatchewan. I was not pleased to see between 6,000 and 8,000 at the S.F.U. meeting at Saskatoon protesting the way this government is handling the feed grain situation. I think this would all be unnecessary if the government would face up to the situation.

I say that the position taken today by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) certainly was that of a very benevolent individual bleeding for the agricultural economy. This is the first impression and one that sets the stage for the great defeat of the agricultural economy. It is a double-cross from the word go.

Let us take a look at the record which indicates the reason given by an irresponsible government for not really meeting the crisis

head on. We have only to look at what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had to say yesterday. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) quoted the Prime Minister as saying yesterday that the economy is on the move and things never have been so good. I am sure the people in western Canada will remember this Statement for years to come. I am sure that the Liberal candidates in the next election will have to justify this statement many times.

Today, the Minister of Agriculture spoke like a great white father. He told us the farmers never had it so good so far as cash advances were concerned. If I understood him correctly, I believe he said 83,000 farmers have taken advantage of cash advances compared to 45,000 last year. These simple facts prove there is a serious crisis facing our primary producers which the government is not prepared, or does not want, to meet. I ask the minister and the government to do something now rather than gloat over what they have done in the immediate past.

The minister spent some time quoting glowing figures. He mentioned prices in respect of other products. If he would look at the facts, he would realize that good steers today should sell at $35.99 per hundredweight; that grade A hogs should sell at $53.85 per hundredweight; that wheat should sell at $3.27 per bushel and that shelled corn should sell at $2.10 per bushel. I ask whether the minister really has uttered any great, magic words of condolence to the people who are not receiving these amounts of money. I am sure the producers would feel a little more confident if they knew they could turn to other products, such as those referred to by the minister, but they would have no guarantee so far as prices of those products are concerned. The suggestion that the farmer should turn to these products at this time means absolutely nothing to him because he has no idea what he would receive on his investment at a future date. It is hypocritical for the minister to bring in such a suggestion.

I should like to move briefly to the subject of feed grain. I am sure the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon (Mr. Lang) is well aware of this subject. If he is not, he should be. In Saskatoon, when some 6,000 to 8,000 farmers gathered to protest the movement of feed grain between provinces, this minister stood up and tried to talk like a professor to practical people. This did not work and no one knows it better than the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

This government, and particularly the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and even the Attorney General, stand accused in the eyes of the people of the west for doing absolutely nothing when they knew this smuggling was taking place. When these people gathered at Saskatoon on April 11, they produced documentary evidence that feed grain was being smuggled. This is going on constantly. We know that some 5,000 bushels per day of feed grain are going from Saskatchewan to Alberta at a price of between 40 cents and 60 cents a bushel. We know the Canadian Wheat Board is aware of this. We know there must be a directive from somebody in the government telling these people to turn their eyes away and do nothing about it.

I, personally, have phoned the department to ask what could be done about it. All that happens is that one is shoved from department to department; they have no intention of doing anything. Many people in the west are asking why something is not being done about the movement of feed grain. The people in the west are familiar with the fact that the ranchers, food processing plants and packers like to have this type of movement continue. This makes one wonder whether or not there is some collusion between these people and others to make sure that nothing will be done about it. As late as the 25th of this month, the following advertisement appeared in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*:

> Required immediately 1,000,000 bu. No. 2 hard wheat. Will pay 70c cash per bushel delivered to nearest elevator.

Then, a box number is given.

I ask the minister whether he intends to sit there doing nothing while this type of procedure is being conducted. We do not know what elevator is being used to obtain this grain without permit books. If permit books are being used, it is illegal. I think it is only right that this government should stand on its own feet and do something for those people who are drawing this situation to their attention. I wonder how we could possibly say we support the Canadian Wheat Board when it has not really been given the authority to market the grain it should market. What the people in the west really want is that the Wheat Board be given the authority to market grain in an orderly fashion. The farmers want a fair return on their investment. I can assure you that under present circumstances in the west there is no opportunity to receive a fair return on any type of investment. I

most heartily support the suggestion put forward by my colleague that an income sufficiency payment is needed now, not tomorrow.

• (9:10 p.m.)

The immediate need is for the payment of 20 cents per bushel of grain on a maximum of 5,000 bushels. At one of the meetings in Moose Jaw I believe one of the farmers put it very aptly. He said: "We have waited in vain with patience and too long now for promised programs that would provide some solutions to our problems". I should like to quote an article written by George Bain, which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of March 11, 1969. It is headed, "A protest from the West", and reads as follows:

> Read Bruce Hutchison in Saturday's *Globe and Mail*: "...The people of the west are beginning to suspect that they have in Ottawa not a genuine national government but an Ontario-Quebec government too concentrated in the Laurentian centre, too French, and too careless of the perimeter, both Western and Atlantic".

I am sure those people in the other areas of Canada can subscribe to the idea that the west and the far east are not getting their fair share or a return on their investment. I am sure that the people will not stand by and accept much longer that which is being forced on them.

Before I conclude, may I put a question which I believe the government should answer: Does the federal Liberal party support the orderly marketing of feed grains under the quotas and pricing system of the Canadian Wheat Board? The Minister without Portfolio did not answer that question in Saskatoon when it was put to him. I believe it is an obligation of this government to tell the people of this nation whether or not they support the Canadian Wheat Board and whether or not they support the orderly marketing of grains. Nothing else will do at this time.

I am sure that all of us here are sincere when we ask the government to take immediate action to supply cash for the benefit of the western agricultural economy. I am sure that everyone here is sincere when they say it can be done and it must be done. If the government does not act now, they will forever know that they deliberately destroyed the entire agricultural economy of this country.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to inform the house of my views on what I have heard since noon, of what I think of the motion of non-confidence blaming the government for its administration especially with regard to agricultural matters.

I was surprised to hear all those who supported this motion, especially the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) who surprised me all the more as he was the only one who did not propose any solution to the problem. That surprised me greatly.

I recall certain facts which may help me to explain later on why my feeling of surprise disappeared fairly quickly. I do it with much conviction, Mr. Speaker, because the lot of those who till the land in order to provide food for their fellowmen has never been easy except in times of famine or war, and it has been so in every country in the world. We must acknowledge that.

When efforts are made during difficult periods to improve the situation of agriculture, perhaps something else than what was done this afternoon should be tried. Instead of blaming, we must find solutions.

Was the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Danforth) who proposed the motion truly sincere? We shall analyse that problem together and thus we shall be able to decide whether or not we should support the motion. As for me, I feel that I do not even have the right to back it, but let us analyse the problem.

If my information is correct, the hon. member introduced this motion as a result of the policy of the present government to improve the dairy industry. Because time is limited, I shall try to limit myself to the dairy industry.

So, I told myself: Things are not too bad even now, for when the party of the hon. member was in power—there were then 208 members in the government—there was no policy, and I myself was a farmer at that time.

If one should decide to find out how serious the suggestions are that were made, including those of the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), one could consult available figures and discover that in 1962—at which time the conservatives were in power—they were not led by the present Leader of the Opposition, who doubtless heard the unpleasant news—the Canadian dairy production was worth only $13,257,869. We see a change from 1963 to 1969: the dairy industry alone has now reached a production of $136,000,000.

A look at the total budget for 1961-62 reveals that $240,581,231 were allotted to agriculture. In the budget for 1969-70, over

$280,000,000 are earmarked for agriculture alone.

In 1958, I was having problems on the farm, just as everyone else did in every sector of society in Eastern Canada, because support prices had gone down; that happened under the Progressive Conservatives regime.

I am hardly in a position to discuss the problems the West had to face in those days for I was not involved at that time as I am today. As for those of the East, I have experienced them myself. In fact, the price of bacon had gone down to the point that in 1958 and 1959 I was selling it at $17.80 per hundred pounds. That was not under the present administration.

If I mention this, it is in order to assess the arguments put forward today. If they are genuine, let us put the blame on those who were in charge of the country at that time, the same who are unable today to offer any answer to the increase in production costs.

I am certainly not too happy over that myself but those who can do no better than put the blame on others are not, in my opinion, very fair. And those who say that the government did not take the necessary steps are simply changing the terms of the problem. But when you say it has taken no efficient steps and is unable to take any, I think you are entirely wrong.

Mr. Speaker, when we were discussing the milk quotas, a member of the N.D.P. said that the Canadian Dairy Commission had penalized the farmers when fixing their milk quotas. Here again, in all fairness, all hon. members, to whatever political party they belong, should admit that many farmers are doing a job for which they are not fit, on land, in eastern Canada, which does not suit the dairy industry.

If you want to help us, get the money elsewhere, from the Welfare Department or the Unemployment Insurance Commission, but do not try to grant subsidies so as to induce the people to believe we are crying on their shoulders because the dairy industry will be facing the same problem ten years from now on.

Then, let us agree to impose quotas even if we run the risk of losing votes and even if the farm associations run the risk of losing contributions. But the first step is necessary. Now, the Canadian Dairy Commission has almost taken this step but it hurts to see young people finding it hard to follow suit. The farm associations, together with the Canadian Dairy Commission have asked that one should not let any more people engage in dairy production in order to help those who are now engaging in it.

Let us not forget that we have already imported butter from New Zealand. What was the policy before such imports were allowed? Today it is probably economic to import some but only as a guarantee and not for consumption. We must be assured not to run short. The Commission has two roles to play. It must promote the marketing of dairy products and protect the consumers to prevent the price of butter from becoming exorbitant.

Last year, 3.3 million pounds of butter were imported from New Zealand though we did not need it. It did not cost anything; it was simply resold. We did it in order to protect ourselves remembering what happened in 1962. The members of the opposition must remember, because there was no dairy policy concerning butter and we had to store in the government warehouses over 260 million pounds of butter in 1962. It cost the Treasury of our country over $60 million to get rid of this butter to resell it in any form, since we were forced to melt some of it.

The money was taken out of the pocket of the taxpayers, and we did not complain. The opposition did not complain either, despite the fact that there was no policy.

Today the situation is more stable. Because some butter is imported for protection, they complain and they cry shame.

Since this afternoon no hon. member has proposed any real solution. As for the quotas, as I said a while ago, we will all have to accept the government policy, whatever party we belong to.

This will hurt a few. Even for the small farmer who does not produce enough to make a living, we will have to implement policies like the present one. We cannot tell him that we should have helped him, because then that would be cutting our own necks. We should rather say, altogether: We know that we have to stop producing, and that it will hurt. We know that we will lose votes, in one party as well as in the other.

But if we really want to solve the problems of the dairy industry, we will have to fall into step.

I have a few solutions to propose to hon. members. First, about marketing: In my opinion, we must reduce in certain fields if necessary, if we are afraid to tax a little. Indeed, we should not forget that if we impose taxes to improve the situation, the opposition will

be the first to criticize us. If we do not want to impose new taxes, if we accept to make a reduction in the field of scientific research and if we promote the marketing of the product, this would be very significant. We must continue the work that the government—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

• (9:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. A. C. Cadieu (Meadow Lake):** I should like to begin by saying that I have had the pleasure of talking to a number of those who served on the standing committee as well as with Wheat Pool committee men. I am sure the Wheat Pool in Saskatchewan is to be commended on the wonderful job it did in organizing its business throughout the province of Saskatchewan. Above all, the members of the various pool committees are to be commended on the excellent briefs they presented to the Standing Committee on Agriculture. I am sure it would be a good exercise for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) to read these briefs, if he has not already done so. I am sure he would not continue to hold the view that there is no problem facing western agriculture. I also believe it would be well for him to read the brief submitted to the Committee by the Liberal premier of Saskatchewan. He would then agree, I feel, that there are problems facing agriculture, not only in western Canada, but right across the country.

It is significant that it should have been left to the opposition to bring before parliament a question of basic social and economic concern, one which should have been assigned top priority by any government with a serious desire to tackle the real problems confronting this nation. In my view, one of the most serious weaknesses of the present administration is its failure to face up to the urgent problems weighing upon ordinary people in this country. As a member for a riding that is largely rural, and a rural western riding at that, I welcome this opportunity to speak on the problems facing the industry of agriculture because I have become increasingly aware over the past months of the growing gulf between that industry and this government.

When one considers the tremendous importance of agriculture to the Canadian economy as a whole, when one realizes the number of Canadians intimately affected by the state of agriculture and when one recognizes the full social and economic implications of a sick agricultural industry for our standard of living and development as a nation, it is remarkable that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his colleagues should have allowed this gulf to occur and to widen. It is even more remarkable that no attempt has been made to bridge this gulf.

The evidence clearly indicates that the policy-makers of the Liberal party have weighed Canadian agriculture in political terms and have declared it expendable. I will not labour the evidence supplied by the present depressed state of the grain industry. This is already well known and the shameful record is clear for all to see—tons of dry, marketable wheat piled on farms across the prairies side by side with mountains of damp, unsaleable grain.

This government has failed all along the line. What measures were taken fall into the category of too little and too late. Inadequate assistance to farmers to meet the natural disaster of damp grain; chaos in the reception arrangements and shipment to the ports, bumbling in untying the railway transportation knot; too little of the right grain and too much of the wrong grain in terminal elevators; lost sales and failure to make significant new sales abroad. If it were not for the prior commitments to purchase made by Russia and China several years ago, the Canadian grain industry would today be bankrupt and in ruin.

Not once during its brief lifetime has this government brought forward one major piece of agricultural legislation. This house has seen a series of minor bills dealing with various aspects of agriculture, but the majority have been merely amendments to take the ceiling off various interest rates.

Not once has a senior minister mentioned the possibility of this government bringing forward a major measure dealing with basic agricultural policy. All we have seen has been a callous disregard for the very real problems of the industry and the depressed economic conditions now being experienced by those engaged in agriculture. This government has been responsible for parliament frittering away its time on minor matters such as the amendment to the Criminal Code.

The Canadian farmer is not interested in legally being able to engage in homosexual practices. What he wants is some assurance that he will be able to maintain a decent standard of living. The farmer with a glut of unsaleable grain on his hands, no credit at the bank and bills piling up disastrously, is

not too concerned with legalized abortion or changes in the rules governing firearms.

Throughout the agricultural community today many thousands of solid, hard-working Canadians are beset by the devils of a real economic depression. They have every right to expect their government at least to recognize their plight. It is now obvious from the legislative plans of this government that there is no room for them in the "Just Society". They have been ignored by Ottawa, excluded from government policy and planning and sacrificed to other interests and other areas, and I speak of agriculture in all parts of Canada, not just in the west. It is almost as if the Prime Minister and his government were actively antagonistic to agriculture.

What little attention has been paid by the Minister of Agriculture to the farmers of Canada has been negative: "Don't do this, don't do that, don't grow wheat, grow something else, don't expect the government to sell your products."

There is much to be said for the suggestion of a two-price system for grain, but so far it is just another suggestion, a hint of something the minister may some day, just possibly, get around to discussing with his colleagues. What the Canadian farmer needs right now is reassurance that he is not forgotten, that he has not been written off. He wants to know that he can continue to enjoy the same standard of living as his fellow citizen in industrial Canada and that he will share equally in national prosperity, national development and national life.

• (9:30 p.m.)

The Canadian farmer needs some assistance from government. He needs this assistance to meet the uncertainties nature imposes, to meet stronger foreign competition and the radically changed market place for agricultural produce. He needs the same kind of degree of government assistance as any other segment of the economy.

The farmer needs guidance from government. If government is to make suggestions that mean a basic change in his mode of work and life, if government largely controls the purchase and marketing of his produce, then he needs government guidance to ensure his future. Above all, he needs government leadership; leadership that will reassure, uplift and inspire him. So far, this government has failed to supply any of these things.

I could get specific, Mr. Speaker, and go into detail about the deplorable state of dairy farming, for instance. I could give you chapter and verse with regard to cases of young, able and willing farmers who cannot start in the dairy business, the business of their choice, because of government policies that create injustice, inequality and impose an economic burden no young Canadian can shoulder.

I believe that this house today should be most concerned with the general question of agriculture as well as this government's abject failure to provide answers to its many serious problems. I believe this house should be even more concerned with this government's obvious determination to ignore the agricultural community.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, having recently visited western Canada I find it shameful that so many farmers are at a loss about putting in a crop this spring.

**Mr. Ross Whicher (Bruce):** Mr. Speaker, coming from an agricultural area as I do, and also having visited the west with the agricultural committee, I feel that during the next few minutes I should like to say something about this important subject. If I may get right down to the nuts and bolts of the situation, the problem is just this: As many speakers have said, we have an over abundance of wheat and other foodstuffs in this country. The solution to the problem is to get out into the markets of the world and try to sell this foodstuff.

I am not suggesting that a great deal has not been done in this connection in the past. I went out west as a greenhorn as far as western agriculture was concerned—perhaps I came back the same way—but I did learn certain things about the Wheat Board that I did not know before. I should like to go on record right now as saying I agree with the general feeling in western Canada that when the Wheat Board was created some years ago it did a most remarkable job in stabilizing the wheat situation, which was in chaos.

However, I suggest to the house tonight that as a sales agency the Canadian Wheat Board has not been as successful as perhaps it should have been. In the last few years, Canada sold wheat and grain to 118 countries. That figure is in the Wheat Board's report. Yet last year we called on only 36 countries. Is this the way to do business? Is this the way other companies that sell coal, baking powder or Red Rose tea do business? We have to get out and see people before we can

sell them goods. If we are going to sell wheat to China, we will have to send to China people who are prepared to use chopsticks, drink Chinese wine and eat their rice. We must associate with them and become jolly good fellows so that, like private enterprise, we are able to sell our products.

In this regard, we have a fantastic advantage over our United States friends because we sell to communist countries. The United States sells very little to communist countries. As a matter of fact, the Chinese would sooner starve to death than buy United States wheat, so automatically they come to Canada. Last year we sold 133 million bushels of wheat to communist countries.

As all hon. members know, there is presently a world glut of wheat. Although Canadian officials tell me we cannot sell wheat, last year the United States increased its sales to foreign countries from 742 million bushels to 753 million bushels?

**An hon. Member:** Why?

**Mr. Whicher:** Because they went out and sold it. They went to work. You cannot expect the little farmers of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba to go out and sell wheat to Russia, Cuba, Hungary, France or whoever it may be. You have to have a sales organization to do that for you. It is the obligation of the government to set up this sales organization and to send it out to sell wheat.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Whicher:** I regard as a downright shame the fact that last year we sold only 27 per cent as much wheat as the United States sold to the so-called free world. There seems to me something wrong with the way we are doing business. We have to go out and say hello to these people.

How does the Ford Motor Company, General Motors or any private enterprise business sell their products? What would Ford or General Motors do if they had too many cars? They would go out and sell them. This is what we have to do with our wheat.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Whicher:** My hon. friends to the left are acting most raucously because they think I am criticizing the government, but I can say exactly the same thing about them, too. The fact is that when they were in office they too had the Wheat Board.

**Mr. Horner:** We had Alvin Hamilton.



**Mr. Whicher:** Yet they could not sell all our wheat. In fact, it was China and Russia that came to us and bought it.

**Mr. Hees:** Who sold wheat to China?

**Mr. Whicher:** Hon. members to my left might be able to speak English and French, but I do not think they understand Chinese. This they should be able to do if they want to sell goods to China.

**Mr. Hees:** When was the first Chinese sale?

**Mr. Whicher:** It was the Chinese who made that first sale because they came to us and bought.

In the few minutes that I have, I am suggesting that not only with regard to wheat but any agricultural products of which there is an over abundance in Canada we must go to the markets of the world before we can sell such products. For example, we have millions of pounds of powdered milk on hand at the present time. We should not wait for countries to come to us and ask us whether we have any milk for sale; we have to go to them and sell it.

I do want to be completely fair, Mr. Speaker. I understand a member of the Creditiste party, which has had only one speaker, wishes to say a few words, so I will relinquish the rest of my time to him.

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take part in this discussion on the non-confidence motion against the government.

We would not want to blame the government overmuch, but we have to upbraid them, because we are still looking for an adequate agricultural policy. The government, with a good Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), have not yet found a solution to the serious agricultural problems.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to fight for the farmers of the Eastern Townships, because I am from that area and the farmers I represent are mainly engaged in dairy production.

Mr. Speaker, we have wanted reforms for a long time; we are trying to straighten out all sort of conditions, but the nostrums used up to now were of no avail. The Eastern Townships' farmers are in a serious plight; never in the history of this country have we seen them in such parlous circumstances.

A while ago, I heard the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Côté) say that this government

*Division*

had done many things. However, I would like to remind him that all the government has done bore no fruit; it did not solve anything, and there will soon be no farmers left in the Eastern Townships and in the province of Quebec. Indeed, farmers are on the verge of bankruptcy. Never was agriculture so near bankruptcy as it is today.

Mr. Speaker, since I have only a few minutes at my disposal, I should like to deal with the element missing to solve the problem. Farmers pay too much tax on building materials. They are overtaxed. Their machines cost too much.

Since agriculture is a basic industry in our country, interest rates should be brought down, because the farmers should not always be the ones who have to make sacrifices. The hon. member for Richelieu said earlier that if farmers are not able to pay a 10 per cent interest rate, they should quit. I think the hon. member for Richelieu is standing up for finance. Hon. member for Richelieu, you are not a farmer, even though you you have at one time tilled the land, and you do not know anything about farm matters.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member must direct his remarks to the Chair.

It being 9.45 p.m., it is my duty, pursuant to standing order 58(9), to interrupt these proceedings and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the proceeding concerning the motion now before the house.

[*English*]

The question is on the amendment to the main motion. All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** Those opposed 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. Gleave) to the motion which was negatived on the following division:

• (9:50 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell
Benjamin
Broadbent
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Coates
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fortin
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
La Salle
Latulippe
Lewis
Lundrigan
MacEwan
MacInnis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mather
Matte
Mazankowski
Monteith
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Noble
Nowlan
Nystrom
Orlikow
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rose
Saltsman
Schreyer
Scott
Skoberg
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Winch
Yewchuk—76.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Andras
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Boulanger
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Chappell
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Cullen
Danson
Davis
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Émard
Forest
Forget
Foster
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (Saint-Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kierans
Laing
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault

Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
McBride
McIlraith
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
Noël
Olson
Orange
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rock
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Serré
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Whicher
Whiting
Yanakis—115.

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost.

The question is now on the main motion. All those in favour please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

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

Is it the wish of hon. members that we proceed with the division with the ringing of the bells?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Danforth), which was negatived on the following division.

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell
Benjamin
Broadbent
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Coates
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fortin
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
La Salle
Latulippe
Lewis
Lundrigan
MacEwan
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.) (Vancouver-Kingsway)
Macquarrie
McCleave
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mather
Matte
Mazankowski
Monteith
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Noble
Nowlan
Nystrom
Orlikow
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rose
Saltsman
Schreyer
Scott
Skoberg
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Winch
Yewchuk—76.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Andras
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Boulanger
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Chappell
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Cullen
Danson
Davis
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Émard
Forest
Forget
Foster
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kierans
Laing
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
McBride
McIlraith
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
Noël
Olson
Orange
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Richard
Richardson
Roberts

*Division*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Robinson | Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay) | Wahn | Whicher |
| Rochon | St. Pierre | Walker | Whiting |
| Rock | Sullivan | Watson | Yanakis—115. |
| Roy (Laval) | Thomas (Maisonneuve) | | |
| Ryan | Tolmie | | |
| Serré | Trudeau | | |
| Sharp | Trudel | | |
| Smerchanski | Turner (London East) | | |
| Smith (Saint-Jean) | Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) | | |
| Stafford | | | |
| Stewart (Cochrane) | | | |

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

It being ten o'clock this house stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

At 10:15 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, May 2, 1969

The house met at 11 a.m.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### INDIAN AFFAIRS

STATEMENT BY MINISTER AS TO JUNE, 1969, POLICY ANNOUNCEMENT

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the minister of Indian affairs. Now that the national Indian conference has been completed I wonder whether the minister would undertake to clarify the confusion surrounding the intentions of the government. Specifically, could the minister say whether legislation will be introduced in the month of June with respect to the Indian Act, or is he simply planning to issue a white paper or make some statement of policy instead?

At the same time would the minister say when the government intends to take action with regard to treaty rights? Will this be done before or after the introduction of legislation in regard to the Indian Act?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, even though the national meeting of Indians has not ended yet, I have decided to come back to the house because I am working on a statement I am to deliver this afternoon to Indians.

To answer the question of the hon. leader of the opposition, the government intends to make in June an official statement of policy regarding the Indians problems. We do not intend to bring forward a new legislation on Indians in June but in that declaration of policy we shall express the underlying principles of our future Indian program and explain the intentions of the government regarding claims and the way to settle them.

[*English*]

EXTENSION OF JULY, 1968, CONSULTATIONS TO PERMIT DISCUSSION OF INDIAN ACT AND TREATIES

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Now that the minister has moved further away from the Minister without Portfolio from Port Arthur, perhaps it would be appropriate to ask him whether the Minister without Portfolio from Port Arthur was speaking for the department on Wednesday when he said that government consultation with the Indian people followed the wrong priority, that more attention should have been given to the question of treaty rights?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I have not read that statement, but I must say that when the consultations began in July last, we were supposed to limit the discussions to the Indian Act. However, following the first two consultations, we decided to open the debate and we allowed Canadian Indians to air their views, not only regarding the future legislation on Indians, but also on all problems of concern to them, including the question of the treaties.

[*English*]

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO PRESS STATEMENT RESPECTING RECENT MEETING WITH INDIANS

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** One further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the department intend to accept the apparently unanimous request of the representatives of the Indian people meeting in Ottawa for financial assistance to conduct their own inquiry into matters that the Indian people themselves consider most important? Does the minister intend to accept this request or not?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to make it clear that our discussions drew to Ottawa spokesmen for Indians all over Canada. I must say that the meeting proved extremely useful and I am quite pleased by the fact that the Indian people are most happy with that type of consultation.

As regards in particular the request for research grants, the matter is now under

study and I hope I can deliver a statement to the Indian people this afternoon and in the course of the next few weeks talk over the form that consultations may take in future with the Indian Affairs Branch.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL CONSIDERATION OF B.C. NON-TREATY INDIANS

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether, in the statement which he said will be forthcoming in the future outlining government policy, he will deal with a peculiar and very serious situation affecting Indians in British Columbia. In the main they are non-treaty Indians who claim that until some satisfactory arrangement is made, they own British Columbia?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** That problem is quite complex, for British Columbia Indians have not signed any treaty. The same problem arises as regards Quebec Indians, and in our statement of policy in June we hope to announce the government's intention to seek a solution likely to allow them a full participation in Canada's economic and social life, and safeguard the national features peculiar to the country's first citizens.

QUEBEC—ATTEMPT TO FIND SOLUTION TO INDIAN-ESKIMO PROBLEMS

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** I should like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Would the minister make a statement with regard to the meeting held last Friday, at Quebec city, between the representatives of the federal and provincial governments and the Indians and Eskimos of Northern Quebec?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I have not made a report on that subject. It is an ordinary meeting between the Eskimos and the Indians of New Quebec with the representatives of the federal and provincial governments, in order to find some grounds of agreement to try to settle problems involving the two jurisdictions. Some aspects of their life come under the provincial authority and others under the federal jurisdiction. I am told the conference went off smoothly.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

[*English*]

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO JUNE, 1969, STATEMENT ON CLAIMS COMMISSION

**Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Now that the people at this conference have indicated they are more interested in treaty rights than in revision of the Indian Act, will the minister say when he will be introducing legislation to establish the long promised Indian claims commission?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, in June, when I make my statement, I am sure that we shall know where we stand with regard to the Indian Claims Commission. We shall probably be able to state at that time that we are proceeding with the establishment of that organization.

[*English*]

ANNOUNCEMENT OF APPLICATION TO INDIANS OF FARM CREDIT POLICY

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I note, according to a press release of yesterday, that the minister in collaboration with the Minister of Agriculture has obtained cabinet approval for an agreement in connection with farm credit. Can the minister advise us whether the terms of that agreement submitted to the Indian Conference held here were first considered and discussed with other representatives of the Indian people before the agreement was made and approved by the cabinet?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** At the meeting of the National Federation of Indians in Ottawa in December, we informed the Indians of this new policy and they seemed to think that such a policy was likely to help the Indians engaged in agriculture. In fact, they were quite happy about that decision. As from today, they will be able to borrow from the Farm Credit Corporation in the same way as any other farmer in Canada. The Indians are very pleased about this new progressive policy of the government.

[*English*]

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister if the terms of this agreement approved by cabinet were discussed with Indian representatives. I was not asking about general policy.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Chrétien:** The government has taken an administrative decision in the best interests of the Indians, and they are very happy about it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the hon. member for Shefford wish to put a supplementary question?

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** It is not a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

## FINANCE

### FUNDS FOR MUNICIPAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES—SALES OF DEBENTURES

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the very serious difficulties municipalities of Canada are facing in securing funds for capital expenditures and in view of similar difficulties some provinces, particularly the Atlantic provinces, face, will the minister make a statement at an early date on motions outlining any plans the federal government is working out in co-operation with provincial governments to help to resolve the financial difficulties of our municipalities?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I will consider making a statement. I believe that all governments and people borrowing money for long terms at fixed rates are having difficulties. This applies not only to Canada but to the rest of the world also. Certainly it applies to the United States and Canada. This will be overcome only when we learn that we have to battle inflation and not expect more of the economy individually than we are putting into it through increased productivity.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that public bodies have greater difficulty raising money in the public than in the private sector, is the minister considering either in his white paper or budget in June providing some inducement to make it more attractive to secure capital funds for public projects?

**Mr. Benson:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure the original assumption that my friend put forward is correct, that it is easier to borrow in the private sector than in the public sector. Of course I cannot indicate what is to be done in the tax reform until I produce the white paper.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister of Finance had any consultations with the provinces to ascertain the extent of the difficulties that municipal governments are having in financing the central projects through the normal sale of debentures?

**Mr. Benson:** Of course, Mr. Speaker, the municipalities are basically the responsibility of the provincial governments. As of this date no provincial government has come forward and asked for discussions in this regard.

[*Translation*]

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

If he did not consult the representatives of the provinces with regard to the release of credit, will he ask the Bank of Canada to help municipalities and provinces?

[*English*]

**Mr. Benson:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be of any great help to simply have the Bank of Canada printing more money.

**Mr. Stanfield:** A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister agrees that inflation is the main part of the problem, and since tax legislation proposed with regard to insurance companies is affecting their tendencies toward investing in fixed interest obligations, will the minister agree to do everything he can with regard to fighting this inflation? In particular will he do his best to persuade his colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to act—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. This is argument rather than a question.

[*Translation*]

## THE MINISTRY

### INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE RESIGNATION OF MINISTER OF JUSTICE

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Prime Minister.

Since Mr. Dalton McGuinty, President of the Liberal Association of Ottawa-Carleton, constituency of the Minister of Justice, has resigned because of the government's attitude

on abortion, can the Prime Minister assure this house that the Minister of Justice is not now drafting his letter of resignation, as the Minister of Transport did recently?

[*English*]

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

### NATO—STATEMENT BY GENERAL LEMNITZER ABOUT EUROPEAN REQUIREMENTS

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Arising from the minister's statement in the house Wednesday that he would obtain a report on the interview given by General Lemnitzer, has the minister obtained such a report and is he now in a position to advise the house whether the Department of National Defence is in accord with the assessment of the military situation in Europe made by the NATO military command, under which Canadian forces are serving in Europe?

**Hon. Leo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that my good friend is enlarging the report that I saw of the interview of General Lemnitzer. I think General Lemnitzer's comments were to the effect that there should be no over-all military reduction of the capability overseas. I think we generally agree in the government with that kind of proposition, but we said all along that individual members of the alliance should have the opportunity of making adjustments to their own contributions after consultation with their allies. However it was never inferred that the over-all capabilities would have to be reduced.

**Mr. Hees:** As a supplementary question, does the minister believe that it is possible to maintain the over-all strength of the NATO forces in Europe if individual countries are going to be permitted—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member's supplementary question, in my view, is argumentative. The hon. member for Abitibi.

**Mr. Hees:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I submit that the Canadian government's position is contrary to that of General Lemnitzer. He stated that forces could not be withdrawn from the NATO Alliance.

**Mr. Speaker:** Of course I do not disagree with the hon. member; but in my view he is not submitting a point of order for the consideration of the Chair but rather is pursuing the argument which I thought a moment ago he was submitting for the consideration of the house instead of asking a question which, I suggest to him, is possibly about the only thing he can do at this time.

[*Translation*]

### POSITION OF GENERAL ALLARD ON GOVERNMENT POLICY

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Defence.

I wish to ask him if General Allard is in agreement with the government's policy with regard to NATO and if the General has not already made some statement against that policy.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. That is a question for General Allard. Besides, at this time, the hon. member is only allowed to put questions to the minister.

[*English*]

## ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

### POSSIBILITY OF CLOSING FARM PRODUCING MOUNTS

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I should first welcome the solicitor general back from the United Kingdom.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** "My kingdom for a horse" has been somewhat changed: Now it is a horse for a Queen. I would ask him, as the titular head of the R.C.M.P., whether there is any foundation for the suggestion made in western Canada that the R.C.M.P. farm, which produces the horses that have been used by the R.C.M.P., is to be closed down?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, I did not get the answer.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I am not sure to what extent the question is urgent, but the Solicitor General appears to be very anxious to answer it.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, it is urgent.

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best way of having a full answer to and full treatment of this important and interesting subject would be to have it dealt with on the estimates, when

they are before the committee on Tuesday. At that time I shall be glad to give the right hon. gentleman full information on the subject.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I understand the closure is to take place before that, Mr. Speaker, and I want to raise strong objection to the last severance of the Mounted Police from horses.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have to impose closure on the right hon. gentleman.

## AIR TRANSPORT

### PILOT FATIGUE CONSEQUENT UPON AIR CANADA STRIKE

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, with your permission I should like to go from horses to air lines, and ask the Acting Minister of Transport the following question: In view of the serious problem of air safety and the concern of the Air Pilots Association, can the minister assure parliament that his department has not given any permission for an extension of the hours which air pilots are required to spend at work as a result of the pressures on air lines consequent upon the strike at Air Canada?

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The same conditions that apply at any time apply now to the granting of licences, and the same concern for safety and pilots' hours will be observed.

**Mr. Lewis:** Perhaps the minister does not have the information. In view of the fact that there are ways by which extension of hours may be made by his department, what I am asking him is to inform parliament, and if he cannot do so now would he undertake to do so on Monday, whether any extension of hours has been permitted either by the central department or by regional officers of his department.

**Mr. Richardson:** Yes, Mr. Speaker; the licences are not made by the Department of Transport. They are made by the Canadian Transport Commission. I know what I said earlier is correct, but I shall be pleased to discuss this matter again with the president of the commission.

### EXTENDED WORK LOAD OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** I have a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of complaints by the air traffic controllers that because of a shortage of controllers they are required to work far too many hours for safety, can the minister inform the house what studies are being made of this problem, if in his view it is a problem, and what action is proposed to deal with it.

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** Yes; I think we recognize a problem. We also recognize the public concern in this area. I should like to suggest this matter is of sufficient importance that it should be brought forward under motions some time in the near future.

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister, when he does bring this matter up under motions, if he will deal with the subject of whether there is in fact a national emergency under the terms of the act about which he has been speaking. In other words is what the Prime Minister said true, that there is not a national emergency, or is there one under the act under which the minister could take action in these instances referred to by the hon. member for York South.

## INDUSTRY

### AUTOMOBILES—INCLUSION IN AGREEMENT OF AFTER MARKET PARTS

**Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Acting Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Is it the intention of the government to include in the United States-Canada car pact what is commonly referred to as the after market car parts?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I will have to look into the present status of any discussions with regard to this. I am sure the minister would like to report more fully on this to the house when he returns.

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

### BAKER LAKE, N.W.T.—INQUIRY RESPECTING BORIS KOTELEWETZ

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I welcome him to that end of the chamber which generates most solutions to the problems with which he is confronted. In the light of a request from the Eskimo people at Baker Lake that Mr. Boris Kotelewetz, who was once an arts and crafts officer within the

department and no longer employed by the department, be returned, I wonder whether the minister would be prepared to act on that request, or whether in the absence of any effort to reinstate Mr. Kotelewetz he would be prepared to send whatever material he has in his possession to the Standing Committee in order that the committee might inquire into all aspects of this situation.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I must say first of all that I like the constructive suggestions of the opposition. In fact, their last one was that I should introduce a bill to abolish the Department of Indian Affairs and I have taken note of it.

As for that gentleman whose name I cannot repeat, because I find it rather difficult to pronounce, he worked in Baker Lake and I met him personally in my office a few weeks ago. I am now considering the problem and I hope to be able to report to the house within a few days.

[*English*]

## TRADE

### WHEAT—TWO PRICE SYSTEM IN INTERNATIONAL MARKETING

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. Has the government inquired of its legal advisors if the institution of a two-price wheat system would be in violation of international trade agreements and would expose Canada to the charge of dumping, and if so what their opinion is.

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, the position with regard to the two-price system and its relationship to the international market is one which we have always had before us and understood well. I believe the hon. member is referring to a reference to it not long ago as dumping. No doubt in the strict sense it is, but that is purely in the strict sense.

It is also true, on the other hand, that the practice of two-pricing in the world is common, and remedies are not sought by countries receiving grain. Hence, in the strict sense it is not very meaningful, although on the whole it would no doubt be better for Canada if it were.

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

[*Translation*]

## NATIONAL PARKS

### GASPÉ—AGREEMENT BETWEEN PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whom we welcome to this part of the house. It is hoped that his coming this way is a promotion.

Could he tell us what progress has been made in the talks with the province of Quebec about the possible development of a national park at Pointe-Forillon?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I have received representations in this morning from the Minister of Tourism, Fish and Game, this very morning, and further talks are scheduled for next week. I am happy to see the minister has re-opened discussions. We shall probably get along quite well.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Is the minister in a position to tell us whether he expects an early settlement of this problem rather than drawn-out discussions and serious difficulties?

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, I hope that, in the best interests of Gaspé inhabitants, we will find a prompt solution.

[*English*]

## HOUSING

### MUNDY POND, NFLD.—URBAN RENEWAL SCHEME

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Housing. In view of the fact that the government in reviewing its policy with regard to urban renewal has imposed a freeze on future schemes, can the minister say whether this freeze applies to studies that were in the process of being completed? I am thinking particularly of the Mundy Pond urban renewal scheme in St. John's West.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It seems to me that the hon. member is asking a question which was asked yesterday. I think however the hon. member was unsuccessful in his attempt yesterday; therefore in the circumstances I would allow the question today.

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's West is asking about an urban renewal project. I would like to advise him, as I advised the house yesterday or the day before, that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is currently preparing guidelines for all urban renewal projects. As soon as these have been approved by the government they will be made known to all municipalities. Of course that will include St. John's.

REQUEST FOR GUIDELINES STATEMENT BEFORE END OF JUNE

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Housing. In view of the fact that there is some uncertainty as to the direction in which this government is going, could the minister now assure the house that we will have these guidelines and the commitments for the various municipalities before the end of June?

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** The guidelines are being studied and, as I have repeated many times, when they have approval by the government they will be made known.

**Mr. Alexander:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is most amazing to me that after considerable questioning of not only the former minister of transport, whom I am very glad to see sitting in the house, as a result of which we had a sort of dialogue going—and I suppose I will now have to get a dialogue going with the Acting Minister of Housing—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that he should have a dialogue with the Chair and indicate what his point of order is.

**Mr. Alexander:** I beg your indulgence, Mr. Speaker. I hope that after the numerous questions that have been asked in the house with respect to urban renewal programs and public housing schemes, the government will be able in the very near future, before the end of June, to give us some idea of what is going on.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Obviously this is not a point of order. The hon. member may be dissatisfied with the answer he receives, but that cannot be made the subject of a question of privilege or point of order.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## WATER RESOURCES

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—POLLUTION AFFECTING FISHERY AT LONG HARBOUR

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry or to his parliamentary secretary. In reply to my question No. 1331, as reported in *Hansard* of February 24, regarding the pollution of fish at Long Harbour, Newfoundland, by the Electric Reduction Company, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries stated that it was an accidental contamination by the company and that there would be no further recurrence of this pollution. I now ask the minister, in view of the apparent continuing recurrence of fish pollution in the area by this company, what immediate action is his department taking?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Supply and Services):** Mr. Speaker, since I am acting for the Minister of Fisheries this morning perhaps I can provide the answer for my hon. friend. As was indicated in the statement yesterday of the Minister of Fisheries, there is strong circumstantial evidence that this plant is contributing to the pollution problem. There is a very definite question as to whether this can in fact be established in law, when of course it would be necessary for us to take action by way of appropriate legislation. However, because of the seriousness of the situation representations have been made to the company in question and they have agreed to close the plant, to instal additional equipment, and not to reopen except after consultation with both the federal and provincial governments, in order that more tests can be carried out to ensure that the problem is resolved. I understand the plant will be closed this week end as a result of the representations made by the Minister of Fisheries.

**Mr. Harding:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Who sets the pollution standards for industrial waste before it is allowed to be released into the bay, and who enforces those standards?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The supplementary question is not in order. It is very general in nature, and cannot be asked at this time.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—COMPENSATION TO FISHERMEN FOR LOSS THROUGH POLLUTION

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Acting Minister of Fisheries. In view of the fact that a large part of the Placentia Bay area has been forbidden to fishermen because of the pollution caused by the plant at Long Harbour, can the minister say whether the government will take action to pay compensation to fishermen affected?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Supply and Services):** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that it is forbidden by law at the moment. However, this may be a matter of semantics. We are examining what next steps will be necessary and whether it will be necessary to close portions of the area for a time. If that is the decision, consideration will also be given to compensating the fishermen.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I refer to the press release that the Minister of Fisheries released yesterday. Today, according to the Prime Minister's roster, the Minister of Fisheries and his parliamentary secretary should be in the house, and both are absent. It was for this reason that hon. members on this side of the house, including the hon. member for St. John's West and myself, did not direct questions to the minister, because obviously he was not here and we did not know that the Minister of Supply and Services was acting minister. My point of order is this: How can we on this side of the house direct questions of an urgent nature to ministers who are not even in their place when they are supposed to be here? Second, information about this matter, relating to the press release of yesterday, was given today to the Newfoundland legislature by the Newfoundland minister of fisheries, to the effect that certain bays were being closed by the federal Department of Fisheries until this matter was corrected. This information because of its urgency should have been given to the house this morning on motions, and because the situation could have a detrimental effect on our whole east coast fishing industry.

POLLUTION OF CANADA-U.S. BOUNDARY WATERS

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Last Monday I drew the attention of the Prime Minister to the confidential report which was submitted to the International Joint Commission regarding the pollution of Canada-United States boundary waters. I asked whether the government would undertake to have that report made available to members of parliament and the public. I wonder whether the Prime Minister is in a position to give us some information about this matter.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I did inquire, and I was told it was a draft report only which was shown to the International Joint Commission by its international board. This draft report will be brought to more advanced stages and then presented to the commission. At that time the commission will probably want to have public hearings and make recommendations to the government. It is only at that point that the government will be in a position to act or not act on the recommendations of the commission. But this, according to the commission's information, is several months away.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether, when the report is submitted to the International Joint Commission and they have had an opportunity to study it, it will then be released to the public?

**Mr. Trudeau:** If it is in the public interest, Mr. Speaker.

*[Later:]*

POLLUTION—DESIGNATION OF RESPONSIBILITY TO ONE MINISTER

**Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova):** A supplementary question to the Prime Minister with regard to pollution, Mr. Speaker. In view of the many aspects of pollution in the whole of Canada, would the right hon. gentleman consider designating one minister to be in charge of pollution problems rather than spread authority among various departments?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** We have considered this, Mr. Speaker.

## FISHERIES

SHUSWAP RIVER DIVERSION—INQUIRY AS TO DECISION REACHED BETWEEN FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** On Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, I directed a question to the Minister of Fisheries. In his reply,

he indicated that the matter in which I was interested came under the authority of the Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. With your indulgence, I should like to repeat the question now. Can the minister inform the house whether any decision has been reached between the federal government and the government of British Columbia over the Shuswap River diversion plan?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** The negotiations in connection with the basin involved here are under way. They are in one sense at a preliminary stage. On the other hand, we are fairly optimistic that a conclusion can be reached in the not-too-distant future.

**Mr. Rose:** May I ask the minister whether the international aspects are being considered, since the water diverted will eventually flow into the Columbia River basin and become United States water?

**Mr. Lang:** It is the objective of what is essentially a planning survey to consider all aspects of the water and its use.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

### USE OF CF-5 FIGHTER BOMBERS

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** My question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. Now that the first deliveries are being made of the government's $212 million order for 115 CF-5 fighter bombers, will the minister tell us whether a firm decision has been made as to what use the government intends to make of them?

**Hon. Leo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** We are studying all the new aspects of the defence policy. I think the hon. gentleman should not be too impatient. There are many complex problems but I am sure we are going to use the CF-5 for a very worthwhile role.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Can the minister tell us whether these planes are to be used in Canada, Europe or in Timbuktu?

### NATO—DEFICIT IN STRENGTH THROUGH WITHDRAWAL OF CANADIAN FORCES

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** I have a question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, following the statement made by the Minister of National Defence a few minutes ago. If it is the view of the government that the over-all strength of NATO forces should be maintained, is it the government's intention that our NATO allies should make up the deficit caused by the withdrawal of Canadian forces which the government has stated it intends to carry out?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I do not think I can add anything to what the minister said. We know that NATO is an alliance which arrives at collective decisions, but members within the alliance are of course permitted to redeploy their forces as they believe to be most compatible with the strength of the alliance and the peace of the world.

**Mr. Hees:** Can the Prime Minister explain how, if one member withdraws forces, the over-all strength can be maintained without the other countries making up the deficit?

**Mr. Speaker:** That is the question which I thought a moment ago was argumentative.

## TRADE

### WHEAT—POSSIBILITY OF DEFAULT IN U.S.S.R. AGREEMENT

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** My question is directed to the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. Speaker. I would ask him whether there is any foundation for the widely dispersed suggestion now being made that the U.S.S.R. is showing no indication of taking up the balance of wheat which it undertook to take under the agreement between Canada and that country.

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce):** The negotiations with regard to the long term agreement to purchase are still under way.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** When the minister was in the west last week did he not say there was grave doubt whether the U.S.S.R. would take up the balance of 70 or 80 million bushels, as the case may be, and that the effect might be to bring about a very serious worsening of the wheat export situation?

**Mr. Lang:** No, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. As far as I know I did not refer to that question at all. I certainly did not say what the right hon. gentleman suggested.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Everybody understood it that way.

## CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

CONSULTATIONS RESPECTING PENSIONS OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** May I direct a question to the Acting Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker? I trust my hope, as a fellow member from Winnipeg, that he will be made a full minister will not hurt his chances.

**An hon. Member:** The kiss of death.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** In view of the assurance the minister gave me on September 24 and February 14 that consultations are taking place with the C.N.R. concerning increasing the pensions of retired employees, can he say what progress has been made in connection with this important matter?

**Hon. James Richardson (Acting Minister of Housing):** The consultations are continuing, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. During the time the minister is top man in the department will he step up these consultations, in the hope that something will be done?

## WATER RESOURCES

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—POSSIBLE CLOSING OF FISHERY THROUGH POLLUTION

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** I have a question for the Minister of Supply and Services. Has the government decided, because of pollution from a phosphorous plant, to close Placentia Bay to the fishing industry?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Supply and Services):** No, Mr. Speaker. No definite decision in that regard has been taken. As I outlined a few moments ago, now that the plant is closed it is a matter of determining whether it is necessary to close the whole bay or any parts of it. This decision will hopefully be made over the weekend and an announcement could be made early next week.

[*Translation*]

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, April 29, consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 28, Mr. Laprise.

**[Mr. Diefenbaker.]**

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday we were studying the amendment relating to hospitals that should be accredited or approved so that therapeutic abortions may be performed in them.

The minister, during the debate on that amendment, imputed to us intentions which, in my opinion, reflect an unacceptable demagoguery.

• (11:50 a.m.)

We move an amendment providing that in order to be accredited, a hospital will have to be able to accommodate at least 400 patients. In doing so, and according to the minister, we would discredit every rural hospital or physician, including the very persons who voted for the members of the Ralliement Créditiste.

Mr. Speaker, to prove what I have just said, let me quote a statement by the minister, as reported on page 8185, of the official report of the House of Commons debates:

> The only hospitals the hon. member trusts are those in which there are at least 400 beds and which form part of a university.

At that time, the minister gave the following answer to the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), and I quote:

> To my mind, he is prejudiced against rural hospitals, against rural ridings and against the small cities of Canada or the province of Quebec.
>
> I believe the Ralliement créditiste party does not trust rural hospitals!

That, Mr. Speaker, is a facile argument, which ascribes to us tendentious intentions. We are thus being discredited, and so are those who ask us to fight in this house measures which are obviously weakening the government itself more and more.

Mr. Speaker, we object to rural hospitals and doctors being authorized to perform therapeutic abortions, not because we have a grudge against them, but because—and this is much more serious—we are sure that if they are allowed to perform such operations, the situation will turn out to be as it is in England's hospitals.

I refer to an article published in the April 30, 1969 issue of *La Presse*, which reads in part as follows:

> Britain's Minister of Health and Welfare stated that the "seven abortion clinics which performed 4,522 abortions out of the 4,958 such operations performed in the last year, will have to improve their services or close down.

Mr. Speaker, is it not clear enough? It is obvious that if we leave it to the clinics or to the small hospitals to procure abortions, we would necessarily encounter abuses. Even if proud Albion renowned for its puritanism, a certain greatness of soul and exemplary spirit in this field, fell victim to such abuses, must we, in turn, fall in the same errors? We are preparing to make the same mistakes, which is far from comprehensible.

All that is needed is for a few practitioners to lack professional integrity and we will move towards similar results. It is well known that doctors are faithful to their professional ethics. But we must simply recognize that in all professions and trades, there are always less scrupulous people. That is a truism.

This is what happened in that clinic in great Britain. Indeed, in the said clinic, there was a physician who performed abortions. Some of them took advantage of that situation to swindle. The newspaper article read as follows, and I quote:

> Some physicians took that opportunity to swindle on a large scale. One of them charged $268 for each abortion and performed 62 in a single day.

If a physician performs 62 abortions on the same day, even if the hospital is accredited and is equipped with all surgical facilities required and even if every essential sanitary precaution is taken, at that rate, it is impossible to enforce the most basic principles of hygiene and medecine.

That is why abortions must be performed only in quite large hospitals so as to prevent such things from happening without anyone knowing about it.

Such is the purpose of the amendment, Mr. Speaker. We must not let things develop in a way likely to bring about disastrous results for the population. I revert once again to the demagogic remarks of the Minister of Justice. Last Wednesday, he imputed the same motives to us, and I quote:

> One must then conclude that under this amendment, the Ralliement créditiste does not trust small hospitals, does not believe that "an atmosphere of perfect professional ethics" can be found in small and/or rural hospitals.
>
> I humbly suggest to the Chair that this amendment reflects a bias against all rural, all small hospitals in the province of Quebec—
>
> Women living in small Quebec towns—

This is the kind of demagogic talk indulged in by the Minister of Justice resorted to. It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, to hear a responsible minister say such things.

Why do we say that abortions should not be performed in smaller hospitals? Because, according to doctors and scientists, perhaps only three therapeutic abortions might be necessary out of 10,000 cases. Three out of 10,000. Is there any need then to set up abortion clinics and hospitals throughout the country?

Mr. Speaker, this does not make sense. The minister strongly emphasized the term "rurals". People are in the habit of confusing "rurals" with "créditistes".

Mr. Speaker, the Ottawa region, particularly that of Ottawa-Carleton, is not a rural region, as far as I know. Yet in the minister's riding, the president of the Liberal Association who is a physician, recently, when announcing his resignation, said, and I quote:

> I have met many people, but not a single soul told me that, by voting for the Liberal party, he intended to support the new legislation on abortion. I do not know many people who support—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I must remind the hon. member, first of all, that he must limit his comments to the amendment before the house and, secondly, that his time has expired.

[*English*]

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, my comments in connection with this amendment will be very brief. Coming as I do from an area which, prior to redistribution, comprised almost one-third of the province of Alberta, stretching from the Northwest Territories hundreds of miles to the south and with a great many small communities, I can only say that I have to vote against the motion proposed by the hon. member. I understand, of course, the feeling that has animated him in moving it, and I give it full effect as I do all other amendments that have been proposed and await discussion.

Because I intend to make a motion at the end of my brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will not depart from the motion but traverse a collateral course. We are in the position of debating this particular and very important amendment at this time because the government has placed us in an impossible position as a result of its refusal to do what should have been done and divide this bill.

We in this house are waiting for an opportunity to deal with urgent and pressing questions such as housing—a very important matter—with matters affecting Indians, with agricultural problems and a great many other topics. The motion that I intend to move will not be for the purpose of inhibiting the right

*Division*

of members to proceed with amendments that have been moved on this bill and which should be the subject of discussion in the house. It is our view, and it always has been the view of members of this party, that there should not be any inhibitions of this sort, that those members who feel very strongly about this subject should have the right to move amendments and debate them.

• (12 noon)

In order that we may proceed with other extremely important business of the house I shall move a motion which I hope the government will see fit to accept. It might then consider setting apart one or two days a week for proceeding with this bill, with the rest of the time to be spent in considering measures which the government and we in the opposition consider very important. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell):

That the said debate be now adjourned.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**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 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 motion (Mr. Baldwin) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Beaudoin
Bell
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Caouette
Carter
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne
Fairweather
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Gundlock
Hales
Harkness
Hees
Horner
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Laprise
Macquarrie
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Mazankowski
Muir (Lisgar)
Noble
Paproski
Peddle
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Scott
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Yewchuk—47.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Andras
Badanai
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Broadbent
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Côté (Longueuil)
Cullen
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Dubé
Forget
Foster
Gendron
Gibson
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harding
Hellyer
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jerome
Kierans
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Laing
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Lefebvre
Legault
Lewis
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
McBride
McIlraith
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
Noël
Orange
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Perrault
Peters
Pilon
Pringle
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Rock
Ryan
Sharp
Skoberg
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Thomson
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Whiting
Winch—97.

• (12:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Allow me to thank the Liberal party for allowing us to

continue this debate, because in the course of his speech, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) accused us of filibustering. This morning, we have the confirmation that the government wishes the debate to continue, and we did not want—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member cannot deal with the vote taken a while ago; he must restrict himself to the amendment now under study.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to congratulate the Liberal party on his attitude towards this amendment. And before proceeding with my remarks, I want to deal for four or five minutes with the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise).

Mr. Speaker, I should like first to refer to some remarks made by the minister about this amendment. We told him we had received hundreds of protests against abortion and against the method of determining the conditions under which abortion will be authorized.

The minister said, in reply to the speech of the hon. member for Abitibi, as reported on page 8184 of *Hansard*, and I quote:

> First, I must point out that when this bill was considered by the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, several amendments were moved by members from all political parties and the government accepted about 25 of them.
>
> We are now at the stage of the committee report. This report has been prepared by the members of the four political parties involved and we have to accept or reject the report. The amendments moved by the members of the Ralliement Créditiste are not affecting this bill, but the committee report.
>
> Well, as I said, the committee accepted about twenty or thirty amendments—

We agree with the Minister of Justice on that point. However the committee did not accept all amendments since you allowed us to move the amendments before us.

In that connection, the Minister of Justice said and I quote:

> The standing committee on justice and legal affairs met 14 times in 30 days. It really meant business. The committee made inquiries, called witnesses, almost all the officials from the Department of Justice.

And I emphasize those words:

> —all the officials from the Department of Justice.

I will say a few words about that later on. The quotation goes on:

> After six days of debate on second reading, 14 committee meetings, and 8 more days of discussion in the house at the stage of the committee report, I can say we are very much concerned with this important legislation.

Those words are nothing but empty words because we heard, in committee several witnesses of whom officials of the Department of Justice. According to me, those officials need not have come before the committee.

We should have heard technicians, specialists. However, it seems everything was done to interfere with them and keep them from speaking up.

They were told: We are not asking you to come here to tell us whether you are for or against the bill, but to get a scientific data. I am wondering if all those witnesses did not come in order to tell us whether the bill made any sense or not. Indeed, the words pronounced by the minister, Mr. Speaker, are just words. The minister does not tell us what really happened at the committee meetings. What happened there was probably intended since no one wanted to present true reports, and call true technicians, true doctors and true surgeons. They were granted patient attention and once the evidence they had to give was collected, that was that. We remained convinced they had to follow the orders given to them, that is, encourage the bill on abortion.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I have been listening very carefully and it seems to me he is discussing matters which took place before the committee. I remind him that the debate at the moment should be on the amendment of his colleague the hon. member for Abitibi, which as I understand it deals with the definition of an accredited hospital. I would invite the hon. member to try to confine his remarks as much as possible to the specific amendment.

• (12:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gauthier:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I knew I was a little out of order. I was quoting a statement of the minister on the amendment but I must point out the decisions the Chair must take sometimes.

I am not blaming the Chair for allowing the minister to discuss what I am dealing with now. I was reading his speech and I was ruled out of order. You did not tell him that he was out of order when he made this statement. I quoted his words to prove to the house that when a minister has the floor, he is not treated the same way as an ordinary member.

I knew I was out of order, but I was quoting the words of the minister on this amendment.

I recognize that you are right Mr. Speaker, but you should not have allowed the minister to speak.

**Some hon. Members:** That is right.

**Mr. Gauthier:** However, he was allowed to speak. He is the minister. He has every right. That is why I quoted his comments.

I come back to the matter at issue: the 400-bed limit. I want the people to know that something is going on in the house that we cannot tolerate. We have been elected to let them know.

As for the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi on the 400-bed restriction, I think it is an approximation because we have failed in all our efforts to reduce the bad effects of the bill.

We could have put down 300 beds. This amendment is moved to prevent the establishment of abortion clubs. Even if abortion is legalized, we could at least prevent in small villages the creation of clubs made up of three physicians.

In connection with the legislation on homosexuality, the first social cub for homosexuals was widely advertised in Montreal under the banner of the Prime Minister. This is, Mr. Speaker, what we want to avoid.

We do not want, as suggested by the Minister of Justice, to bring discredit on our hospitals. I am wondering what he means by rural hospital? In my constituency, hospitals are all located in cities. He is not aware, I believe, that in the province of Quebec, there are hospitals in other cities besides Montreal. It looks as if the minister has not been around enough. There are no rural hospitals administered by farmers. Hospitals are in cities, not in rural areas. The minister should stop laughing at the people.

There are highly qualified doctors in city hospitals. Those doctors are objecting to such a disgrace since they find that 98 per cent of the population in our rural constituencies are against this bill.

Now, we want to prevent any misuse of the bill by limiting authorized abortion to 400 bed hospitals. As I said before, we want to prevent two or three doctors from forming a board and starting an abortion business, as it happened in England. The doctor who performs 62 abortions daily, for a fee of $300 each, makes a nice income! Just figure it out. And to think that doctors are the very ones who pay no income tax!



**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Doctors are the very ones who pay no income tax! Many interesting things are brought to light. Indeed, it is precisely such abuse, that we want to prevent the establishment of human butchery clubs, by authorizing abortions only in 400 bed hospitals. Such a restriction would no doubt restrain the activity of quacks—I was going to say of freaks—who want to earn a living by commercializing abortion.

I am sure that if this amendment were passed, the population would feel more secure, for there is some fear, in my area and in others, that abortionists clubs will multiply as well as homosexual clubs.

It is being said that we are not legalizing abortion. Abortion like homosexuality is in fact, being legalized. Clubs will be established. England is presently facing such a problem. She is starting to impose restrictions to it.

Then, why are we told that it is not an important question, and that we are using filibustering tactics? In my opinion, if we are dealing with the future of the Canadian race, the matter is important.

I would like to see any minister give us proof of the contrary. When a law permits the extermination of a race, that is important. Abortionists are about to exterminate the Canadian race.

To populate Canada, we will have to send for Chinese and Japanese. Today, the birth rate has dropped by 60 per cent, and continues to fall. It is time that responsible men stand up and face those who never do.

Someone has just said that silence is golden. In my opinion, silence is outside, and we will soon be thrown out of our country, for want of population, because of the legislation we pass and which is designed to destroy the Canadian population.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I will vote in favour of this amendment. It is not perfect. It would have been better not to introduce the bill, which contains a lot of stinking clauses. It is not pleasant to talk about this. It is disgusting, but we have to do it.

We must repeat what the Canadian people are telling us. It is imperative that a small group of members make the views of decent people publicly known. Once more this is why I shall vote in favour of the amendment.

If today the government had voted in favour of the motion presented earlier, we could have started dealing with another subject, leaving to doctors the discussion of this matter.

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I had not anticipated to take part in this debate, but considering the turn of events and the views expressed in the house, I think it is my duty to intervene in connection with the proposed amendment moved by my colleague the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) and so well defended by most of my colleagues.

It is to be noted that our opponents, mostly the Liberal members, are trying to hold up to ridicule our efforts to stop the passage of this bill's clauses by saying, for instance, that we are doctors, that we possess great knowledge in medicine.

• (12:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, at this point I must call to the attention of the house and of the minister that this amendment to Bill C-150, proposed by the hon. member for Abitibi, says the following:

"For the purpose of this section an accredited hospital means a hospital containing not less than four hundred (400) beds and/or forming part of a university, in order that the therapeutic abortion committee may execute its functions in an atmosphere of perfect professional ethics."

The fact of presenting an amendment on a minimum of 400 beds does not mean that we accept the principle of the bill. All hon. members know that we are opposed to the parts of the bill related to abortion and homosexuality.

This amendment was proposed after conversations with Dr. Jutras, a pediatrician, of Victoriaville.

Dr. Jutras said to us and rightly so, and I quote:

"We want these therapeutic abortions to be performed only in large centres and not in small communities where everybody knows everybody else, so that people will not be able to point at well-known and highly respected doctor as being a professional abortionist. The purpose is also to preserve the identity of pregnant women who would wish to get an abortion.

That is the statement of Dr. Jutras who is himself opposed to this bill. However, to counteract the nefarious effects of this bill, we suggest a hospital with at least 400 beds because we believe that in big hospitals, the equipment, the training, the organization make it easier to deal with these things. I refer to the evidence given by the representative of the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards on this bill. It was then Bill C-195. However, the same remarks apply to Bill C-150. Here they are:

The therapeutic abortion committees mentioned in this bill should exist only in hospitals where there is a sufficient number of physicians and consultants in each department so that the decision arrived at may be the result of a just and impartial evaluation.

Those people are not members of Parliament but nevertheless they watch closely government legislation and proposals.

Mr. Speaker, our amendment to allow abortion in special cases in hospitals containing not less than 400 beds, as Dr. Jutras pointed out, will eliminate in my opinion possibilities of gossips and bickering in small localities. That does not mean that rural hospitals are no good and my hon. colleague from Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) has well emphasized that point. Nevertheless, one must recognize that hospitals in cities like Rouyn, Noranda, Chicoutimi or even other cities less important than Montreal, Quebec, Trois-Rivières, Sherbrooke, are not as well equipped as the others.

Mr. Speaker, in order to show this amendment is approved by many people from outside Parliament, I received this morning a telegram from Montreal—not from the constituency of Ottawa-Carleton, but from Montreal, where the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) used to live—which reads as follows:

We Liberals support your stand on omnibus bill.
Mr. and Mrs. M. V. Murphy
9729, boul. Rivière-des-Prairies
Montréal

I quote the name as the minister may know those people who are still Liberals. Those people support our objections against this bill.

Now, even where admission in a hospital is concerned, why not consult the people, by means of referendum?

We, from the Ralliement Créditiste, we have a basic principle under which we do not just limit ourselves to talking about the Bank of Canada. People charge us with having a bee in our bonnet which goes on bumbling about the Bank of Canada. Our basic principle is that the government is meant to serve the individual. The main duty of a democratic government, is to rule the country according to the will of the citizens.

In the present circumstances, the people have not been consulted, but rather the government wants to impose its will on the people which is contrary to the principles of democracy.

I am utterly dumbfounded, when I see the members of the New Democratic Party loudly calling: democracy, democracy! What are they doing, in practice? They object to a referendum through which the opinion of the people on this bill might be known.

Mr. Speaker, why are they so afraid? Because we are not the only ones to object. No later than yesterday, the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was saying that he had received no request, whatsoever. What about this request bearing 6,000 signatures, and that other one with more than 70,000 names protesting against this bill as well as against the article presently under discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I will be told that we are drifting away from the amendment now before the house, but our arguments do concern it, and they are all intended to prevent the spread across our land of this abomination the government proposes through Bill C-150.

Mr. Speaker, a while ago an hon. member mentioned—and you called him back to order—the resignation of the president of the Liberal Association in Ottawa-Carleton, the riding of the minister. Mr. McGuinty is a close friend of the minister's; the minister tells us that he is a philosopher, a doctor of philosophy. If he is a philosopher, that is because he has common sense for, indeed, philosophy is good common sense. That is why he quit the Liberal party.

Mr. Speaker, what Mr. McGuinty says—

**Mr. Paul Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Works):** You would be willing to accept him—

**Mr. Caouette:** Of course, we would accept him in our ranks as a philosopher, but we certainly would not accept the member for Chicoutimi in the same capacity.

Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Langlois:** There is not much danger—

**Mr. Caouette:** I know there is not much danger of it. The hon. member for Chicoutimi is especially good at playing Santa Claus during the Christmas season.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it one o'clock?

[*English*]

At one o'clock the house took recess.



## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

• (2:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment at one o'clock, I was saying that my friend from Abitibi, Mr. Laprise, had moved an amendment tending to authorize the practice of abortion only in 400 bed hospitals, and I quote

> —in order that the therapeutic abortion committee may execute its functions in an atmosphere of perfect professional ethics.

Mr. Speaker, we have been accused of holding up the proceedings of the house, of objecting to this bill or to the introduction of amendments, merely to play politics.

But the other day, when the member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) told me: Your attitude will not bring you any votes, I asked him since when he was interested in our winning votes in the province of Quebec or elsewhere in Canada.

The other day, the member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) also accused the Ralliement Créditiste of filibustering with regard to the clause of Bill C-150 about the eligibility of hospitals, for example. As usual, the member for Trois-Rivières, taking to task the Ralliement Créditiste, acted like a fool and talked through his hat.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the proposed amendments is not to express our approval of the bill, even if it were amended, but rather —and I shall be quite frank with the house—to prevent, as long as possible, the passage of this bill. By so doing, we give the opportunity to associations, in Quebec as well as in the rest of Canada, to submit petitions and to bring pressure to bear on the government in order to prevent it from making too hasty a decision on a matter so big with consequences. That is the main purpose of our amendments.

Mr. Speaker, we readily admit that far more important and urgent subjects should be debated in parliament at this time, and we do not object to the government taking it upon itself to postpone the study of this Bill C-150 so as to enable the house to discuss other more important problems, such as unemployment and the plight of western as well as of eastern farmers. There are urgent problems that must be settled. And the Créditistes will be accused of delaying tactics because of their amendments to Bill C-150.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to discuss the amendments. We are dealing with the amendment relating to the number of hospital beds, after which we shall study another amendment dealing with something else. When we have gone through all the amendments, Mr. Speaker, we will reach the stage of the third reading of the bill. There are 14 of us and we shall deliver 14 speeches because the government would not give various Canadian organizations the opportunity to submit their intentions and their suggestions.

We demand that a hospital should have at least 400 beds in order to be accredited, according to the clause of the Bill.

We say again we repeat that we do not endorse the bill for all that. We want to minimize as much as possible the disastrous effects of the bill. If we are successful, we shall have rendered the people a service all the same. I only speak on behalf of my colleagues of the Ralliement Créditiste.

During the lunch hour, I had a phone call from Montreal, not from a Créditiste, but from Mr. Morois, a notary. I do not know him. I think he is the president of an association of Catholic parents in Montreal. He congratulates us on the stand we are taking in the house. We are not asking the notary if he is going to vote for us or not. We do not care about that.

We are greatly concerned, however, about the bill before us. Are we going to impose a legislation, even against the will of the people, across the country?

There is an old fable of La Fontaine about animals sick of the plague. I am wondering if we might not apply it to this government as regards Bill C-150.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, we have this amendment before us. We are opposed to the idea that, if this bill is passed, any hospital in Canada can be accredited.

We are sticking to our opinions concerning this amendment. We are surprised that members who consider themselves to be very democratic do not suggest that we go before the people in order to find out if they are in favour of the bill or not.

We are convinced that catholics, protestants, and people of other creeds are happy to see us adopt this attitude here. It is not as Créditistes that we have done so. It is not in the name of the Ralliement Créditiste that we have adopted that attitude, but in the name of Christian morals—for those of us who are Christians—and in the name of the Canadian people, which we must serve and not enslave, as is being done now.

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** I regret very much not to have been able, before today, to speak in this house in support of my colleagues of the Ralliement créditiste and object, as did all the others who took part in this debate, to the clauses concerning homosexuality and abortion in Bill C-150 to amend the Criminal Code.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I was unable to do so because of an absence of several days from the house; in fact, the committee on fisheries and forestry, of which I am a member, went to Vancouver, Victoria and several other cities in western Canada, to investigate problems in those fields.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the amendment moved by my colleague the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), which reads as follows:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting paragraph (a) of sub-section 6 of clause 18 on page 43 and substituting therefor:

"(a) For the purpose of this section, an accredited or approved hospital means a hospital containing not less than four hundred (400) beds and/or forming part of a university, in order that the therapeutic abortion committee may execute its functions in an atmosphere of perfect professional ethics."

I fully support that amendment which is of the utmost importance. I find it most important, because the matter at issue is to know whether the therapeutic abortion committees set up in hospitals will be able to consider and determine the opportunity of procuring the miscarriage of a female person, as the bill puts it.

This is why even large hospitals, with 400 beds or more, are concerned about the consequences of passing Bill C-150.

I recognize the importance of the amendment now before us; to illustrate my point, I would like to refer to a brief submitted by experts in hospital management. I am quoting:

The Canadian Association of Catholic Hospitals, representing the administrators of some 300 hospitals (making up about 35 per cent of all the hospital services offered to the Canadian public) recognizes the necessity of clarifying the present sections of the Criminal Code regarding abortion, but is opposed to proposals aiming to liberalize abortion.

This is why the necessary amendments to this law should not be adopted before the question as a whole has been thoroughly studied and before the government finds better ways to carry on research.

Our brief dealt mainly with the important question of administration that is to say with the real problem hospitals will have to face should Parliament hastily legalize, without having carefully considered all its possible implications, a practice which is not only considered repulsive by the majority of Canadians, but contrary to the common weal.

At present, the administrators of catholic hospitals follow rules of conduct which prohibit therapeutic abortion and therefore they cannot provide premises, equipment and staff for such ends.

Even though the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code do not make abortion mandatory but merely abolish all possible penalties in given circumstances, the conditions stipulated put the catholic hospitals in a new and extremely vulnerable position, since the provincial authorities can, under said amendments, require them to set up their own abortion committees.

I believe that point most important, since we have to decide on such a serious matter, in other words, whether abortion should be performed on a female person, and since the implications of such act can be very serious.

I have read evidence from several prominent doctors on abortion, as well as reports from doctors well aware of what goes on in hospitals at the present time. I should like to quote figures provided by Dr. Gregg Tompkins, who had this to say:

We have actively tried to discover the cases of therapeutic abortion. Their number varies according to localities. Very few in some centres, but quite numerous in others. In 1965, 17 therapeutic abortions were performed in Nova Scotia. In a maternity hospital where half of the deliveries occur, or which services about half of the province, three therapeutic abortions were performed.

Mr. Speaker, this quotes shows the difference between cases where abortion may be allowed and those where it must be refused.

I go on with the quotation:

In another locality about 70 miles away, where there are 500 deliveries a year, that is approximately one hundredth of the population, eight or ten therapeutic abortions are performed, I think. Now it is quite probable, I am sure, that those men have made such decisions in good faith, but it cannot be inferred that they were dealing with a proportion of the population where risks are greater than for the rest of it—

Here are Dr. Vant's figures, and I quote:

Dr. R. W. Lohner of Utah noted in a recent study effected over a 10 year period, that the frequency of therapeutic abortions in Salt Lake City was one out of 2,482 deliveries. He compared that figure with a frequency of one out of 160 over a 5 year period in Mount Sinai hospital in New York City and of one out of 6,416 over a ten year period, where there were 102,654 deliveries in the Los Angeles county hospital. He concluded that those figures reflect the mentality of the local people.

Dr. Patrick Beirne, of New York City, says this:

In New York City, two hospitals, a few streets away from one another, have abortion committees. In the first one, there is one therapeutic abortion per 16,000 deliveries. In the other, there is one abortion per 20 births.

It is most important to decide who, in the hospitals, should be appointed to such a committee. Therefore, committees are no guarantee that in our province serious consideration will be given as to whether or not abortion should be procured.

And I go on with the quotation:

One committee is not good enough. The matter should be cleared up, in my opinion.

On the other hand, Dr. Jack Walters says this:

If we consider the differences in the frequency of abortions in the world, we find that hospitals with the highest record of abortions are those that have the most lenient committees. In a hospital with 20,000 confinements a year, only a few abortions are procured to save the life of the mother. In another hospital with 10,000 confinements, there would be 40 times more abortions in a year and the difference is not in the frequency of these abortions, but in the fact that it is common knowledge that if sent to that hospital, a woman can procure her own miscarriage.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that for all those reasons I just mentioned, and especially on account of such evidence given by people who have several years' experience in New York hospitals and elsewhere, it is our duty to give this amendment the most careful consideration possible.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

• (2:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** 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 view the nays have it. The motion is negatived on division.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. 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 S-33, an act to incorporate Atlantic Mutual Life Insurance Company, to which the concurrence of this house is desired.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi)** moved motion No. 29:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting paragraph (f) of subsection 6 of clause 18 on page 44 and substituting therefor:

"(f) "therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee, comprised of not less than two qualified medical practitioners and one gynaecologist, appointed by the board of that hospital and approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province concerned, for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital."

He said:

[*Translation*]

• (2:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, the amendment I am moving just now tends to amend paragraph (f) of sub-section 6 of clause 18 which reads as follows:

"therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee, comprised of not less than three members each of whom is a qualified medical practitioner, appointed by the board of that hospital for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to termination of pregnancy within that hospital.

The amendment that I am moving states that the abortion committee for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than two qualified medical practitioners and one gynaecologist. The amendment moved by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) mentions three medical practitioners. Well, I move through my amendment, that out of these three medical practitioners, one gynaecologist should be appointed by the board of that hospital and approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province concerned, for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital.

Mr. Speaker, in moving this amendment, I wish to point out that I am doing so, subject to the reservation that I object to the principle of abortion as proposed in Bill C-150.

I am therefore moving a new amendment to clause 18 in case that clause would not be rejected, and I want my position to be well understood.

The object of this amendment is to specify the nature of an abortion committee and to provide that the College of Physicians and Surgeons will have to approve the establishment of such committee. It will not only be the authorities of the hospital but the College of Physicians and Surgeons in each province which will be called to approve the establishment of each committee. The amendment also states that the committee will have to include a gynaecologist, that is a specialist in gynaecology which *Larousse* defines as the science of morphology, physiology, pathology and psychology of women.

Mr. Speaker, this is why we are asking that a gynaecologist be included in the therapeutic abortion committee, if such a committee is appointed and provided, of course, that Bill C-150 is passed in its present form.

Mr. Speaker, if we want that a gynaecologist be included in the group of three physicians which will be called to decide whether an abortion will be performed, it is to make sure as much as possible that they will take a serious decision.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I have moved is not my own, since I have introduced it on the request of gynaecologists who want to assure the presence of a specialist in the abortion committee.

Since Bill C-150 provides for the legalization of abortion in order to protect the mother's life, a small abortion committee will have the authority to decide whether the abortion will be performed. Finally, if the law is adopted in its present form it will enable two physicians within a three-member committee to authorize abortions as they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, considering how easy it will be for a small group of physicians to decide whether or not a being meant to live should be destructed, often in compliance with the fancy of some women, we do not hesitate to oppose the bill. We must face the fact: under the legislation presently before us, some women and young girls have the definite impression that abortion will be legally and readily authorized. That is why we insist that a gynaecologist be on the committee, because we know such a person has made extensive studies regarding the function of giving birth to children. All doctors do not know the matter as well, not even obstetricians.

According to some gynaecologists, this section of the medical science has greatly improved particularly in the last ten years. Studies have been made and others are underway, and the findings are surprising. It is becoming always easier to treat all diseases affecting pregnant women.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, they cannot be entrusted to doctors who are not fully qualified to treat women's diseases at the time of delivery or during pregnancy.

We have received many testimonies in this connection. To support my views I shall quote part of an article by Mrs. Claire Campbell in the February 1968 issue of *Relations:*

> Dr. Kaseki, a famed gynaecologist at Nagoya, Japan (known as the abortion land), made a survey among 525 women who had resorted to a therapeutic abortion. He found out that 73 per cent had felt anguished after abortion. Another inquiry revealed that out of 253 married women on whom a therapeutic abortion had been performed, 92 per cent felt the pangs of remorse. In addition, a survey conducted by a Mainichi newspaper produced 1,026 replies: 68 per cent said that abortion was intrinsically wrong and that they missed the child that had been destroyed.

We find that gynaecologists everywhere have made studies not only in an attempt to find a cure for diseases likely to affect expectant mothers, but also to learn more about the effects of abortions.

And we know, Mr. Speaker, that one cannot take a green fruit from a tree without injuring the branch itself. The very same thing applies to abortions. It has been proved by gynaecologists that childbirth is a natural process which, if terminated before maturity, affects the woman.

I feel it is important and necessary to look fully into those matters before accepting clause 18 as proposed by the Minister of Justice.

In support of my arguments, I shall quote part of Dr. Légaré's evidence—Dr. Légaré is another gynaecologist—when he appeared before the committee on justice and legal affairs on March 25, 1969.



I refer to page 622 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the committee, and I quote:

> I mentioned these matters a while ago, and of course, it is difficult to judge the value of our brief, but I was very careful to stick to the question in so far as the indications are concerned. As to these indications, I think that the comparison of the life of the foetus against the health of the mother is difficult to make in certain particularly questionable fields. I would accept therapeutic abortion in certain cases, where it is one life against another.
>
> For instance, I mentioned certain inoperable mitral stenoses, certain cases of renal insufficiency, especially those following chronic nephrites, and not those which are caused by acute phenomena, which are called acute glomerulonephrites, which can be fairly well treated with modern medication.
>
> But, as I stated, these cases should become more and more rare, because medicine is developing and progressing and we are finding more potent medication to treat these illnesses without having to have recourse to therapeutic abortion.

We have here another gynaecologist who testifies that cases where therapeutic abortion is necessary are very rare, because of the progress of medical science. That is why I deem it important that a gynaecologist be a member of the therapeutic committee. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) asked Dr. Légaré if, in his opinion and I quote:

> —according to your medical knowledge, are there cases of therapeutic abortion which are absolutely necessary?

Dr. Légaré answered:

> I must say that I have never come across any, but I do not have too much experience in this. I have been practising obstetrics for 13 years only.

To my mind, Dr. Légaré is extremely modest in this regard, for 13 years' experience is quite a lot. I resume my quotation:

> However, I think there could be doubtful cases, and to come back to that subject, I do not know if this suggestion to amend the Act is prudent or not, but it seems to me that it is not worthwhile upsetting the legislation, which might be risky, when the serious cases are covered at the present time.

Dr. Légaré does say that the present act, even before being modified, does cover—as he says—the few cases that can occur, because in almost every case the necessary medication and care can be given to restore the health of the mother and enable her to see her pregnancy through.

Mr. Rondeau followed with another question, and I quote:

In your experience has it ever happened that you had to perform therapeutic abortion as the ultimate means of saving the life of the mother?

The member for Shefford wanted specific information in this case. Here is Dr. Légaré's reply:

No, not personally. I come back to the evidence of Mrs. MacInnis—I am probably influenced, and even as a last resort, I do not have the right to resort to this. I multiply all the "other" means to solve these problems. But I think that, in fact, the problem can be discussed on the basis of statistics. Let us compare the statistics of places where therapeutic abortion is practised with those of places where it is not practised—

My colleague from Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin) gave statistics a while ago which show that there is a difference between those places where therapeutic abortions are practised and those where they are not.

—and check the results. This is where we shall be able to judge, according to whether the results are identical, higher or lower.

• (2:50 p.m.)

This can be proved by figures and not through philosophical arguments, you are right. But these are very infrequent cases—

And Dr. Légaré emphasized this aspect in almost every answer to questions that were asked him.

Mr. Rondeau got back to the matter again and I quote:

The therapeutic abortion committee that will have to decide in what cases there should be an abortion, could not this committee still be subject to medical error?

Dr. Légaré answered:

Yes, of course. Any human being can make a medical error, and that is why at the end of my brief I mentioned that the death penalty has been abolished because of the possibility of a miscarriage of justice and out of humanitarianism. We ourselves must be at least as humble as the judges and accept that we can make mistakes, that even a committee can make mistakes. And a life is at stake. This may be a matter of opinion but as far as we are concerned a life is at stake at the very outset.

Not at the moment of delivery in due time, but at the very outset.

Mr. Rondeau then asked another question and I quote:

Does medical progress call for abortion or does it not rather make it unnecessary?

Dr. Légaré answered:

There are a great number of indications, some that I have not even mentioned, that are now of lesser importance. Take for instance, uncontrollable vomiting, vomiting at the beginning of pregnancy on which medication had no effect. A woman could die from this or suffer an acute atrophy of the liver but this no longer happens because of serums and all the various means we have to maintain a patient's balance. These indications are no longer of first importance.

So, Mr. Speaker, these indications demonstrate the necessity to have one gynaecologist on such therapeutic abortion committee. Dr. Légaré went further to say:

Other indications which I mentioned are less important today because of progress. For instance, from the viewpoint of cardiology, there are fewer indications than previously. It is normal, I think, that as medicine progresses, it becomes increasingly medical instead of surgical.

So I think that this statement from Dr. Légaré indicates that there is a possibility in nearly all cases to find a solution, and even a cure, through medical treatments rather than surgery.

So Mr. Speaker, those are indications in favour of my amendment. I am more and more convinced that this amendment is valid and that it should be accepted by the Minister of Justice, to insure that a gynaecologist will be on this therapeutic committee and that every guarantee is obtained as to the decision to practise an abortion or not. Such decision must be taken wisely and with as few mistakes as possible.

So I think we are playing with the life of foetus, who can expect to live, and we should not neglect anything so that they will be born. We have evidence indicating that with today's medical knowledge most of those difficult pregnancies can be continued. This is what happens.

So for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Justice should accept this amendment, as there is no doubt that it is really needed.

[*English*]

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, although in committee we were able to accept well over 20 amendments, the government, as you know, is supporting the committee report participated in by members of the house from all political parties. We have to support the committee on this particular measure and reject the amendment just spoken to by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise). His proposal would inject the requirement that members of a therapeutic abortion committee of a hospital be approved by the provincial College of Physicians and Surgeons; it would also specify that

at least one member of the committee be a gynaecologist.

In this as in other areas of medical practice, the responsibility for appointments should be with the board charged with the control and management of the hospital. In our view, to require approval by the provincial College of Physicians and Surgeons would constitute an unwarranted reflection on the good faith and competence of the boards of hospitals which are either accredited or approved as defined in the bill. After all, we are dealing with hospitals that are accredited or approved. An accredited hospital, in the bill, means a hospital accredited by the Canadian Council on Hospital Accreditation, and an approved hospital means a hospital in a province approved by the minister of health of that province.

We believe that the qualification of the hospital by either the medical profession itself or by the provincial minister of health is sufficient to maintain the standard of professional conduct we believe is required for the purpose of the bill. For that reason we have to recommend to the house that the hon. member's amendment be rejected.

• (3:00 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to speak on this amendment, because I realize that the hon. minister does not know what to say.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a correction made to the French Orders of the Day on page (i) concerning the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise). I quote:

—be amended by deleting paragraph (f) of subsection 6—

There is no such thing in the bill as a paragraph (f) in section 18. The "therapeutic abortion committee" is defined in paragraph (e), not paragraph (f). I presume, Mr. Speaker, that it must be a misprint.

To prevent my hon. colleagues of the government party from making a mistake when they vote, I would like this correction to be made.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to make a few comparisons for the minister's benefit and I would ask him to listen carefully to our remarks; he may be in a position to change his mind after that, since what he said in the speech he just made relates neither to the bill, nor to the amendment nor to what the hon. member for Abitibi said.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

Clause 18 (6) (e) of the bill defines "therapeutic abortion committee" as follows:

"therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee, comprised of not less than three members each of whom is a qualified medical practitioner, appointed by the board of that hospital for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital.

However, this amendment gives another definition of "therapeutic abortion committee". In fact, the hon. member for Abitibi makes only two new suggestions. The committee would still be comprised of three members, but whilst according to the minister's proposal, these members would be three qualified medical practitioners appointed by the board of the hospital, in the proposal of the hon. member for Abitibi, one of the three qualified medical practitioners would be a gynaecologist. The amendment proposed by the hon. member stipulates also, as this is not in the bill, and I am quoting:

—approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province concerned.

Why? Obviously because in our medical legislation the provisions differ from one province to another and that a certain latitude must therefore be provided.

Secondly, we should ensure that appointments of committee members are approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province concerned. This seems quite logical and normal to me. However, the minister does not accept a gynaecologist on the therapeutic abortion committee, in spite of the fact that he himself proposes three doctors on the committee, not necessarily gynaecologists.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand why the minister's argument is so narrow and why he cannot admit that a gynaecologist would have his place on a therapeutic abortion committee. It seems to me that if you wish to have the automatic transmission of a car repaired, you do not go to the dentist but rather to a mechanic specialized in the repair of automatic transmissions. When you suffer from a headache, you could take the medical advice of the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle), but if it is a serious illness, you would see a specialist in that field, which is normal, in my opinion.

If a cancer patient went to seek medical advice from the hon. member for Hull, he would say: "I know more competent people than myself to treat that illness." Now, prompted by his professional conscience, the hon. member for Hull would send his patient to a specialist in that field.

In fact, specialization is everywhere today. There are pediatricians, gynaecologists, general practitioners, psychiatrists, specialists in political illnesses who could treat those of the Liberal party for example. This is why certain philosophers and physicians are resigning.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that each patient consults a specialist, according to the nature of his illness, because he will obtain a more adequate treatment. That is why we feel we must enlighten the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) in his consideration of abortion because he is not himself a specialist in this field. Experts in different areas must help each other. That is the reason why we take part in this debate.

The minister said earlier—I am sorry he is not here to take note of what we are telling him—that the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi was contrary to the views of the medical board. I think the opposite is true, because the amendment stipulates and I quote:

—approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons—

There is the word "approved", which indicates that there is no intention to make doctors fight against the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Yet, that is what the minister was suggesting earlier. He is wrong because the text says clearly, and I quote:

—appointed by the board of that hospital and approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons—

I do not find anything extraordinary in that and I cannot see how the minister can read the opposite of what is written.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi states two particular points, since it is necessary to repeat it. In short, it is a matter of defining what is a therapeutic abortion committee.

To analyse further the amendment and to explain the reasons why I support it unreservedly, I would like to remind the minister and his colleagues that the therapeutic committees, which are proposed for hospitals where abortion will be performed, that is all hospitals without exception, are the keystone of the entire law on abortion.

In fact, the whole question of abortion is based on the establishment of those famous therapeutic abortion committees. One understands right away the importance of a definition of the words "therapeutic abortion committee". Here, the question is not to define minor words used in the bill, but the very essence of the bill itself. In short, we have to make clear who will be responsible for the administration of the act, consequently for safeguarding the mother's life, it possible, and for enforcing the code of professional ethics.

Mr. Speaker, I could hardly imagine a dentist—since no definition is given of the "medical practitioner" performing an abortion; however, that might well happen if no such definition is available in the bill.

That is why we would like the words "qualified medical practitioner" to be clarified as meaning an expert in that field, as recommended by Dr. Légaré, from Quebec City, according to No. 13 of the minutes of the proceedings of the committee. He felt that the government should guarantee that the therapeutic abortion committee will include a gynaecologist.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a sound amendment and I cannot understand why it would be rejected.

I am coming back to this amendment to say that a therapeutic abortion committee means, and this is the definition suggested by the hon. member for Abitibi, and I quote:

—a committee comprised of not less than two qualified medical practitioners and one gynaecologist—

Well, the act states this:

• (3:10 p.m.)

—means a committee comprised of not less than three members—

And we, in this party, say:

—a committee comprised of not less than two qualified medical practitioners and one gynaecologist—

This is the first difference with which I dealt earlier. In other words, we accept the proposal that the committee shall comprise three medical practitioners, but we say that one of them shall be a gynaecologist.

I continue to quote the clause of the bill:

—each of whom is a qualified medical practitioner—

Therefore, it conforms with the definition.

—appointed by the board of that hospital—

Well, in our amendment, we say:

—appointed by the board of that hospital—

So, there is no difference at all, which means that Liberals can be Creditists or that Creditists can be Liberals.

—for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital.

As for us, we say:

—for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital.

Now, before that we have simply added:

—and approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province concerned—

In my opinion, it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal is clear and merely clarifies subclause (f) of the bill which stipulates that a therapeutic abortion committee must be established with a view to determining who will be appointed to it.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask those who are more familiar than we are with such matters why a gynaecologist should not sit on such a committee to supervise the operation required to perform an abortion.

I should be most happy to have the opinion of the hon. member for Hull, who is a capable doctor, on this matter.

In Hull, this morning, I met a few of his close friends. We were precisely talking of the important job he was doing as chairman of the health, welfare and social affairs committee, for which I commend him. But these same people were wondering, however, what he was doing regarding abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I should like him to answer that question himself and say why a gynaecologist should not sit on such a committee.

The object of this amendment is to specify the nature of an abortion committee and to stipulate that its membership must be approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. According to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), the committee must include a gynaecologist, that is a doctor who has specialized in gynaecology, which *Larousse* defines as the science of the morphology, the physiology, the pathology and the psychology of women, or as a branch of medicine having to do with the diseases of women.

That is why we are asking that a gynaecologist be included among the members of the therapeutic committee.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to go further, but I would like to remind the house that consideration of this point is of the utmost importance.

Mr. Speaker, we are in agreement and we wish to make a positive contribution to the drafting of the legislation. One must admit that this is a very simple amendment, which is nevertheless important and essential in order that all persons seeking an abortion be ensured at least of adequate care and the help of specialists.

I dare not hope, however, that the amendment will be adopted; I would be very much surprised if it were, because they are so determined to have the omnibus bill passed at all costs that they are even ready to make it retroactive.

The logic of that clause is thus laid bare, and I blame the house for not saying anything. Indeed, this amendment calls for comments. I think the members of the New Democratic Party, who are true blue socialists and idealists, whose abode is in the clouds, should practice democracy and as they preach it and express their point of view. Whether we approve or blame the government is irrelevant; we want to know if people who apply to a doctor and whose case will be settled by the therapeutic abortion committee, will be treated by specialists or by unqualified persons. That is the gist of the matter, Mr. Speaker.

I am loath to believe that our older colleagues, whose white hair should command respect, do not have enough courage, nor firm enough convictions or ideas to stand up and be counted, to tell us whether or not they agree on a more adequate membership for the therapeutic committees. But no, they seem to be seated on six inches of Lepage's glue, and we do not hear a peep out of them—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please.

**Mr. Fortin:** And the members of the Ralliement Créditiste have—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

The hon. member had made a good start, and I would ask him to round up his remarks in the same vein.

**Mr. Fortin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for appreciating what is said and how it is said.

I shall close my remarks by saying that the atmosphere which prevails in this house is rather discouraging. If our constituents could see us, I feel that long ago we would have been left without a government, since the whole building would have been blown to smithereens.

From a medical standpoint, abortion means the expulsion, natural or caused, outside the uterus, of the product of conception.

There are two kinds of abortions. First, there is the abortion called a miscarriage, which is a natural phenomenon over which

the human will has no power. That is not the one we are concerned with.

But there is also the voluntary abortion, which causes the expulsion of a live foetus. There can be no doubt that it is a human being, a living being. The expulsion is produced for different motives or reasons.

I would go even further, Mr. Speaker, and suggest that there should be a psychiatrist on the therapeutic abortion committee to study the motives of the women asking for an abortion.

I think that the hon. member for Abitibi does not go far enough.

At least one psychiatrist should be on this committee to examine the reasons which prompt a woman to ask for an abortion and show that there may be other means than the removal of the foetus from the uterus to solve her problem.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the establishment of therapeutic committees is the cornerstone of this legislation—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Fortin:** —which asks—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Does the house agree to the hon. member continuing?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Isabelle:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the hon. member.

• (3:20 p.m.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The time allotted to the hon. member having expired, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) will have to get the unanimous consent of the house to put a question to the hon. member.

Does the house allow that the hon. member to put a question to the hon. member for Lotbinière?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

**Mr. Isabelle:** Mr. Speaker, I am rising both on a question of privilege and on a point of order. The member for Hull was mentioned regarding consultations for headaches. It was also suggested that the hon. old white-haired members of the house seem reluctant to act wisely.

In reply, I shall say that at our age, we still have our own hair and that if the hon. member continues to speak like this, he will not have any hair left in five years from now.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Hull on a point of order.

**Mr. Isabelle:** I rise again on a question of privilege.

If it is necessary to appoint a gynaecologist on the abortion committee, I do not believe that it has to be specified. I hope the hospital trustees will ensure that this specialty will be represented within the committee. On the other hand, I would like to say that in listening to speeches like those we have listened to for a week, I think that these people should consult a proctologist.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière rises on a point of order.

**Mr. Fortin:** The house gave unanimous consent to the hon. member for Hull to ask me a question, so I should be given unanimous consent to answer him.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Hull rises on a question of privilege.

Before I give the floor to the next speaker, I might say that the hon. member for Lotbinière, in opening his remarks, pointed out an error on page (i) of the order paper. He might perhaps point it out again to allow the Chair to decide whether there is an error or not.

**Mr. Fortin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. However, I realized during the debate that I had the first version of the omnibus bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The Chair, having looked at Bill C-150, finds that there really is a paragraph (f).

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Lotbinière on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

I felt the remarks of the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) were aimed directly at me. He hopes that I will lose my hair. I think that it would be more important to ask ourselves—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I think this is turning into a debate, which is out of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I believe in giving credit where credit is due, even when this means giving credit to the Creditistes. I have listened, as have all other hon. members, with considerable admiration to the members of that party in this house speaking in support of the moral issues involved in this legislation. As the leader of the Creditistes party said a moment ago, they have not taken that stand on a partisan basis; they have taken their stand on the common, ethical and moral grounds with which we can all agree. There is a moral factor involved in these questions, regardless of what hon. members opposite may say, and my hon. friends to my left at the far end of the chamber can be congratulated on bringing it out.

They represent a viewpoint common to many Canadians, regardless of which language they speak. Many issues of a similar nature have been raised where common ground exists, regardless of language or province of origin. My hon. friends have done us a tremendous service in bringing these matters forward. Certainly, some of the matters they have raised are worthy of our consideration. Are we to compel doctors to perform abortions against their will or to serve on abortion committees when they do not wish to do so? These provisions are like many others being brought forward as part of the attempt to establish a permissive society. The accumulated wisdom of peoples shows that laws like the present one do not work. They are divisive, they destroy and tear apart the fabric of society.

Consider for a moment, Mr. Speaker, what kind of society we shall have if we introduce relaxed divorce laws, if we permit abortions to take place, the smoking of marijuana and homosexuality. Why, it will be just one long, swinging ball. But do you build a nation and defend freedom by lowering the barriers against vice?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I hope the hon. member is coming to the point. I point out to him that we are considering a specific motion to amend a clause in Bill C-150, and I ask him to restrict his remarks to that motion.

[Mr. Fortin.]

**Mr. Paproski:** Mr. Speaker, I will come to the point. Next, we may expect the government to introduce a law legalizing graft and corruption.

During the debate on abortion, we have heard a great deal about permissiveness and the just society. Well, you cannot have justice for the few. After the legislation concerning abortion has been passed, we shall have a situation in which doctors will no longer be allowed discretion in refusing to perform abortions. On what grounds, Mr. Speaker, can a medical committee in a hospital refuse to grant an abortion? Will the grounds cover the mother's physical or mental health? These are so nebulous that, like charity, they cover a multitude of sins.

I submit that once you remove the child's basic right to live you have no leg to stand on in refusing abortions. I ask hon. gentlemen in this chamber this question: Do they honestly think that once this legislation becomes law, once this chamber has approved the principle of abortion, those demanding abortions will be satisfied with a simple "no"? They will not be so satisfied, and that has been the experience in countries like Japan, where abortions are allowed. In those countries it has been found in practice that the mere, simple request for an abortion is enough. The person requesting one obtains one.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Some will say, what is wrong with that? Actually, those favouring this legislation see nothing wrong with abortion as such; nor are they disturbed at the idea of abortions being as widespread as vaccinations are. Many of the advocates of this legislation would have adopted a position far more in line with their real views if they had said, "We favour abortion because there is nothing wrong with it." They simply do not believe in the rights of the unborn. They did not, however, say this, because if they had they would have trampled on the dearly held convictions of many thousands of Canadians of various religious denominations who hold that human life is sacred. Those who favour abortion laws leave out of their consideration entirely the rights of the child. A simple test will show that I am right. How many abortions would there be if the child had a say in the matter? Not very many.

There is a deep moral issue behind all the verbiage we have heard on this matter, that issue being the right to life. The unborn child has not illegitimately taken the life of another. The child has not transgressed any law. It wants to be born and under this legislation this becomes a crime.

With that closeness they have to the ordinary men and women of their province, my hon. friends at the end of the chamber to my left have determined the feelings of ordinary Canadians. They have raised this issue as a moral issue and that is the basis on which it must be approached. The framers of this legislation have chosen to ignore the history of experience and the wisdom of other nations.

We face the same problem with marijuana. Certain persons in this country are acting as though narcotics appeared only yesterday in our society. This shows a naïvety, Mr. Speaker, that among supposedly responsible persons is almost unbelievable. The nations of Asia have had a thousand years of experience with the anti-social and destructive effects of such narcotics and have seen fit to outlaw them, with very severe penalties for those breaking the law. In 1969 marijuana was outlawed in India, not for ideological reasons, but simply because the drug had a destructive and catastrophic impact on society.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I must interrupt the hon. member to remind him that his comments at this time ought to be related to the specific motion now before the house. I know the hon. member has followed this debate closely during the last few days and realizes that, on a number of occasions, the Chair has invited hon. members to limit their contributions to the specific motion being considered. If the hon. member is allowed to disregard that rule of relevancy, other hon. members must also be given similar treatment, and we might as well be prepared to stay here until Christmas.

I suggest to the hon. member that there will be other opportunities to make general speeches on abortion. Having said that, I hope the hon. member will now try to relate his remarks to the motion moved by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) which deals with therapeutic abortion committees.

**Mr. Paproski:** Mr. Speaker, may I just say this in closing? I cannot help thinking that all these initiatives of the so-called just society or permissive society have one thing in common. If carried out unchecked they will completely destroy society. That is why the older civilizations ruled out such things. The consequences will be on the heads of the members of the government. I will say nothing else.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, we are studying an amendment much similar to the one that follows, which refers more specifically to the famous hospital committees and requires greater guarantee than is offered in the present bill.

The hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) has just confirmed our assertions, for instance, that he would like to see a gynaecologist on those committees. We are not here to rely on what others will do. We must draft clear, definite and precise laws. If we admit that gynaecologists are the best experts in this field, we must not approve legislation which, at best, expresses the hope that a gynaecologist will be a member of those hospital committees.

The act should say "two doctors and a gynaecologist". In this connection, I agree with the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) who feels that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) is still not definite enough, even if it stipulates that a gynaecologist must be a member of the committee. That is certainly not asking too much, because the bill could be much more strict than it is presently even with the amendment moved by the hon. member for Abitibi.

Even in the latter case, the only guarantee would be that a gynaecologist would be a member of the committee on which there would still be some doctors, the majority of them actually, who are not gynaecologists and who could always reverse the decision, whether positive or negative, of the gynaecologist.

On this I am not referring to the expert witnesses we called, but to other witnesses called on the suggestion of members of the other parties. I am not questioning the value of the witnesses called; they were serious and knowledgeable. I am speaking here of Dr. George B. Maughan, chief obstetrician and gynaecologist of the Royal Victoria Hospital of Montreal, who is a highly competent gynaecologist, and who said, as may be seen at page 555 of the minutes of proceedings of the committee that even if two doctors told him to "shoot" a foetus, the doctors were making the decision but not the operation. It was in fact the gynaecologist who had to practise the abortion. As a result, he said:

It is nice to ask somebody else to take decisions when you do not have to do the work.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt my remarks but I notice that we have no quorum.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I would ask the clerk of the house to take the count of the hon. members present to determine if we have a quorum.

The count having been taken, I believe that we have a quorum.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing that some members are staying close.

Dr. Maughan, on page 570 of the minutes of the proceedings, said the following in reply to a question asked by the member for Peel-South (Mr. Chappell). First, here is the question:

> Now, my question is: Do you not think quite a few doctors would feel better if it were written out that it was legal for them to do it and not to have that shadow of guilt hanging over them?

Here is Dr. Maughan's reply:

> I fully agree with you and I might add that the gynaecologist is the trigger man in this thing. He is the one who commits the murder. It is all right for the psychiatrist, or the internist, or the cardiologist to say: "Stand up and shoot that guy".

It is the gynaecologist who, finally, will have to perform the operation.

That is why we want the act to be more specific, if the gynaecologist is to do the work. Nothing in the act guarantees that the gynaecologist will have to take part in the decision before performing the operation. That is why we feel that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Abitibi is excellent, even though it does not demand very much. We want the hospital committees to be protected, with regard to the competence of those who will make the decision and perform the operation.

This bill is odious. We regret that the government did not support this morning the motion for adjournment of this debate. We could have gone on to more pressing things.

Mr. Speaker, this bill says, for instance, that abortion must be performed. So, the therapeutic abortion committee will have to study the reasons for which the doctors will have to procure an abortion.

All the doctors and specialists who testified before the committee on justice and legal affairs told us that abortions cause more illnesses than they prevent. This means that by performing abortions we will increase the social problems. The health of our people is supposed to be protected, but by procuring abortions to all those who will request them, for health reasons, we will in fact be endangering their health.

Several doctors, several psychiatrists have proved beyond a doubt that when a woman has been aborted, a feeling of guilt seizes her, not a couple of months after the abortion but several years after, and her health is more seriously damaged than if she had not been aborted.

For the very reasons given in the bill, we claim that abortions will ruin the health of an undetermined number of persons. That is why we are fighting with so much zeal and conviction.

We do not do so on the strength of our own personal knowledge. But, every day we get phone calls about this. Last night, doctors came to see me to suggest arguments of which I had not thought. Why do they come to the Creditistes? Because the members of the other parties do not express in the house the opinion of the people.

• (3:40 p.m.)

If we look at the papers of the last 15 days, we can see that they do not deal with what is taking place in this house. We can quote the facts. In England, as far as committees on abortion are concerned, the Ministry of Health had to take certain steps for abortions were being procured quite extensively, for any reason.

So if the bill is not amended, it is the general medical practitioners—and not gynaecologists—those who cure colds, sore throats, who practise appendicitis or liver operations, who will take the decision to procure an abortion for a particular woman and to take the life of her foetus.

Mr. Speaker, since the bill is extremely serious and will affect the health and the morale of millions of Canadians, we feel duty bound to express the views of scientists etc, because the bill cannot be accepted. That is why we must fight. We shall keep on fighting, because we heard evidence which compel us to act. We would be held responsible if we failed to make the views of those people known.

It is all very well to want to pass legislation in the house but we must take into account those who will have to enforce the law and, who will have to perform abortions. And it is precisely because we want to take into account the evidence provided by the gynaecologists that we want one gynaecologist at least on the therapeutic committee. And it

is hardly enough for two doctors who are not qualified in the field of pediatrics, psychology and gynaecology, to order the gynaecologist to kill the foetus.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that even if this amendment somewhat restricts the extent of the bill, it is not strict enough, especially where it concerns those who will have to tell the gynaecologist: Did you have any decision to makke in order to procure the abortion of this woman? You have no decision to make. We have made it, and you, a gynaecologist, you must procure the abortion, you must shoot the foetus you, a gynaecologist, you must commit a murder.

It is on behalf of the gynaecologists of the province of Quebec and of the whole of Canada, that we are requesting, for the sake of their own protection and in consideration of medical science, of competence, that the gynaecologists be consulted. It must be mentioned in the bill, so that justice be done to the knowledge and science of our gynaecologists in Canada. Why are they gynaecologists, if not to be consulted and make decisions on gynaecologic matters. Why are they gynaecologists? Why should we demand that a gynaecologist commit a murder? Let us protect the doctors. At this stage of the bill, it is a most important thing to do.

We trust medical science and we respect our doctors, specially the gynaecologists of Canada.

We ask the Minister of Justice (M. Turner) to trust gynaecologists and their judgment. Unfortunately, in a few months they will be called upon to commit murder by practicing abortions. Why should a gynaecologist be held responsible for murder or abortion, if he could not take part in the decision-making, since this bill does not guarantee that he may be consulted?

The hon. member for Hull said a while ago: We hope that a gynaecologist will sit on this committee. But how is this guaranteed? In the house, there is no such thing as trust. We have adopted a Criminal code, in the house several years ago, and we want to amend it in order to punish offenders.

The Criminal Code exists; but why should not we also protect the gynaecologists? Why should we not insert a clause to that end in the bill? Let us not say: we hope that a gynaecologist will sit on the therapeutic committee of a hospital. We do not trust in hopes because we have already seen that the government has failed to honour some of his written official commitments.



Since there is an important bill under study today, we are asked to hope that a gynaecologist will sit on a therapeutic committee. Let us not kid ourselves and entertain illusions, because tomorrow the gynaecologists will have to kill the foetus and commit murder. We want that the gynaecologists be consulted before they are forced to practise an abortion, before performing an act which will have serious consequences for our decadent society.

Mr. Speaker, some hon. members may believe we are fighting for the love of it. No, Mr. Speaker, we have no time to waste. It is our opinion that parliament has many much more serious pieces of legislation to consider. We blame the government for not having put this bill aside for a while, if there are more serious bills to be introduced or passed. That is the reason why we regret having caused such a loss of time in this house on a bill that should never have been introduced in this house.

This bill is of British inspiration and nowadays newspapers from England and from the whole world show that such laws that stem from socialist countries, without morals, are now introduced in the house.

It is because we are aware of the unfortunate experience in other countries that we know what happened abroad will happen here as like causes produce like effects in like circumstances. This bill will produce in Canada and before long the same effects as in England. On account of that, the British government must pass laws today in order to prevent extermination of the people.

I have here statistics on extermination of people due to stupid laws such as the one under consideration now. However, I will quote those statistics in relation with another amendment as they will be more appropriate then.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I think it is my duty to take part once again in the debate on this amendment. First, I want to point out the answer given earlier by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) to the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) who asked his opinion on this subject.

In fact, as we all recognize his competence in this field, we were anxious to hear what he had to say. He replied to the hon. member for Lotbinière that he should be careful not to lose the few hair he has left! That is how serious the government members are.

That, Mr. Speaker, is one way to evade the real question with which we are dealing in this debate.

We could answer him that we are not quite ready to determine the seal of intelligence, and it would be better I think—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I would suggest to him also to stay close to the amendment now before us.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that what is under the scalp is much more important than what is on the top.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I come back to the amendment before us, and I would like everybody to understand the great significance of changing somewhat this paragraph (f), which reads as follows:

"therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee, comprised of not less than three members each of whom is a qualified medical practitioner, appointed by the board of that hospital for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital.

Mr. Speaker, a few moments' reflection should suffice to realize that a committee of three qualified medical practitioners is not enough. Of course, it will be said off hand that one qualified medical practitioner is enough, provided he can meet the requirements mentioned by the previous speakers.

Comparing that paragraph with the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Abitibi, (Mr. Laprise), we see a world of difference between the two. Allow me to read the amendment:

"therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee, comprised of not less than two qualified medical practitioners and one gynaecologist, appointed by the board of that hospital and approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province concerned, for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital."

As I say, Mr. Speaker, such is the difference that it befalls us to take the necessary time and care to analyze every word of this amendment. A huge difference, first as to the standards that should apply to those who will have to practice this kind of surgery.

Then, there is another kind of specifications: those which empower not only the doctors of a hospital but also the organized medical staff of the province concerned to keep an eye on the members of its committee and on their decisions. The previous section which defines a "qualified doctor" does so under the laws of the province.



Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have here an extremely important difference. I shall not so much underline the points relating to the qualifications of the doctors themselves for my colleagues have very well indicated them. I shall deal rather with the provisions which require that not only should those doctors be with accredited hospitals but also be duly authorized by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province concerned. This, Mr. Speaker, is a provision which should be added because it makes a huge difference. Thus, we shall eliminate the cases where a not too consciencious doctor might perform useless abortions, thus breaking the law.

The more, responsible people there will be to check the standards and decisions governing such surgical operations, the more we shall be satisfied that the law is well enforced. Why? Because it would need just one case where a doctor would not have taken his responsibility seriously to see the hospital committee under attack and also the College of Physicians and Surgeons.

They will therefore be more interested in seeing that the law is fully enforced. And that is how we shall achieve through this amendment something really sensible, and avoid all the abuses pointed out since the beginning of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, when legislating on a subject of such importance, before coming to a decision it is our duty, to give some thought to the consequences. There is nothing more inconsistent than to disregard the experience of others.

Why, Mr. Speaker, do they want at all costs to repeat the errors made elsewhere, under the false pretext of improvement or of human progress? We are quite convinced that we are in the right in opposing this bill. We are confirmed in our opinion by the fact that all those who make representations make them to the Ralliement créditiste.

Why? Because when somebody wants to speak about freedom, one addresses himself to free men. The hospital committees, the doctors belonging to various Quebec associations—not only in the areas in which we are more particularly concerned, we, of the Ralliement créditiste, but throughout the province,—ask us to intervene, to go on fighting this battle which will end only when it is at last understood that there is an advantage for the country to suspend consideration of the litigious clauses of the omnibus bill.

It is not for nothing that every day we receive letters, phone calls, from the Canadian electorate. They tell us that they cannot address themselves to their member, because there is nothing he can do about this matter.

It is extremely unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, to find that such things can exist today. We are not surprised to see that one of the closest colleage of the Minister of Justice decided to depart from the policy of a party which deprived him of one of the most indefeasible rights one can enjoy, that is, the right to freedom.

When the electors find that their representative is not even free to express his opinion, it is unfortunate. It is a fact that is worth considering.

If this endless debate resulted only in having this bill amended rather radically, we would have gained something.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it four o'clock?

• (3:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. 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 private bills, notices of motions and public bills.

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might have your indulgence for a moment. There has been some discussion, and there is good reason to believe there might be consent of the house, to proceed to deal with item No. 1 under the item private bills, namely consideration of Bill S-27 as reported from the particular committee and then adjourn. I would so request.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is it so agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## PRIVATE BILLS

THE QUEBEC SAVINGS BANK

**Mr. Raynald Guay (Levis)** moved:

That Bill S-27, respecting the Quebec Savings Bank, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs on Friday, April 18, 1969, be concurred in.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** When shall the said bill be read a third time?

**Some hon. Members:** Now.

**Mr. Guay** moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Pursuant to special order made this day this house stands adjourned until Monday at two o'clock in the afternoon.

At four o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Monday, May 5, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

## THE LATE MR. DONALD GORDON

TRIBUTES TO DECEASED PUBLIC SERVANT AND INDUSTRIALIST

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the house from my place that Mr. Donald Gordon, one of Canada's most distinguished public servants, died suddenly on Saturday. We are all well aware of his towering accomplishments as deputy governor of the Bank of Canada, chairman of the Foreign Exchange Control Board and, later, as chairman of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board. He was director of the Industrial Development Bank and, at the summit of his career, chairman of the board of directors and president of the Canadian National Railways from 1950 to 1966.

We have always regarded the late Mr. Gordon as the kind of person who personifies Canada abroad. He was large in stature and decisive in action. In his career we all have much to admire and learn. Following his appointment as president of Canada's largest railway, Mr. Gordon is reported to have said:

> All my life I had learned things from the bottom up. Now I am learning from the top down and I find it's a lot harder.

From either direction Donald Gordon learned fast and learned well; and Canada benefited as a result. I am sure all hon. members will join with me in expressing sincere sympathy to Mrs. Gordon and the Gordon family.

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and the members of this party I join with the Prime Minister in expressing our regrets to the family of the late Mr. Gordon. We appreciate what he did for this country. There are not many people of whom it can be said genuinely that they were builders of the country. Mr. Gordon did his share of building as deputy governor of the Bank of Canada and as chairman of the board and president of Canadian National Railways. Earlier in his career he did good work as chairman of the Foreign Exchange Control Board and of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board. His accomplishments earned him the gratitude of his country.

He was a big man; he was the kind of man this country needs and it was our good fortune that he came here from Scotland. We did not always agree with what he said, but we always respected him for the vigour and determination with which he pursued his ideas. We hope that condolences of the members of this party will be conveyed to Mr. Gordon's family.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, the members of this party join with the Prime Minister in paying tribute to the memory of Donald Gordon, one of this country's great public servants who over a period of years did titanic work as head of the Foreign Exchange Control Board, chairman of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board, director of the Industrial Development Bank and chairman of the board and president of Canadian National Railways. For his work as president of Canadian National particularly this country is deeply indebted to him for his vision and for the vigour with which he discharged his responsibilities.

Although we did not always agree with him we could not help admiring the forcefulness with which he defended his ideas and the efficiency with which he carried out any task assigned to him. Here was a public servant who worked hard to do the job given to him by respective governments of this country. On behalf of this party I join with other hon. members in all parts of the house in expressing our deep sympathy to Mrs. Gordon and the Gordon family.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the leader of our party and of my colleagues, I should like to join with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the previous speakers to extend by deepest sympathy to the bereaved family of the late Donald Gordon.

Mr. Speaker, we mourn his death because Mr. Gordon was a great man who rose from the ranks to reach high positions in the government. As the Prime Minister said, his accomplishments in the service of his country and towards its development were towering. We extend our sincere sympathy to the bereaved family.

*Questions*

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### THE MINISTRY

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHANGES

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I should like to inform the house of certain changes in the ministry which shall take effect as of today.

[*English*]

It has been my pleasure to recommend to His Excellency the Governor General the appointment of the hon. member for Burin-Burgeo (Mr. Jamieson) as Minister of Transport.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

• (2:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Trudeau:** May I carry on, Mr. Speaker? The portfolio of Minister of Supply and Services has been assumed by the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Richardson). The hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Andras) has been designated Minister responsible for housing. I wish to add, Mr. Speaker, that during my absences the hon. member for Eglinton will be Acting Prime Minister.

### POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

TABLING OF TASK FORCE REPORT

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2), I wish to table two copies in English and French of the first report completed by the task force studying the Post Office. It amounts to a 25 year environmental forecast for the Post Office. I would like also to say, Mr. Speaker, that this does not create a precedent, but it is our purpose to table as many reports as possible, especially those of general interest and those which are critical. I of course reserve the right not to table those which deal with internal matters such as management, personnel and financial matters.

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

CROWN LIABILITY ACT REVISION

Question No. 1,118—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Does the government intend to proceed with a full revision of the Crown Liability Act in order to correct some of the existing cases?

[Mr. Fortin.]

2. When will this new legislation be introduced?

3. During the past year, how many actions were brought against the government and what was the total amount of claims laid by claimants?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** 1 and 2. A full revision of the Crown Liability Act is not contemplated at the present time.

3. During 1968, 73 actions were brought against the Government by way of petition of right in the Exchequer Court of Canada, in which claims for a total of approximately $6,000,000 in addition to general damages were asserted. Claims were also made, of course, by way of appeals from income tax assessments, of which 550 were launched in the Tax Appeal Board, and 170 were launched in the Exchequer Court by tax payers during 1968. The amounts involved in the income tax appeals greatly exceed the amounts claimed by way of petition of right. In addition, approximately 200 other proceedings were launched during 1968 in the Exchequer Court and in the Tariff Board in which large amounts of public funds are involved.

FISHERIES TREATY IN NORTH PACIFIC

Question No. 1,433—**Mr. Anderson:**

1. Has the Canadian Government received a copy of the bilateral U.S.-U.S.S.R. fishing agreement covering the area off the coasts of Washington, Oregon, California and Alaska, which was negotiated recently?

2. Is it the intention of the Canadian Government to negotiate a fisheries treaty with the governments of the U.S.A., U.S.S.R., and Japan to cover other areas of the North Pacific?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1. On January 31, 1969 the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. signed an agreement at Washington which amended and extended an agreement of February 13, 1967, as previously amended and extended, in respect of certain fishery problems in the northeastern part of the Pacific Ocean off the coast of the U.S.A. The appropriate Canadian government departments have copies of the agreements in question.

2. The Canadian government is conducting negotiations with the U.S. government with a view to reaching an agreement on the continued exercise of reciprocal fishing rights by Canadian and U.S. nationals in the respective fishing zones established by the two countries. Japanese and Soviet nationals do not fish in the fishing zones established by Canada off

the coast of British Columbia, and the Canadian government for the present has not entered into negotiations with these countries in respect of their fishing operations in the North Pacific.

STEPHENVILLE, NFLD.,—GOVERNMENT ACCOMMODATION

Question No. 1,705—**Mr. Marshall:**

What accommodation has been leased to the federal government in the Town of Stephenville, Newfoundland, under (a) location (b) area leased (c) annual rental, and (d) department of government leasing the accommodation?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** (a) Location, Building No. 450, near main entrance to Harmon Air Base; (b) Area Leased, 1,354 sq. ft.; (c) Annual Rental, $1,200; (d) Department, Canada Manpower.

(a) Location, Second floor, Jet Cleaners Building, Queen Street; (b) Area Leased, 168 sq. ft.; (c) Annual Rental, $660.; (d) Department, Unemployment Insurance Commission.

FORESTRY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT SUBSIDIES

Question No. 1,746—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Forestry and Rural Development provide subsidies and/or support programs for any segment of the economy, groups or individuals inside Canada and, if so, to what extent, in what amounts, and to whom are the amounts paid?

2. What amounts have been paid for subsidies and/or support programs during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

POLYMER CORPORATION DIRECTORATE

Question No. 1,771—**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):**

1. How many Directors are there on the Board of Polymer Corporation?

2. How many of the Directors are French-speaking?

3. What are the names and addresses of each such Director?

4. What is the annual salary received by each Director?

5. Does this Corporation have special advisers and, if so, what are the names and addresses of each such adviser?

6. What is the annual salary of each?



[*Translation*]

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Supply and Services):** 1. There are nine directors on the board of Polymer Corporation.

2. One director is French-speaking and, in addition, two other directors speak both English and French.

3. Mr. Eugène Laflamme of Quebec City is the French-speaking director.

4. Directors receive an annual fee of $1500 plus $100 each meeting attended.

5. and 6. Polymer does not have special advisers.

[*English*]

CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENTS

Question No. 1,786—**Mr. Gilbert:**

1. As a result of the review and comment by the panels of lawyers, accountants and businessmen as listed at page 6104 of *Hansard*, were any changes made in the draft bill amending the Corporations Act or are any contemplated?

2. Were the members of the panels paid any expenses or honoraria and, if so, how much was each paid?

3. What was the selection procedure used in selecting the members of the panels?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** 1. The recommendations that were made by the Task Force on the Canada Corporations Act were reviewed and commented on by the panels. The bill to be introduced in parliament which will reflect government policy has not been seen by the panels.

2. No honoraria were paid. Travel expenses were reimbursed as follows: Panel of Businessmen: Mr. Jack Austin, Vancouver, Nil; Mr. R. M. Barford, Toronto, $70; Mr. W. J. Cheesman, Hamilton, $56; Mr. J. W. Dobson, Montreal, $45.60; Mr. R. T. Morgan, Toronto, $81.50; Mr. Claude Tétrault, Montréal $36.40; Mr. J. W. Younger, Hamilton, $86.35. Panel of Chartered Accountants: Mr. A. I. Barrow, C.A., Halifax, $163.03; Mr. R. B. Dale-Harris, F.C.A., Toronto, $11.64; Mr. G. Keeping, F.C.A., Toronto, $57.05; Mr. W. R. C. Patrick, F.C.A., Vancouver, $332.62, Mr. J. Valiquette, C.A., Montreal, $73.28; Mr. A. G. Watson, F.C.A., Toronto, $115; Mr. F. Winspear, C.A., Edmonton, $325.78. Panel of Lawyers: Mr. D. A. Berlis, Q.C., Toronto, $64.90; Mr. G. E. Creber, Q.C., Toronto, $123.60; Mr. C. Scott, Q.C., Ottawa, Nil; Mr. G. B. Robertson, Q.C., Halifax, $228.30; Mr. H. G. Field, Q.C., Edmonton, $476.50; Mr. P. Crawford, Toronto, $122; Mr. J. S. Woods, Calgary,

$334.51; Mr. J. A. Desjardins, Montreal, $140.19; Mr. G. McCarthy, Montreal, $54.10; Mr. P. Legrand, Montreal, $113.87; Mr. A. Sweatman, Q.C., Winnipeg, $236; Mr. C. F. Murphy, Vancouver, $510.49; Mr. M. Greenblatt, Q.C. Montreal, Nil.

3. The members of the panels were selected on the basis of their professional or business reputation and experience, with due regard to proper regional representation. The Canadian Bar Association, the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association were also invited to nominate a number of persons for the appropriate panel. Before serving on the panel, each member took an oath of secrecy.

STUDENT LOAN FUND REPAYMENTS

Question No. 1,808—**Mr. McIntosh:**

1. In light of the severely restricted opportunities for employment of persons graduating from Canadian universities this year, will the government amend repayment provisions of the Student Loan Fund, to take account of the inability to repay of those students who cannot find jobs upon graduation?

2. What other specific steps is the government taking to assist Canadian students who are graduating this year and are unable to find adequate employment?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Departments of Finance and Manpower and Immigration as follows: 1. The regulations made pursuant to the Canada Student Loans Act provide for a large degree of flexibility in setting repayment terms. They are capable of accommodating virtually every conceivable situation, including cases where students are unemployed following graduation and cannot commence regular repayments immediately following the expiry of their interest and repayment free period. Borrowers are required, however, in all cases, to discuss their particular circumstances with the bank to which their loans are owed, before agreement can be reached on appropriate repayment terms.

2. As the number of graduates entering the labour force has increased, a proportionate increase of effort to assist their placement has been made by the Department of Manpower and Immigration. Through 57 Canada Manpower Centres on various university campuses and in community colleges, students are being supplied with pertinent information on job opportunities and the labour market generally. A clearing system covering all 350 Canada Manpower Centres assures that student applications for employment can, when required, receive a wide exposure to potential employers. A Directory of Canadian Employers who have expressed interest in hiring graduates has been published by the department and made available to students through the campus centres. Additional information regarding job vacancies is fed back from the Canada Manpower Centre network to the centres on campus. Officers at all centres are maintaining, and as needed, increasing their efforts to seek out every possible job vacancy through their employer contacts.

So that students will receive as much assistance as possible in choosing university courses with a better knowledge of labour market demands and job opportunities, Canada Manpower Centre staff are intensifying their efforts to supply career and labour market information through the school guidance system.

[Mr. Basford.]

GRANTS TO OIL REFINERIES

Question No. 1,894—**Mr. Mahoney:**

1. What grant or subsidy has been paid or agreed to be paid by the Government of Canada in respect of the construction or expansion of each of the following oil refineries (a) Newfoundland Refining, Come-by-Chance, Nfld. (b) Gulf Oil, Point Tupper, N.S. (c) Irving Oil, Saint John, N.B. (d) Golden Eagle, Quebec City, Que. (e) Nepco Refining, Quebec City, Que. (f) Irving Oil, Quebec City, Que. (g) Petrofina, Montreal, Que. (h) Shell, Montreal, Que.?

2. Are there any other refineries located east of the Ottawa Valley presently being constructed or expanded in respect of which a grant or subsidy has been paid or agreed to be paid and, if so, what is the location, owner, capacity, year of completion and amount of grant or subsidy in each case?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion):** 1. In the cases of (b), (c), (d) and (f), it has been agreed that the projects will receive grants under the Area Development Incentives Act provided they meet the conditions of the legislation. The amounts of the grants under this legislation are determined when the projects come into commercial production.

2. No.

SAINTE-JUSTINE HOSPITAL, MONTREAL

Question No. 1,949—**Mr. Laprise:**

During the last five years, has the federal government granted subsidies to Sainte-Justine Hospital, in Montreal, to cover maintenance, administrative or other costs?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Based on projects submitted by the province of Quebec, the federal government, through the national health grants program, provided assistance to the Ste. Justine Hospital, Montreal, during the past five years as follows: (a) Hospital construction grant, $15,839; (b) General health grants, $921,862.

During the last five years, Ste. Justine Hospital has been listed in the Agreement with the province of Quebec under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act and has been benefitted from this shared cost program to the extent of approximately 50 per cent of maintenance, administrative and general operating expenses approved by the province of Quebec.

[*English*]

COST TO POST OFFICE OF "TIME", "NEWSWEEK" AND "READER'S DIGEST"

Question No. 1,951—**Mr. Mather:**

What, in dollars, is the cost of the Post Office in carrying "Time", "Newsweek" and "Reader's Digest" at 1968 and 1969 rates?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: Based on 1967-68 volumes and costs, the deficit incurred by the Post Office Department in the handling of *Reader's Digest* and *Time* at the postage rates in effect before and as of 1st April 1969 is estimated as follows:

| | Before 1st April 1969 | Effective 1st April 1969 |
|---|---|---|
| Time | $864,362 | $735,153 |
| Reader's Digest | $982,388 | $851,636 |

*Newsweek* is mailed in the United States, consequently, comparable data is not available.

APPLICATION OF QUOTA TO CANADIANS ENTERING U.S.

Question No. 1,956—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. Has the government either formally or informally held discussions with the Government of the United States regarding the effects on Canadians employed by U.S. firms or their subsidiaries operating in Canada of the quota restrictions now applicable to Canadians seeking entry into the U.S. as landed immigrants in order to continue their employment?

2. Has the government received protests from Canadian firms operating subsidiaries or branches in the United States that U.S. quota restrictions on Canadians entering the U.S. as landed immigrants are seriously hindering the normal movement and promotion of Canadian personnel in Canadian firms while U.S. citizens may enter or leave Canada for similar purposes without restrictions?

3. Is the Canadian government planning any action with regard to these related problems?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1. Yes, informal discussions with the appropriate United States authorities are now underway.

As indicated in reply to a previous question on this subject (*Hansard* p. 5314 February 10, 1969), the Canadian Government has already made formal representations to the U.S.A. authorities regarding the introduction of a numerical limitation on the movement of people between our two countries by the imposition of the ceiling on Western Hemisphere Immigration, which went into effect on July 1, 1968.

2. Yes, the Government recently received complaints along these lines.

3. See answer to part 1.

KINGSTON-CORNWALL WATER STUDIES

Question No. 1,959—**Mr. Godin:**

Did the studies of the quality of the water in the St. Lawrence River between Kingston and Cornwall, since 1965, reveal any danger to swimmers?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** The studies carried out in the international section of the St. Lawrence river under the aegis of the International Joint Commission, since 1965, have been designed specifically to examine whether or not there is pollution being discharged on one side of the international boundary which is causing or is likely to cause a threat to health or property on the other side of the boundary. The studies were not conducted to assess the water quality in local areas near the points of discharge. The findings of the studies are currently being reviewed by one of the International Joint Commission's Advisory Boards on Water Pollution, with a final report to the Commission expected later this year.

A review of data collected by the Department of National Health and Welfare in these international waters indicates a water quality acceptable for swimming purposes and other water contact sports. These data cannot however be considered as representative

of local conditions, though this may well be so. The control of water quality in the Canadian portion of these waters is under the jurisdiction of the Ontario Water Resources Commission, and the determination of whether or not waters in specific areas are suitable for water contact sports is the responsibility of local health authorities.

[*English*]

TRANSLATION OF "HANSARD"

Question No. 1,960—**Mr. Godin:**

Who is the Minister responsible for the translation of *Hansard*?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I regret that in replying to an oral question on March 17, I included the responsibility for translation of parliamentary reports with that for printing. The *Hansard* Debates are translated by the Debates Division of the Translations Bureau which is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State. The printing of the translated version is the responsibility of the Queen's Printer.

*A.B.M. SYSTEM—POLICY OF GOVERNMENT

Question No. 1,965—**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):**

1. Has the federal government decided whether it will support or condemn the United States Government's proposed ABM system as expressed by the Prime Minister in *Hansard*, Wednesday, March 19, 1969?

2. Is it the intention of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to attempt to obtain contracts for Canadian industry related to the development and construction of the United States Government's ABM system, as expressed by Mr. A. Mundy, Assistant Deputy Minister of the Industry, Trade and Commerce Department to the Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee on April 1, 1969?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Prime Minister's office and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce as follows: 1. No.

2. Under the Canada-U.S. Production Sharing Program Canadian industry is free to participate in most U.S. defence programs and to seek, actively, subcontracts from U.S. companies. The department has the responsibility to assist Canadian industry in these efforts. However, no such assistance has been provided relating to the A.B.M. program.

[Mr. Munro.]

QUEBEC—ADULT TRAINING PROGRAM

Question No. 1,980—**Mr. Godin:**

How many agricultural workers were accepted under adult training programmes for the 1967-68 and 1968-69 sessions in each of the following constituencies (a) Champlain (b) Portneuf (c) Montmorency (d) Charlevoix (e) Bellechasse (f) Lévis (g) Beauce (h) Lotbinière?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):**

| | 1967-68 | 1968-69 |
|---|---|---|
| (a) | Nil | 12 |
| (b) | 120 | 120 |
| (c) | Nil | Nil |
| (d) | Nil | 45 |
| (e) | 8 | 36 and 58 part time |
| (f) | 12 | 33 and 62 part time |
| (g) | 37 | 67 |
| (h) | 64 | 166 |

[*English*]

INSURANCE PLAN FOR FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

Question No. 1,986—**Mr. Robinson:**

In view of the present Health and Welfare Committee's concern about the harmful effects of the use of tobacco, will the government reconsider its program to provide support for a special insurance plan for flue-cured tobacco?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** In so far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned: It is not proposed at this time to exclude tobacco crops from support under provincial crop insurance programs.

*FARM MACHINERY—ADDITIONAL REPORT BY DR. BARBER

Question No. 1,993—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. Will the Minister of Agriculture table the additional report on farm machinery prepared by Dr. Barber, referred to by the Minister in *Hansard* of April 1, 1969, page 7370?

2. What action is the Minister planning regarding the results of the above study and the study paper on farm machinery presented to the Congress on Agriculture?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** 1. No, since this is only an interim report.

2. Consideration as to what action may be taken will be made after receipt of the final report.

UNPAID INCOME TAX

Question No. 2,012—**Mr. Saltsman:**

For the taxation years 1955, 1960, 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968, what is the distribution of the total amount of income tax unpaid for the following income levels (a) under $10,000 (b) $10,000 to $20,000 (c) $20,000 to $50,000 (d) over $50,000?

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue):** The information is not available in the form requested.

EXTENSION OF TAX EXEMPTION TO PENSIONERS UNDER 70

Question No. 2,026—**Mr. Mather:**

Is consideration being given to extending the $500 income tax exemption to old age pensioners under 70 years of age?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** This is a matter of government policy. If the government proposes an amendment to the Income Tax Act to change any exemptions, it will be announced at the appropriate time.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES PAYMENTS

Question No. 2,027—**Mr. Mather:**

Is consideration being given to changing (a) the amount or (b) the type of payment of Family Allowances?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** The government is presently conducting a review of all federal social development programs. In the course of this review the Family Allowance Program will be examined to ascertain how and to what extent this program is meeting its original and changed social and economic objectives.

FOREIGN MINING COMPANIES IN N.W.T. AND YUKON

Question No. 2,036—**Mr. Harding:**

1. Which three foreign mining companies were granted licences to carry on mining operations in the Northwest Territories and in the Yukon Territory in the fiscal year 1967/68, as stated on page 18 of the 1968 Annual Report of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

2. What criteria are used to determine whether a foreign mining company will be granted a licence or not?

3. What rights are granted to the companies by the granting of licences?

4. Is there a fee charged for these licences and, if so (a) on what basis is it levied, and (b) what was the fee for each of the above three companies?

5. Are oil and natural gas companies included in the definition of "mining" companies and, if not, for what reason?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** 1. Shenandoah Oil Corporation; Gage Canadian Oil and Gas Corporation; Global Marine Drilling Company.

2. Subject to what is said in paragraph 5 of this reply, there are no criteria to determine whether foreign mining companies should be granted a licence other than those outlined in Part IV of the Canada Corporations Act, Sections 203 to 207, inclusive.

3. The rights granted were to carry on mining operations in the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories in accordance with the provisions of Part IV of the Canada Corporations Act.

4. (a) The fees were based upon the Tariff of Fees in force prior to August 1, 1968; (b) $100.00.

5. The answer is in the affirmative. It must be pointed out, however, that Part IV of the Canada Corporations Act was repealed by Section 49(1) of Chapter 52 of the Statutes of Canada 1964-65, the repeal to come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation of the Governor in Council. The repeal came into force by Order in Council P.C. 1968-1337 dated August 1st, 1968.

The repealing of this section took place at the time when both the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories had adequate legislation to assume this responsibility.

The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has not issued any further licences in this respect because of the repealing of that section of the Act.

CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN CONFERENCE AT THE HAGUE

Question No. 2,041—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. How long has Canada been taking part in the conference at The Hague and if Canada has only been taking part for two years, for what reason?

2. What agreements has Canada signed at these conferences, have they been ratified and, if not, for what reason?

3. Does the government intend to enter into discussions with the provinces concerning implementation of the agreements, in so far as such implementation lies within the legislative jurisdiction of the provinces?

4. Who were the members of the Canadian delegation to the last conference at The Hague?

*Questions*

[*Translation*]

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** 1. Canada has taken part in the Eleventh Session of The Hague Conference on Private International Law which was held at The Hague from October 7 to 26, 1968. The Hague Conference normally meets every fourth year. On September 4, 1968, Canada was admitted as a member and its instrument of acceptance was transmitted on the 7th day of October. Due to its form of government, Canada has found it difficult up to that time to seek membership in the Conference.

2. No agreements binding on the participating government are signed at these sessions but delegates agree to submit to the appreciation of their governments draft conventions. At the conclusion of the 1968 session the following draft conventions were thus signed: (1) Convention on the recognition of divorces and legal separations; (2) Convention on the law applicable to traffic accidents; and (3) Convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters. These conventions have not yet been ratified. Decision as to their ratification must await the conclusion of studies now being made of their import.

3. A decision as to the entering into discussion with the provinces concerning the implementation of the conventions, must await decision as to their ratification and as to the best procedure to engage into such discussion; these questions are currently under study.

4. The Canadian delegation at the Eleventh Session of The Hague Conference was composed as follows: Rodrigue Bédard, Q.C., Associate Deputy Minister of Justice, head of the delegation; Dr. Horace E. Read, Vice-President of Dalhousie University; Professor Paul-A. Crépeau, of McGill University; H. Allan Leal, Q.C., Chairman of the Ontario Law Reform Commission; L. R. McTavish, Q.C., member of the Conference of Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada; The Honourable Sterling R. Lyon, Attorney General of Manitoba.

[*English*]

U.S.-CANADA CIVIL DEFENCE AGREEMENT

Question No. 2,046—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Is a civil defence agreement in effect between Canada and the United States?

2. On what date was it signed and where and by whom?

3. What is the basis of such an agreement?

4. What public or private discussions occurred prior to the decision to sign this agreement?

5. Does this agreement provide for a joint emergency board and who would be designated to serve on such a board?

[Mr. Fortin.]

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** 1. There is in effect an agreement on co-operation between the United States and Canada on civil emergency planning.

2. August 8, 1967, at Ottawa by the Ambassador of the United States for the United States and the Secretary of State for External Affairs for Canada.

3. The agreement provides for consultation and co-operation in civil emergency planning between the two countries. The purpose of this consultation is to ensure that national plans formulated independently by each country are as compatible as is considered desirable and possible by both countries. The agreement does not provide for integrated planning, and the two countries retain national control over their own civil emergency plans.

4. On the Canadian side the principle participants in the discussion on this matter were officials of the Canada Emergency Measures Organization and the Department of External Affairs. Other Canadian departments concerned with civil emergency planning were associated with these discussions. On the United States side the principle participants were officials of the Office of Emergency Planning, the Office of Civil Defense and the Department of State. The draft agreement was concurred in by the U.S.-Canada Civil Emergency Planning Committee, and subsequently approved by the Canadian Cabinet.

5. The agreement does not provide for a joint emergency board, but rather provides for a joint committee designated the United States-Canada Civil Emergency Planning Committee. Its membership comprises, for Canada: the Director General, Canada Emergency Measures Organization; a representative of the Department of External Affairs; and for the United States: the Director, Office of Emergency Planning; the Director, Office of Civil Defense; a representative of the Department of State.

SANDFORD, N.S.—CONTRACTS TO L. E. SHAW

Question No. 2,049—**Mr. Comeau:**

How many of the 111 contracts awarded to Mr. L. E. Shaw of Sandford, Nova Scotia were open to public tender (a) how many were invited tenders, and (b) how many did this contractor bid upon?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** Public tender, 19. (a) Invited tender, 41; (b) 60.

ECONOMIC COUNCIL STUDY OF COMBINES

Question No. 2,053—**Mr. Gilbert:**

1. What are the terms of reference given to the Economic Council of Canada and its study of combines activity in Canada?

2. When is it expected that this study will be completed?

**Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister):** 1. I am informed by the Economic Council of Canada as follows: In July, 1966, the government requested the Economic Council of Canada to undertake a study of certain important aspects of the responsibilities of the Registrar General of Canada and his department under the Government Organization Act which was awaiting proclamation at that time. The terms of reference are as follows: In the light of the Government's long-term economic objectives, to study and advise regarding: (a) the interests of the consumer particularly as they relate to the functions of the Department of the Registrar General; (b) combines, mergers, monopolies and restraint of trade; (c) patents, trade marks, copyrights and registered industrial designs.

2. It is anticipated that the report on combines, mergers, monopolies and restraint of trade will be completed by mid-year, with the total reference to be completed by the end of the present fiscal year.

EFFECT OF U.S. ANTI-TRUST LEGISLATION

Question No. 2,054—**Mr. Gilbert:**

Has the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs undertaken a study to examine the effects on Canada of United States anti-trust legislation and, if so, are any changes in legislation anticipated and, if not, for what reason has such study not been undertaken?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** The Director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigation Act considers the effect of United States antitrust laws in particular cases. This matter was given special study and consideration in connection with the Canadian Radio Patents Limited case in 1959. Arising out of that case and talks between the Attorneys General of Canada and the United States, enforcement of antitrust laws in the United States which may affect Canadian interests and vice versa are now considered under what is known as the Fulton-Rogers understanding, providing for a policy of notification and consultation in such circumstances between Canada and the United States as described by the then Minister of Justice in *Hansard* for February 3, 1959, at pages 617-19, and in accordance with the recommendation adopted on October 5, 1967, by the Council of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development as set out at pages 25-27 of the Annual Report of the Director of Investigation and Research, Combines Investigation Act, for the year ended March 31, 1968.

In accordance with publicly announced Government policy, no amendments to the Combines Investigation Act are contemplated pending receipt of the report of the Economic Council of Canada on Competition Policy.

PRODUCTION OF BACTERIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Question No. 2,059—**Mr. Mather:**

Does any federal department, agency or Armed Service participate in the study or production of chemical or bacteriological weapons and, if so (a) what department, service or agency does so (b) what is the purpose of such study or production, and (c) what is the cost of this effort?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Yes, (a) the Department of National Defence studies all types of weapons that may be encountered by the Canadian Armed Forces, including chemical and bacteriological weapons. There is no Canadian production of chemical or bacteriological weapons; (b) to assess requirements for defence against such weapons; (c) data is not maintained in a manner that would permit the costs of such studies to be readily isolated.

AMHERST, N.S., POST OFFICE

Question No. 2,067—**Mr. Coates:**

Does the government intend to enlarge the space available to patrons of the Post Office at Amherst, Nova Scotia and, if so, when will tenders be called for the enlargement of the facilities?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** Yes. It is hoped to call tenders late this summer.

FORT QU'APPELLE, SASK.—PUBLIC BUILDING

Question No. 2,069—**Mr. Burton:**

1. With respect to alterations to the public building in Fort Qu'Appelle as set out on page 318 of 1969-70 Estimates, is it the intention of the government that the Fort Qu'Appelle Post Office will remain in this building?

*Questions*

2. If not, what arrangements are proposed for accommodation for the post office and what arrangements have been completed to date in this regard?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** 1. No decision has yet been made. The Department is studying the most economical and feasible means of providing increased accommodation for the Post Office and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

2. No arrangements have been completed to date.

DARTMOUTH, N.S.—FEDERAL BUILDING CLOCK

Question No. 2,074—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. How long has it been since the clock in the Dartmouth Federal Building ceased to work?

2. What is wrong with it and how much would it cost to have it repaired?

3. Will it be repaired and, if so, when?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** 1. 1965.

2. The clock is worn out. Extensive repairs would be required costing an estimated $3,000.

3. No.

MADAWASKA-VICTORIA REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Question No. 2,084—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. How many companies in the federal constituency of Madawaska-Victoria have received financial aid under the Regional Development Agency's subsidy program since the inauguration of this program and what amount did each company receive?

2. What is the number and the amount for the whole of New Brunswick?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** 1. (a) To March 31, 1969, four companies have received industrial development grants.

| (b) Name of Firm | Amount Received $ |
|---|---|
| Nadeau Poultry Farms Ltd. | 51,527.89 |
| Long Fertilizer Ltd. | 20,000.00 |
| Highland Hardwood Ltd. | 52,141.60 |
| Raoul Coutourier Lumber Ltd. | 26,288.00 |

2. 33 firms have received a total of $3,709,875.62.

[Mr. Burton.]

[*English*]

ASSISTANCE TO PH.D. STUDENTS

Question No. 2,088—**Mr. Anderson:**

Are exceptions made to the National Research Council policy of granting assistance to Ph.D. students over the age of thirty and, if so, on what occasions?

**Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board):** No.

SCIENCE COUNCIL STUDY ON COMMUNICATIONS

Question No. 2,091—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Which government department or agency is analysing the results of the Science Council of Canada study on technological communications?

2. When is it anticipated that the review of the above study will be completed?

**Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister):** I am informed by the Science Council of Canada as follows: 1. Special Study No. 8, entitled Scientific and Technical Information in Canada—Part 1, was prepared by a study group headed by Mr. J. P. I. Tyas of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the Science Council of Canada. It is not a report of the Science Council itself.

2. The Science Council of Canada is presently considering this report and will be issuing its own report to the government in about October of this year.

ADULT TRAINING PROGRAM EXPENDITURES

Question No. 2,093—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

What are the estimated amounts placed at the disposal of the department for the adult training program (a) do the provinces participate, one way or the other, in this program (b) if so, what is the participation of the Province of Quebec?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** The estimated amounts placed at the disposal of the Department of Manpower and Immigration for the occupational training of adults program in the fiscal year 1969-70 are $116 million to purchase training services and $134 million to provide training allowances. (a) The provinces provide training services required by the program; the cost of these services is fully borne by the Department of Manpower and Immigration; (b) See (a) above.

[*English*]

REDUCTION OF SUPPORT FOR E.M.O.

Question No. 2,094—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

Has the government received complaints during the recent floods on the Prairies that the Emergency Measures Organization has been rendered ineffective by reason of the recent reduction in federal government support for the program and, if so, from what points have the complaints originated?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** No such complaints have been received by the Canada Emergency Measures Organization or the Department of National Defence.

ORTONA BARRACKS, EDMONTON, ROAD RELOCATION

Question No. 2,103—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. Has the Department of National Defence received any notice from the City of Edmonton of any requirement for road relocation purposes of any or all of the D.N.D. property known as Ortona Barracks in the City of Edmonton?

2. If so, when was such notice given, for what date and to what extent of the property?

3. Are any of the reserve units presently using Ortona Barracks to be affected to the extent of losing their training facilities?

4. If so, where are they to be relocated and when?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** 1. No.

2, 3 and 4. Not applicable.

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

HIRING OF CONSULTANTS

Question No. 933—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. What are the government regulations with regards to the hiring of consultants, including advertising consultants, in order to assist government departments i.e., in the areas of planning, studies, feasibility reports, economic analysis, legal assistance, architectural advice etc.?

2. Is there any system of competitive tendering for consultants and, if not, what procedure is followed?

3. What are the expenditures in hiring of all outside consultants, including advertising consultants, for the years 1960, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, for the following Departments or Agencies (a) Department of Agriculture (b) Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (c) Consumer and Corporate Affairs (d) Defence Production (e) Energy, Mines and Resources (f) External Affairs (g) Fisheries (h) Forestry and Rural Development (i) Indian Affairs and Northern Development (j) Industry (k) Justice (l) Labour (m) Manpower and Immigration (n) National Defence (o) National Health and Welfare (p) National Revenue (q) Post Office (r) Prime Minister's Office (s) Privy Council Office (t) Public Works (u) Secretary of State (v) Solicitor General (w) Trade and Commerce (x) Transport (y) Treasury Board (z) Veterans Affairs?

Return tabled.

CANADIAN EMBASSIES

Question No. 1,345—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many Embassies does Canada have?

2. Where is each Embassy located?

3. What is the total number of personnel attached to each Embassy?

4. What is the total cost of each Embassy during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Return tabled.

CANADIAN HIGH COMMISSIONERS

Question No. 1,370—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many High Commissioners does Canada have?

2. Where is each High Commissioner located?

3. What is the total number of personnel attached to each High Commissioner's office?

4. What is the total cost of each High Commissioner's office during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Return tabled.

BANK OF CANADA DIRECTORS

Question No. 1,703—**Mr. Burton:**

What is the name, address, occupation and principal known business associations of each Director of the Bank of Canada?

Return tabled.

YUKON—HOUSES AND SCHOOLS FOR INDIANS

Question No. 1,794—**Mr. Nielsen:**

1. For each of the years 1958 to 1968 inclusive, how many houses were built in the Yukon by the government for occupation by Indian people (a) in what location was each of the houses built (b) what was the total amount spent in each such location in new construction of such houses for each of such year (c) how many of such houses have been wired for electricity (i) by the government (ii) by others and in what locations (d) how many of such houses and in what locations have plumbing and how many have an indoor water supply?

2. How much money has been paid out by the government in welfare grants to Indian people in the Yukon for each of the years 1958 to 1968 inclusive and to how many families in what locations were such payments made for each such year?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

3. How many school age children of Indian parents are there now in the Yukon (a) how many were there in 1958 (b) how many of these are now attending school (c) how many attended school in 1958?

4. Are the residential schools at Lower Post, B.C. and Carcross, Yukon being phased out and, if so, when is it contemplated that these schools will no longer be operated as such?

5. What was the total student population in the Yukon for 1958 and what is it now?

6. What is the amount of the per capita grant paid by the Government of Canada to the Government of the Yukon on behalf of students of Indian parents attending Yukon schools and what was the amount of such grant in 1958?

7. For each of the years since the opening of the Yukon Vocational Training Centre, how many Indian students have been trained at that centre to graduation and in what trade classifications (a) how many such students for each of the years since the implementation of the program have been vocationally trained to graduation at centres or educational institutions outside the Yukon (b) what was the cost to the Government of Canada for each of the years aforesaid for the training of such students (i) in the Yukon, and (ii) outside the Yukon?

8. How many Indian student graduates trained as aforesaid now have full-time employment (a) in the Yukon, and (b) elsewhere?

Return tabled.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### TRADE

WHEAT—SALE BY FRANCE AT CANTON FAIR

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence from the house, for very necessary reasons, of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, I direct this question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that it is vitally important for Canada to sell its surplus wheat, and as France is reported to have just received an order for 800,000 tons from Mainland China at the China Spring Fair in Canton, at which fair it is reported that no member of the Canadian Wheat Board has been present as yet, would the Prime Minister take the opportunity on motions tomorrow to report to the house first of all on how it was that Canada let this very important order for wheat slip through its fingers and, secondly, why there has been no member of the Wheat Board at this very important fair, where obviously deals of this kind are made?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I will ask the minister answering for Industry, Trade and Commerce to reply to this tomorrow.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

WHEAT—SALE BY FRANCE TO MAINLAND CHINA BELOW I.G.A. PRICE

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Has he, as the leader of this country's government, made a strong protest to the French government for selling this grain to China at what is substantially below the International Grains Arrangement price, the price toward which we are trying to reach agreement?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I will ask the minister to consider this at the same time, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Horner:** Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister, the leader of this country's government, if he has made an official protest to the French government for substantially cutting the International Grains Arrangement price at the very time we are trying to reach agreement on that price.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I heard the question the first time.

**Mr. Horner:** Well, I want—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Vancouver East.

AGENCY TO PROMOTE SALES ABROAD OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary or related question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the United States government has set up a new export marketing service to sell agricultural products in the various countries of the world, and in view of the fact, as has been pointed out, that we have lost a very valuable customer in Mainland China at the Canton fair, is the Department of Agriculture considering the setting up of an export sales agency in order to promote the sale of Canadian farm products abroad?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with that part of the question in which the hon. member says that we lost a sale. There have been other sales of wheat, and indeed of other grains, made by France to China. But if the hon. member is asking if we are prepared to take action to strengthen our selling agency for agricultural products, I think that that has been under consideration. Indeed some positive action has already been taken, although we do not claim that all that could be used usefully in promoting export sales of agricultural products has been used.

WHEAT—STEPS TO RENEW AGREEMENT WITH MAINLAND CHINA

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** In view of the fact that our wheat agreement with China expired in July of this year may I ask the minister whether his department or the government generally is taking any steps to have that agreement renewed or extended, and if so what those steps are.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Yes. The Wheat Board of course is involved in this, that is the extension or renewal of an agreement; but I should like to remind the hon. member and members of the house generally that the actual sales and contracts to Mainland China have I believe exceeded the agreement signed three years ago.

## GRAIN

REQUEST THAT HANDLING BE TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER MINISTRY

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. In view of the deplorable situation that has developed with regard to the handling of grain under the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce will the Prime Minister now consider taking that responsibility away from the minister and placing it under some minister who will give us action, perhaps the Minister of Transport.

VANCOUVER—REPORTED SHORTAGE OF WHEAT FOR SHIPMENT

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question dealing with wheat, and I hope that perhaps tomorrow I too can have an answer on it. In view of the fact that the port of Vancouver does not want to see a recurrence of the grain ship tie-up that we experienced a few weeks ago, will the Prime Minister see to it that tomorrow the house is informed on what action is being taken to correct the situation in Vancouver where, we are informed, eight ships could well be tied up in the next few days because that port is short four and a half million bushels of No. 2 Northern Wheat?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I am sure the minister will note the question, Mr. Speaker.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

APPEAL TO RAILWAYS TO MOVE WHEAT

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Transport. Will he assure the house that he will make it his first official duty to see that both railroads make every possible effort to move to Vancouver as quickly as possible the required 4½ million bushels of grain.

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Jamieson:** Mr. Speaker, may I with your indulgence express a word of thanks to hon. members for their good wishes. I assure my hon. friend I will be more than pleased to look into this matter. I am sure he and other members will extend to me the usual courtesy of allowing me time to find my way in the new department—not too much time I expect.

## TRADE

WHEAT—FAILURE BY CANADA TO SEND REPRESENTATIVE TO CANTON FAIR

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he would tell the house and the country why Canada is not represented at the Canton fair, in view of the fact that prospective sales of wheat could be anticipated? Would he also say whether the government will make a statement setting out the sales that have been made by the Wheat Board internationally in the last two months? I realize the Prime Minister has said, "Do you expect me to sell wheat", but I suggest that the western people have a right to an answer to this question.

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the right hon. member for Prince Albert for indirectly giving support to the efforts being made—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** You have no success.

**Mr. Sharp:** —to establish diplomatic relations, which are being carried on between Peking and Ottawa. Sometimes, to judge from his questions, I am not quite sure on what side he is. I always assumed he would concede that this operation has some beneficial result in terms of trade.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Now I ask the minister, whose government has been in authority and the ministers of which government have been

on opposite sides of almost every question, whether there is any difference among members of the cabinet on the question of ensuring western markets for wheat.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## IMMIGRATION

DESERTERS—GUIDELINES ISSUED TO OFFICERS AT CANADA-U.S. BORDER

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of his continued reference to the guidelines issued by his department to immigration officers at the Canadian-United States border and in view of his citation from those guidelines on a television program last night, will the minister now reconsider his decision and undertake to table the guidelines and make a statement on motions on this whole matter at the earliest opportunity?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I understand my friend has a motion on the order paper requesting the production of these guidelines. When that motion comes before the house it will be possible to state the attitude of the government on this point.

**Mr. Lewis:** I rise on a question of privilege in respect of this entire matter. For some months now requests have been made of the minister by members that he make a statement on motions on the question of the admission of military deserters to Canada.

We have asked him on numerous occasions to table the directive of July 29, or whatever is the date, and he has now on at least two occasions outside this house—one in his reply to the moderator of the United Church, and the other last night on a television show—referred to guidelines and told the people of Canada some of the things which they contain. I did not see the show last night but I am informed that he actually quoted from the guidelines.

I respectfully submit that this is either a disregard of the rights of the members of this House of Commons to know about these policies, especially when they have asked for that information or it is a determined and deliberate attempt by the minister to make statements outside the House of Commons so that we on this side of the house cannot say anything about those statements.

If in press statements and on television shows the minister is going to refer to directives that we have asked him to tell us about in this house, then I say he has a duty to rise on motions and tell us what is in these directives, so that members of the opposition may make comments on them.



**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Does the minister wish to speak to the question of privilege?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would be inclined to rule that there is no question of privilege. There may be a serious grievance. This is also an argument which I assume the hon. member would want to advance when the matter is considered, or when the motion to which the minister has referred is put to the house but I doubt very much whether anything can be achieved by pursuing the matter further at this time.

**Mr. Lewis:** With respect, Mr. Speaker, if I may take one more minute, I suggest we have had a number of examples of this sort of thing. One of these days we have to decide whether ministers are going to treat us with respect in this house.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. MacEachen:** On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker: The hon. member, in his customary way with synthetic indignation, has made a series of charges that the house has had no opportunity to discuss the substance of these guidelines. If he had been present when the estimates of this department were before the house he might have listened to one of his colleagues ask for a clarification of this policy, and he might have listened to a reply in clarification, and then might have listened to the total silence of himself and his colleagues. I am not impressed by the synthetic manner in which the hon. member has attempted to abuse the rules of this house.

There is a motion before the house in the regular way asking for the production of these guidelines. The hon. member knows that by long tradition it has not been possible for any government to produce directions to staff. That has been stated in this house by ministers pre-dating anybody sitting in the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** In view of the fact we have had a debate on the motion, perhaps the hon.

member for York South will want to withdraw the motion when it comes before the house.

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether these guidelines are used when immigration officers are interviewing prospective immigrants to Canada from countries other than the United States?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, the guidelines are in general application to applicants from all countries.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** How do we know?

**Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, will the minister give a firm date as to when parliament may expect a statement describing either present policy or proposed changes?

**Mr. MacEachen:** As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, the estimates of the department will be before the committee this week. There will be a full opportunity to discuss every aspect of the policy, the practice, how it developed and any charges that have been made against the administration.

**Mr. Fairweather:** By your own backbenchers, too.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I hope that members of the committee will take advantage of that opportunity to clarify this issue, which has been distorted beyond measure in many quarters of this country.

[*Translation*]

## NATIONAL PARKS

### GASPÉ—AGREEMENT BETWEEN PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, I shall direct my question to the Prime Minister.

Could he tell the house whether the hon. Gabriel Loubier, Quebec Minister of Tourism, Fish and Game, has accepted the conditions set by the federal government for the development of a national park in the Gaspé peninsula?

**The Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** As the hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, the minister concerned is supposed to answer questions tomorrow in the house.

[*English*]

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

### CONVICTION OF CAPITAL MURDER—GOVERNMENT POLICY ON COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Justice. As the first conviction of capital murder since the new act was passed has been upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada, is it now the policy of the government to apply the royal prerogative and commute that sentence? Is this policy still to apply under the law as it stands?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I think that question had better be left for the minister directly responsible for recommending any action to cabinet, namely the Solicitor General.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Then may I refer my question to the appropriate and wise Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker?

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, the exercise of the prerogative of mercy is not a matter of policy that is announced in advance, but is something that has to be dealt with in each individual case as it arises.

**Mr. Woolliams:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that this is the first such conviction which has been upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada since the new act set out that one can be convicted of capital murder only in the case of the death of a policeman, which was the case here, is it the policy of the government to still apply the royal prerogative of commutation of the death sentence to a sentence of life imprisonment?

**Mr. McIlraith:** Mr. Speaker, the exercise of the royal prerogative of mercy is not a matter of policy of this or any other government.

**Mr. Woolliams:** It is still the law.

## PUBLIC SERVICE

### INQUIRY AS TO RATES OF PAY INCREASES TO BE GRANTED

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of reports that a number of top civil servants are to receive pay increases of up to 29 per cent, can the Prime Minister say whether it will now be in order for unions representing public servants

at lower levels to seek pay increases at the bargaining table higher than the 6 per cent or 7 per cent that has been set down by the government?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I do not expect the hon. member wants me to give guidelines to the unions bargaining for employees.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister explain how it is that with government guidelines which limit pay increases to 6 per cent or 7 per cent, 300 who are a favoured few can get increases of up to 29 per cent?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The supplementary question is argumentative and cannot be received.

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

POSSIBILITY OF SEEKING SUPREME COURT DECISION ON CONSTITUTIONALITY OF MEASURE

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. Is he in a position to say when the amendments to the official languages bill will be placed before the house? Furthermore, in view of the view expressed somewhat widely that one section in particular which would appear to amend section 133 of the British North America Act should be referred to the Supreme Court for its opinion before the bill comes before the house for consideration, has the government given any consideration to making such reference in order to determine the constitutionality of the bill or any part thereof?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, we have taken the position that the bill is constitutional and is within the power of parliament to enact, and we would not of our own initiative refer the bill to the Supreme Court. As for when the house will again debate the matter, I should think that would be very soon indeed.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister say whether the amendments of which he spoke when in western Canada are now ready, have received the approval of the cabinet and are available for early introduction to the bill as originally placed before the house?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, the way in which the right hon. member has put that question would force me to break an oath if I were to answer it directly. I cannot tell him.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I would not ask the government to break its word on anything, although it does it regularly.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

REQUEST FOR DEBATE ON FIFTH AND SIXTH REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the new Minister of Transport. In so doing I would like to compliment the Prime Minister on his choice of a Minister of Transport.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. McGrath:** My question is this: Will the minister use his considerable influence with the house leader to bring forward debate on the fifth and sixth reports of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, so that the new minister can have the views of the house on the very serious problems of transportation facing the Atlantic provinces?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I was expecting that question and getting ready to rule it out of order.

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

AVAILABILITY TO HOUSE OF INFORMATION SERVICES REPORT

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the attention of the Prime Minister and ask if he can say when the report of the task force on government information services is expected to be completed?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I at no time stated that the report of this task force would be made available to the house, so I do not understand the import of the question.

[*Translation*]

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MAINLAND CHINA—INQUIRY RESPECTING CANADIAN RECOGNITION

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Would the minister tell the house whether Canada is disregarding its political role in the Pacific by turning to Communist China? Would he also tell the house what progress has been made in the steps taken towards the recognition of Communist China?

**Mr. Speaker:** The first part of the question is probably out of order, but the minister may wish to answer the second part.

[*English*]

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I think I have told the house already that we are expecting this month to begin substantive discussions in Stockholm between the representatives of the People's Republic of China and the Canadian government.

## HOUSING

MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR ANNOUNCING N.H.A. INTEREST RATES

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Which minister will be responsible for informing the public regularly and periodically of the average interest rate for housing coming under the National Housing Act?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the house can always ask the newly appointed minister or the Minister of Finance.

AVAILABILITY OF HOMES TO PERSONS OF MODERATE INCOME

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the great interest the Prime Minister has recently taken in housing, I know he will be familiar with the situation described yesterday in Edmonton by the president of the Canadian Real Estate Board, when he said that two thirds of those who needed housing in Canada could not afford it—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Hees:** I was just getting to my question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** I hope so.

**Mr. Hees:** I figured that just about then Your Honour would want me to do so, so I shall. In view of this very serious situation, is the government planning to introduce any new initiatives in the near future to bring the cost of housing down to a point where people on moderate income can afford it?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** That will depend on the level of the debate the opposition sets when it discusses the bill now before the house.

## HARBOURS

VANCOUVER, B.C.—APPOINTMENT OF SECURITY GUARDS TO REPLACE EXISTING FORCE

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question of an urgent nature to the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that he has just taken over his new position, perhaps he would take the question as notice and let us have an answer as soon as possible, because of its urgency. In view of the decision of the National Harbours Board in Vancouver to appoint a special force to police the port of Vancouver, consisting of 15 or 20 trained peace officers under a retired Mountie as chief, replacing the existing National Harbours Board force of non-professional security guards, will the minister inform the house as to the position of employment of the present security guards, most of whom are war veterans of 17 years service?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would think this question could be placed on the order paper, or if the hon. member prefers he could debate it at the time of adjournment. If there is urgency, it will be given preference for discussion at the earliest possible moment.

**Mr. Winch:** There is certainly urgency, Mr. Speaker, so I will bring it up at ten o'clock.

## THE MINISTRY

MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO TO RELINQUISH INDIAN AFFAIRS DUTIES

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** I have a question for the Prime Minister which arises out of his announcement about ministerial changes. First of all I wish to congratulate all those who have been the recipients of honours. Can the Prime Minister indicate whether the Minister without Portfolio from Port Arthur will be relinquishing his responsibilities in connection with his special duties with regard to Indian affairs?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Baldwin:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of all the changes which have been announced—and I hope a

new day may dawn—will the Prime Minister not consider reviewing the iniquitous roster system, so that on matters which, like running sores, afflict this country continually, such as agriculture, housing and Indian affairs, we will always have a back-up minister in the house to answer questions?

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Perhaps this is just a technical question, Mr. Speaker, but may I ask the Prime Minister whether it is proper for us to address the hon. member for Port Arthur as minister of housing or just as Minister Without Portfolio?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Perhaps we should seek the advice of the legal counsellor of the house, but if I were asked for my opinion I would say the proper title would be Minister Without Portfolio from Port Arthur.

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** I have a supplementary question for the right hon. Prime Minister. Has he appointed any parliamentary secretaries in recent days?

**Mr. Trudeau:** No, Mr. Speaker.

## INDUSTRY

### DEVCO—COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF MINERS

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** I have a question for the Prime Minister. Now that the Prime Minister knows what Devco is—

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** And now that he has forgotten.

**Mr. MacInnis:** —will the Prime Minister make representations to that corporation to see that they carry out their obligations to their former employees and their dependants, as laid down in the legislation?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Perhaps I will be better advised to see what the employees think rather than to listen to the representations of the hon. member.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Is that ever arrogant!

**Mr. Hees:** The boiling point is nearly reached.

**Mr. MacInnis:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, so as to clear up the matter for the Prime Minister. I should like to call his attention to the fact that my question was not about employees, but about former employees with regard to whom this corporation has an obligation under the legislation laid down by the government. There was no question whatsoever about the employees, and if the Prime Minister wishes to be up to date on what the employees think he should catch up on the press reports.



## INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo):** I should like to direct my question to the new Minister of Transport, and may I add my congratulations to the other new ministers. Although I might normally hesitate to ask this question, in view of the minister's own suggestion that we go easy on him at first, I should like to put this perhaps minor but serious and certainly urgent request—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Would the hon. member ask the question.

**Mr. Saltsman:** I have just received a call from Halifax indicating that the washrooms are not functioning—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member's question is out of order.

## WATER RESOURCES

### BAY ST. GEORGE'S, NFLD.—POLLUTION OF FISHERY

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Will the minister advise whether his department is conducting investigations regarding evidence of pollution reaching the Bay St. George's area in western Newfoundland, with characteristics common to those found in Placentia Bay, causing danger to the fishing industry there?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Officials of the department are in the area now examining the matter, and I expect a report momentarily.

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact that the minister will receive representations on the investigations momentarily, will he give an undertaking to make a statement on motions tomorrow indicating the results of the investigation so that he will clear up this business once and for all and eliminate any unnecessary concern?

**Mr. Munro:** I do not know when the full information will be at my disposal. I am hoping it will be perhaps this afternoon or sometime tomorrow. I imagine I may be able to

give that information to the house in some way other than through a statement on motions. If the situation is more serious than indicated, I will consider making a statement on motions later on.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, most hon. members realize the urgency of the matter and the threat posed to a very important industry. Based on that, my supplementary question to the minister is as follows: Will he perhaps take a number of hon. members who are concerned and directly involved into his confidence, rather than making a statement on motions?

**Mr. Munro:** I would be pleased to do so.

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—COMPENSATION TO FISHERMEN FOR LOSS THROUGH POLLUTION

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the fact that the waters of Placentia Bay and St. Marys Bay have been placed off limits to the fishermen of that area, could the minister inform the house whether the government will assist the fishermen, and when we can expect an announcement in this respect?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** The waters of Placentia and St. Marys have not been excluded totally. Only a portion of Placentia Bay has been barred so far, and we hope that this is the maximum action that will have to be taken in that regard.

On the question of tending to the financial needs of the fishermen who are affected, may I say that this is a matter of cabinet decision and will be brought to the attention of the cabinet at the earliest possible moment, in view of the extreme urgency of the problem.

**Mr. Carter:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that this problem could very well reach international proportions, and in view of the fact that it has taken this government and the Department of Fisheries and Forestry six months to study the matter, and the cause of pollution has not yet been determined—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Would the hon. member ask his question.

**Mr. Carter:** —is the government considering seeking outside assistance to find the cause and the solution to this pollution problem?

**Mr. Jamieson:** We will take advantage of any form of assistance open to us. As the hon. member knows, it is an extremely difficult matter to pin down the cause of pollution. As for its becoming a matter of international importance, I should like to suggest that it may well depend upon the action of some of my friends in dealing with this matter.

POLLUTION—REPRESENTATIONS BY U.S. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** I have a further supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Could the Secretary of State for External Affairs indicate whether in fact representations have been made by the United States food and drug administration regarding the extent of pollution and the concomitant results on the fishing industry on the east coast?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** I will make inquiries, Mr. Speaker. These representations have not come to me personally, but they may have come through the embassy to various departments, and I will make inquiries.

## FLOODS

TRAIL, B.C.—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON FINANCIAL AID

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works in regard to the recent disastrous flood situation in Trail, British Columbia. In view of the urgent need of the disaster committee to have information as to the funds available for the victims of the flood, is the minister in a position to inform the house about the financial assistance which the federal government will contribute to the rehabilitation of the area? If the information is not available today, when may we expect to receive it?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** I am fully aware of the urgency of the situation in this area, as expressed by Mayor DeVito of Trail. It is our hope to have the report, not only on the flood damage there but on that in Manitoba and other provinces as well, at which time a decision will be taken by the government. I must reiterate that there is at present a disaster fund set up by the province of British Columbia for such purposes in the sum of $20 million or $25 million. It would appear to me that the damage in Trail would be within the competence of the province of British Columbia.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## GRAIN

ACTION ON PRICING OF DOMESTIC WHEAT

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of his earlier statements to the house that a two price system on sales of domestic wheat is one of the policies under review by the government, what action does the government propose to take on the request by the National Farmers Union for a basic price of $2.75 per bushel of domestic wheat?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** We received that particular recommendation with a number of other obervations and suggestions from the National Farmers Union this morning. That particular suggestion is also part of the review included in the proposals that we are considering relative to a two-price system.

WHEAT—POWER OF BOARD TO NEGOTIATE IN WORLD MARKETS

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of our difficult position in regard to wheat sales, will the minister and the government give consideration, as requested by the National Farmers Union, to their suggestion that the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board be extended to enable it to enter directly into world markets in the negotiation of sales, as does the Australian wheat board?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. It seems to me that the supplementary question is so wide in scope as to require a statement which should, in my view, normally be made on motions.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

INQUIRY AS TO FURTHER RATE INCREASES

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Postmaster General. It is prompted by the futuristic report tabled today which forecasts rapidly increasing operating costs for the post office. Will the minister advise whether his weekend revelation at Sudbury that 10 cents is the true rate on first class mail is the first phase of a movement toward more increases in postal rates?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

[Mr. Laing.]

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPRESENTATION OF CANADA AT FUNERAL OF PRESIDENT OF INDIA

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. Who will represent Canada at the funeral of the President of India?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, our high commissioner in India will represent Canada. May I call the attention of the house to the fact that that is the reason the flag is at half mast today.

## CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

CONSULTATIONS RESPECTING PENSIONS OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. I too join in the congratulations that have been extended to him. Since the house seems to be making up his agenda for him today, may I ask him to put high on that agenda the question of increasing the pensions of retired employees of the Canadian National Railways?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## DRUGS

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF STUDY OF NON-MEDICAL USES

**Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare concerning the proposed committee of inquiry into the non-medical use of drugs. Is it the intention that this committee will examine the relationship between the use of the drugs stated in the minister's announcement, and the use of or addiction to so-called hard drugs, such as heroin and others? If this is the intention, why is it not stated specifically in the terms of reference?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite clear that the terms of reference do not include hard drugs in the sense of drugs such as heroin.

**Mr. Comeau:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister advise whether the reports and the hearings of the committee will be public, and when we can expect the names of members to be announced?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. This is a question that should be considered by the committee itself and should not be asked at this time.

## SHIPPING

SALVAGE OF TUG "EMERALD STRAITS"

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, in an endeavour to assist the Minister of Transport in getting busy, may I address a question to him. I should like to ask the minister whether, as a result of the sunken tug *Emerald Straits*, lost off the British Columbia coast, having been located as a result of the employment by his department of a mini-sub research vessel, any attempt is being contemplated to salvage the tug and find the bodies of those who lost their lives? If so, when and under whose auspices will the tug be salvaged?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to look into this question and see that an answer is given as soon as possible.

## THE MINISTRY

MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO TO RELINQUISH INDIAN AFFAIRS DUTIES

**Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Did the Prime Minister consult with the Indian brotherhood before he took responsibility for Indian affairs away from the member for Port Arthur?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I doubt that this question is in order.

[*Translation*]

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Friday, May 2, consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 29, Mr. Laprise.

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, last Friday I was explaining the necessity of taking all necessary steps in order to avoid errors likely to create conflicts between the various parts of the country, as well as to prevent the medical profession from falling into disrepute.



If ever abortion committees are established in hospitals, it is essential to do so only after a very judicious selection of members, and after due consideration of their personal and professional qualifications.

That is why this amendment provides that the committee includes one gynaecologist. In fact, it is highly irregular that no thought was given to that matter at the outset.

• (3:00 p.m.)

That provision is fully justified for the committee thus made up will ensure that mistakes are avoided. According to that amendment, the committee will be approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province. This is a point which, in my opinion, deserves careful consideration, for how can it be hoped that the College of Physicians and Surgeons can ensure that the physicians who sit on the committee will be conscientious enough not to recommend useless abortions, that they will bow to undue pressure which could be somewhat logical from a social point of view, but would not be based on scientific data?

I do not in the least doubt the good faith and the competence of the doctors as a whole, but one is never too cautious.

Is it conceivable that the College of Physicians and Surgeons on which would reflect the errors made will not ensure that the members of the committee are appointed judiciously.

Mr. Speaker, if this amendment on abortion ever comes to a vote, we might support it, but under certain conditions. When we realize that our speeches are not taken seriously, it is discouraging and we are asking the minister why he is not at least trying to give us the real reasons why he is rejecting some very logical amendments.

Even this morning, we received another document on abortion describing what has happened in other countries and pressing the government to avoid the errors that have been committed elsewhere.

The legalization of abortion opens the door to many abuses and could lead to abortion on request and that is why the minister does not accept any amendment liable to restrict further abortion cases.

Before concluding my comments, I would like to say why we are asking for more details. I quote a paragraph of the above-mentioned letter:

In Canada, the leaders of the campaign in favour of abortion started a few years ago to demand

only restricted amendments to the legislation. One of them, Mr. Stanley Knowles, stated before a parliamentary committee in 1967 "that a limit should be set somewhere". Today, however, he is asking that any reference to abortion be striken out of the Criminal Code.

We have there an example where even if the amendment were rejected or even if abortion were not legalized, some hon. members have already changed their mind and are ready to accept a liberalization of the legislation which would lead to abuses—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I feel duty bound to support the amendment moved by the member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), which reads as follows:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting paragraph (f) of sub-section 6 of clause 18 on page 44 and substituting therefor:

"(f) "therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee, comprised of not less than two qualified medical practitioners and one gynaecologist, appointed by the board of that hospital and approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province concerned, for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital."

The purpose of the amendment is to define the abortion committee and to have its membership approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. The amendment also stipulates that a gynaecologist must sit on the committee. For that reason, we ask that such a specialist be appointed to the therapeutic committee.

I believe the amendment is a very important one, in that it requires medical specialists in this field to be almost infallible, because the question at issue is the right of a foetus or a child in his mother's womb to live or die.

In support of my arguments, I should like to quote the testimony of Dr. Benoît Légaré, a gynaecologist at St. François d'Assise Hospital in Quebec City, before the parliamentary committee on justice and legal affairs, on March 25, 1969. In the following words, the specialist expresses his concern:

Moreover, even if it were liberal enough, to find that where abortion laws have been liberalized—

[Mr. Matte.]

Either by creating committees of specialists or others in several countries, according to the Journal of the American Medical Association, of April 1961,

—these laws have not changed the figures relating to criminal abortions at all.

Some years ago, you abolished the death penalty out of humanitarianism and so that fatal miscarriages of justice would be avoided. Physicians also consider with fear this infallibility conferred upon them by allowing them to decide whether or not an innocent and defenceless being has the right to live.

The legislator's prime concern is to protect the citizens through the laws he enacts. Therefore, it is normal for him to show the greatest concern for the most ill-favoured, the weakest, the weakest of us all, namely the foetus, which is already legally accepted in society since according to sections 338 and 608 of the Civil Code it is already entitled to inheritance rights.

• (3:10 p.m.)

We therefore ask you to humbly strike the clause dealing with abortion from the omnibus bill, though it might be submitted later on, amended after consultation with the different medical circles in the country.

If, per chance, we do not reflect the opinion of the majority, we would request you to consider as essential that the advisory committees set up to that end, be accepted by the College of Physicians of the different provinces or by a national body such as the Canadian Medical Association.

Those words definitely prove that this medical expert was puzzled about the legislative proposal. He added, and I quote:

We do not question the good intentions of the legislators. That is why we wanted to get in touch with the legislators. Perhaps legislators hope, through this bill, to limit the untold number of illegal abortions which are now performed throughout the country. However, they should not have too great expectations since the bill is not sufficiently liberal to hope to achieve this.

For all those reasons, I suggest that it is advisable to support this amendment so that responsible specialists be made members of the committee and be the ones to decide whether or not the foetus should be destroyed.

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, a few words only to tell the house that I am in favour of this amendment, although I already know that they will not carry much weight with those who have been instructed to pass the bill.

The responsibility of the therapeutic abortion committee is to protect the mother's life. In fact, all decisions will be taken by that committee. I do not like its name. It sounds like that of a committee of executioners deciding among themselves whether or not the victim should be put to death.

When people suffer from illnesses, especially from serious ones, the doctors consult each other on the advisability of operating. Two or three of them talk a person's case over. I have never heard that in serious cases just anybody was consulted.

Abortion is very grave since it means the suppression of life. It is extremely grave and, in my opinion, the advisory committee should be made up of experts, namely gynaecologists.

This is a rather good amendment. If I had been called upon to bring in one, I would have demanded two gynaecologists instead of one on the committee. But as I have said, the amendment is quite broad. It is simply asking that the therapeutic abortion committee of a hospital should comprise at least two qualified doctors and one gynaecologist named by that hospital's council.

If we carry things to the extremes—as they will be in certain circumstances, on account of the love of money—I cannot conceive of a gynaecologist, if two general practitioners make a majority decision, being able to impose his opinions. In such a serious case, which would be the responsibility of specialists, the committee should be made up of gynaecologists. A general practitioner is less qualified as regards abortion.

The paragraph of Bill C-150 that the amendment would change reads as follows:

"therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than three members each of whom is a qualified medical practitioner—

In order to be a qualified medical practitioner, one needs only to have taken a medical course and obtained a general medical science degree. In considering this amendment. We must examine the question thoroughly, so as to avoid the abuses and consequences of the passage of this bill.

As regards the prejudicial consequences of this bill, if the committee is allowed to make extreme decisions, all members received a few comments from the Alliance for Life, that I should like to quote:

To what extent are you ready to "liberalize" the Canadian legislation on abortion?

In the opinion of certain members, the government's present proposals may seem deceptively moderate. In fact, however, it appears that such transformations are only a first step.

To my mind, this paragraph of Bill C-150, in its present form, is only a first step and a great one toward excessive liberalization of abortion. I continue quoting the comments:

In Colorado, for example, such a law has done much to increase the number of abortions in hospitals—without reducing the number of clandestine abortions.

They think that will reduce the number of clandestine abortions; yet there is proof to the contrary in the countries where abortion has been legalized. Moreover, it is only the beginning of the stampede. I go on quoting:

Some countries have adopted more permissive laws; they went as far as legalizing abortion at will.

It is what will happen if this paragraph is maintained. Quite naturally, this will lead to abortion at will. I continue quoting:

Most of them however have started by legalizing abortion for so-called reasons of health.

It is precisely what we say and what will be said by the members of this committee. It is likely that the pregnant woman can be sick. Likely, indeed. Let us say that three medical practitioners belong to the therapeutic abortion committee. This will not be the case in every hospital, but it is possible that committees of abortionists will be appointed. I have already spoken of it last week. The committees of abortionists will choose a small hospital where they will establish a committee make up of non-qualified doctors to perform abortions.

• (3:20 p.m.)

And further on:

So did Sweden in 1921. Later on, in 1938, abortion on social grounds ... and others became possible. In 1946, the law became still more permissive.

In Sweden, now, abortions are performed on request. Within a few months, Canada will be one more country where abortion will be performed on request, because of subclause (f) which allows anybody to sit on the committee.

I go on quoting:

In Poland also, abortion was first legalized on vague "medical" grounds. In 1956, those grounds were extended to cover social reasons. Today, Polish laws on abortion are among the most permissive in the world.

The permissive British law was enforced last year, following, however, a series of legal decisions which actually resulted, in making abortion legal for health reasons.

The first of those decisions was made in 1938 and since then, more and more pressure is being exerted in favour of abortion on request.

In my opinion, this bill, and especially the appointment of the committee, is paving the way to abortion on request. I am sure the

minister is aware of it. For Canada, this is only a beginning where abortion and homosexuality are concerned. We made a first mistake by agreeing to the introduction of those two measures in the house.

I am entirely against the present wording of subclause (f) and I shall vote in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Abitibi because it provides a means of ensuring the presence of a gynaecologist on this committee. I am sure that if the government accepted this amendment, it would be commended instead of being criticized.

He would at least have understood what kind of amendment to the Criminal Code the people want. He would have understood also that the population is against the massacre of innocents.

Mr. Speaker, I say again that our society is going to pass a legislation which will allow the most shameful acts a people could be guilty of. I am sure that we will have to pay some day for such acts and for this legislation that should never have been introduced.

I shall be brief, because I want to give the government and government members the opportunity to vote for their fine bill they love and cherish so much. However, I repeat that I shall feel duty bound, as a Roman Catholic and a human being, to vote against this bill which will allow every licence in the future.

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, it must be stated specifically that the committee should be made up of competent gynaecologists, as stipulates this logical amendment intended to safeguard the life of human beings, to allow them to grow and develop normally.

In Canada, the population is not large enough for the debts we have to pay. Instead of turning to massive immigration, we should protect our population, allow it to increase at the rate Providence would have it. If the hospitals do not have competent committees, we will not reach the goal set by Providence.

Providence placed us in Canada and asked us to grow and multiply. The rules that are about to become law with regard to abortion cannot meet divine requirements. In Canada, the population should increase according to the views of Providence.

That committee should protect any being that is intended to live, that has the right to exist. I believe the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) would certainly be held in higher esteem if instead of introducing such senseless rules as those on abortion, he suggested that an amount of at least $1,000 be given to every mother of a family who brings a child into the world. In so doing, we would accomplish an eminently human act, while enabling the family to develop.



The committee to be appointed should include a gynaecologist. In fact, such an important committee should include two gynaecologists, as the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) said.

I feel we should consider that logical amendment. I wonder why the minister of Justice does not intervene and approve this highly logical and commendable amendment.

It is time we tackled the amendments to the bill on abortion proposed by the government. Is the government truly concerned with the protection of a woman's life and health? If so, how can we be sure that the proposed amendments would achieve that purpose?

The committee whose establishment we recommend would be quite in a position to safeguard the health and the life of human beings. Never has the health of Canadians been as well protected as today. In Canada, the rate of maternal mortality is one of the lowest in the world, that is approximately three deaths out of 10,000 births. Can we really believe that the proposed amendments would bring an even greater improvement? The debate has failed to prove as yet that such an improvement would be ensured. It is rather surprising that nobody has raised that question yet. It is also significant that no doctor has shown that it would result in some benefit.

The committee we are proposing would take direct action to protect the human being, who is so great and noble. If the human being did not exist, not much else would in this world.

We need such a committee and we want the assurance that the Minister of Justice supports this amendment. But he did not, and he is content with a status quo which is not good enough because it is beyond all bounds.

In Japan, abortion is legal and is granted on request. According to the United Nations's statistics, the rate of maternal mortality in Japan is more than three times as high as in Canada.

Yugoslavia, which passed such a legislation, has a rate of maternal mortality more than four times as high as ours.

Can it be inferred that legislation making abortion easier promotes health?

• (3:30 p.m.)

Canadians must provide themselves with committees made up of doctors of unquestionable ability.

Canada needs such committees and the services of gynaecologists in order to protect human beings and to ensure that all the requirements of our country are met. We would then thank Providence for protecting us from such acts of cruelty designed to reduce the population.

What we are doing today, every communist country has done before and I think that the legislation we are bringing forward is the most communistic and barbarous we have ever seen.

If various communist countries have committed such barbarous crimes, we do not have to imitate them. Since I do not believe the Minister of Justice is a communist, I am asking why he refuses to listen to our arguments in favour of those amendments.

The amendment now before the house is one of the most logical that has been moved. If we cannot avoid the barbarous acts that we are seeking to prevent through this Committee, the people would feel reassured if skilled men were to make such decisions. Those people, like the Minister of Justice, have been brought into the world to serve the population.

The gynaecologist and the other members of abortion committees must be highly qualified to ensure the protection of our nation. We must make sure that modern technology is made available as much as possible to every matter.

We need such committees and I do not see why the minister would deny society the presence of a gynaecologist on them. We have to sympathize with the Liberal member who lost his wife after refusing an abortion. The Canadian law cannot be blamed for it.

Let us keep in mind also that the tremendous advance of medicine since then has reduced the rate of maternal mortality from 10 to 1 in one generation. Medical authorities recognize that fact which is statistically proved. So it is ironical to claim that the amendments regarding abortion proposed by the government reflect the needs of our modern society.

What is the real purpose of that amendment? What is really going to be protected? Here are the comments of the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle), as reported on page 825 of the proceedings of the committee on health, welfare and social affairs, and I quote:

> This is exactly what we want; to reduce any cause for perplexity in the legislation, mainly to protect the doctor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since we had no such legislation in Canada and we were faring rather well, since medicine is more advanced I would say, than in several other countries, and since the number of deaths due to abortion in Canada is about 3 out of 10,000, we do not need a legislation such as the one brought in and I consider once again that the minister should at least be quite frank and tell us: I want the best, I want a committee to be set up. I do not believe the minister should oppose this amendment, which is a social, moral, human, and above all, life-protecting measure.

Then, why does abortion disturb people so much? If only the destruction of tissue, were involved, any objection to the proposed changes in the abortion legislation would seem quite inconsistent and irrational. Do we believe abortion merely destroys tissue? Is that what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Justice think?

Indeed, there are many who believe that abortion consists in getting rid of something similar to a blood clot.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I am somewhat reluctant to tell the hon. member he is out of order, but in my opinion, his speech would be more appropriate in a debate on a motion for second or third reading. I would therefore ask him to confine his comments to the amendment moved by his colleague.

**Mr. Latulippe:** Mr. Speaker, in all respect, I shall submit to your decision.

As the members of the parliamentary committee on health, welfare and social affairs could see, this point of view is generally accepted by the medical profession. A famous Scotch surgeon, Dr. Ian Donald, a professor of gynaecology at Queen Mother's Hospital of the University of Glasgow, expressed the same opinion:

> There is no excuse, today, for anybody who has studied this much debated question and surely even less for any member of parliament, to think that a human foetus is only a kind of gelatinous and lifeless mass that can be curetted and thrown away.
>
> As soon as a woman is known to be pregnant and, of course, when the operation is being performed, there is actually a human being, a genetically complete entity and we can even say if it is a boy or a girl, a genius or a retarded child, if she or he is gifted for music, mathematics or sports, since all those qualities already exist.

This unborn child even in the first few weeks is perfectly human, or is there anyone to pretend that it is a rat or a guinea pig?

Mr. Speaker, those reports show once again there is a great need for the most logical and the most advisable committees. Members of such a committee should be highly respectable and have a wide knowledge of medical matters, since the decision to perform an abortion must be made by the most highly competent committee ever seen in the history of medicine.

• (3:40 p.m.)

We have those specialists. We only have to find them. We only have to bring them together and set up those committees. We shall then have at least a semblance of justice and be able to give the people related services, proficient services.

I believe that the Canadian people will have confidence in such a committee and I believe also that the mother, who has to go through this, will at least be sure of getting the proper care, thanks to such specialists. The mother surely has a right to life, and the child also. Such things must be protected, because they are the most natural, the most noble—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

**Mr. Romuald Rodrigue (Beauce):** Mr. Speaker, I fully support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) designed to specify how the famous committee appointed in every hospital will be set up.

I also support this amendment for several other reasons.

First of all, in places where therapeutic abortions are performed according to official statistics they are performed much more for questionable psychiatric reasons, and also with questionable results, than in order to save the mother's life. In fact, the bill on abortion compels us to ask ourselves whether we are ready to accept certain forms of murder.

According to the conclusions of a survey conducted by the Association of Quebec Hospital Medical Boards, the number of therapeutic abortions performed in the hospitals of the province is now very restricted and nil, in most cases.

Because of the very limited number of medical indications, the passing of the bill before us would increase very little the number of therapeutic abortions; there would only be an increase in requests for abortion, with their dilemma.

Therapeutic abortion committees mentioned in that bill should only exist in hospitals having an adequate number of specialists and consultants in every branch, so that the decision may be the result of a just and unbiased judgment.

That inquiry—the report of the Association says so—revealed that most medical boards and boards of directors of Quebec hospitals officially and formally objected to the establishment of therapeutic abortion committees in their own hospital.

In view of professional ethics and the constant orientation of their profession, hospital doctors are very reluctant to be part of such committees, and moreover they personally refuse to perform any therapeutic abortion.

What would happen if one or more doctors refused to participate in the work of the abortion committee? Paragraph (f) of subsection 6 does mention "a committee of at least three members".

In view of the decisions taken by the said committee and the implications of such decisions for the committee members as well as for the patient, numerous questions come to mind.

Is it worth taking the risk of upsetting, by legislation, a state of balance arrived at in the status quo? Is it worth setting up a mechanism which could very well go beyond the intentions of the legislator?

Would it not be better to undertake a wider consultation open to all layers of the medical profession, to medical associations, specialists, etc.? Would it not be preferable to learn at this stage all the distinctions capable of improving the legislation even before it is adopted?

Amendment No. 20 of my hon. friend from Abitibi suggests that the said committee be made up of two doctors and one gynaecologist.

In every hospital, there are already research committees whose main aim is to improve medical practice and to allow consultation between specialists. In some hospitals, there are sometimes up to 10 voluntary committees.

However, the committee referred to in paragraph (f) of subsection 6 tends or aims to authorize the medical act. The terms used

leave the door open to problems and to discussion. The main problem with therapeutic abortion committees is that psychiatrists, many of whom will accept any psychiatric indication, will ask gynaecologists to perform an abortion when the latter has refused to do it. This provision will also contribute to bargaining between female patients and their doctors.

Will the doctors and gynaecologists appointed by the hospital to form this abortion committee be working on a voluntary basis? According to a doctor's opinion, these voluntary committees and the work that would be assigned to them would not be considered as seriously as the measure suggests.

At this point, I am taking the liberty of quoting an extract from the proceedings of the committee on justice and legal affairs to show how the problem may be dealt with differently in each hospital.

In New York, an inquiry has been made in two hospitals located a few blocks from one another. It appears from this inquiry that in one of them there is one abortion per twenty deliveries and in the other, one per 6,000. Therefore, I think the proposed amendments would cause rather serious problems.

In the province of Quebec in particular, none of the small hospitals are interested in performing abortions. The doctors firmly believe that such accreditations are useless, a view that is supported by medical science itself. It should not be forgotten, besides, that the majority of Quebec doctors see no need for the proposed legislation or the institution of such committees.

As proposed, the institution of committees opens the door to all kinds of problems.

Psychiatric indications as grounds for abortion are rejected by the majority of doctors and psychiatrists. However, a few psychiatrists admit limited indications. We have to ask ourselves if, while amending the act and allegedly settling one problem, we are not creating another one.

Those are some of the reasons why doctors object to abortion.

• (3:50 p.m.)

There is also another aspect to be considered. What will be the position of physicians with regard to the committees created in the hospitals? Will they be compelled to comply with the decisions of the committee in the name of social order?

If the bill is passed in its present form, I expect two possible effects.



On the one hand, if the abortion committees strictly interpret the terms "the life or health" very few abortions will be allowed and the problem of illegal abortions will remain the same.

On the other hand, if the definition of the word "health" is somewhat broad, it will always be possible to find a reason to consider the pregnancy as dangerous.

A piece of legislation which lends itself to various interpretations and offers no more guarantees is incomplete.

Those are the reasons why I sincerely support the motion of the hon. member for Abitibi, the object of which is to strike out subsection (f) in paragraph 6 of clause 18 of the bill and to have it replaced by the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is the house ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred until after consideration of motion No. 30.

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris)** moved motion No. 30:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting paragraph (f) of subsection 6 in clause 18 on page 44 and substituting therefor:

"(f) "therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than four members, two of whom shall be qualified medical practitioners and one a psychiatrist appointed by the board of that hospital, as well as a clergyman, or spiritual adviser where this is requested by the patient for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital."

He said: Mr. Speaker, the amendment I am sponsoring this afternoon is somewhat related to the amendment we have been discussing. It adds what I regard as an important dimension to this discussion in that it broadens the scope of interest and concern of those who will have the responsibility of making the very critical and vital decision when abortion shall take place.

One of the disturbing aspects of this long extended debate on the amendments to the Criminal Code, which has concerned me as well as many other hon. members and, judging from my mail, the majority of the people of Canada, is the direct antagonism expressed in some of the amendments to what has become known down through the centuries of western civilization as the Judaeo-Christian ethic. Up until fairly recent times, this century as a matter of fact, this has been the basis upon which our system of jurisprudence has been established; it has been largely the ethical and value basis upon which we have made moral decisions.

The amendment brings into abortion this vital question: Who will make the decision as to life or death with respect to a human individual? We know that the Judaeo-Christian ethic regards as of fundamental importance the value of an individual human life. My amendment brings into focus the advice of a psychiatrist. I think this is a very necessary and important dimension in a decision of this kind because the science, if I may use that term, of psychiatry has become pretty well established in the practice of the healing arts today. I shall be dealing with this matter later in my remarks.

But most important, where the individual wishes it the amendment makes it possible for the person concerned or, if it is a family problem, the family concerned, to call in a clergyman or spiritual adviser to deal with this vital and broader dimension in a life or death decision. I know that certain churches in this country have become quite concerned that we are moving toward a humanistic, secular, materialistic attitude toward life. Once the dikes are breached, of course, the value of individual life, as has been the experience in other countries where humanism is rampant, becomes constantly reduced until there are episodes, such as we recall within recent memory, of whole nations dedicated to the principle of genocide, the extermination of human life, because individuals or groups of individuals have been regarded as less than human and, like pests, should be eliminated because they are no longer serving any useful function.



• (4:00 p.m.)

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has argued—and I hope I am not unfair in this statement—that legal matters of this kind do not have any moral overtones or moral implications; in other words, the law does not concern itself with questions of morality. If I am wrong in this respect, he can correct me when he enters the debate once again. It is my strong view that law is very firmly based on morality, particularly law as we understand it in western civilization. We used to call it western Christian civilization. Our law stems from the decalogue which, as we know, has strong moral and religious overtones. If the humanists want to say that law has no direct relationship to moral codes, I think even the sociologists would agree that it at least has some relationship to the mores. These patterns for human behaviour have moral overtones even though they are not as firmly based as those which have undergirded the common law and even our criminal law practice.

There is a fundamental shift taking place in this amendment and other amendments in that, instead of the relationship of man in his society being anchored to concepts that derive from our values which stem from our Judaeo-Christian traditions, it is shifting in the direction of humanistic moral relativism. When that happens in a society I think it is fair to conclude that we are entering into a moral morass and a sea of confusion. I believe—and my mail has testified to this fact—that the majority of Canadians are still on the side of a moral basis for our legal system. This is why I think the Minister of Justice should at least accept this attempt to preserve some of the traditions that have been a vital part of our civilization up to the present time. All it is doing is to add a spiritual dimension so that it will not only be medical doctors—after all, they are specialists trained in a very narrow field—who will make this life and death decision.

If we are going to use the law to change and shape the social order, I suggest we are moving in a dangerous direction. I spoke in this vein a week or so ago with reference to gross indecency, and some of the pundits referred to my comments as being social jingoism. This merely underlines the moral and social confusion rampant in our society when the values and traditions of our Judaeo-Christian civilization, with the experience of

centuries behind it are referred to as social jingoism.

It might be proper to ask at this stage how our society has become so deeply saturated and penetrated by the moral relativism that is indicated in some of this so-called reform legislation. I suppose that the chief sources of influence have been the academic scribblers of the last century, most of whom were concentrated in the last half of the 19th century. The press has popularized science or pseudo-science, and today the process goes on apace through the tremendous social impact of the mass media which have sometimes been referred to as chromium-plated madhouse generating myths, folklore and a reality of its own, a sort of instantaneous electronic folklore because it has no connection either with the past or with the future.

The chief architects of some of these ideas have been men like Darwin, Marx, Herbert Spencer and Freud. As one who has been through the process of higher education, both on the giving and the receiving line, I freely admit that the ideas which stem from these four gentlemen and many other academic scribblers of the last half of the last century have become the guiding stars and the intellectual illumination for much of contemporary society. Darwin gave us the theory of biological evolution, and Marx gave us the doctrine of political and economic expediency, sometimes called atheistic communism or scientific socialism.

**An hon. Member:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** I hear a "hear, hear" from across the way, but these are the terms that apply to these systems. We debate today whether God is dead or alive, but we forget that it was Marx who first explicitly stated in modern pseudo-scientific, social, jingolistic terms that God was quite definitely dead, and he gave us a political and economic system based on this thesis. Herbert Spencer combined biological evolution with humanism to produce his theory of social evolution or social Darwinism which said that in every way and every day we are getting better and better. Of course this was not borne out by the events of the first half of the 20th century.

I have given credit to psychiatrists already so I must not depart from that thesis, but Freudian psychology and the Freudian interpretation of human behaviour have strongly saturated our society. Someone has described a Freudian psychologist as the odd examining the id, and there may be some truth in that description.

Science, or perhaps I should say pseudo-science, has become a sacred cow, and belief in progress because of human perfection has been accepted almost universally, at least in institutions of higher learning.

I recall that Harold Innes, who was a great puncturer of academic balloons until recent times at the University of Toronto, called this process the new mysticism. I think that was a very apt description of the system. It is sometimes referred to as Fabianism or the inevitability of the perfect man, man in his natural state breaking through the corruption of his social institutions and achieving a peace and perfection out of the process of change that is going on apace in society. Perhaps I should resort to doggerel to simplify it so that he who runs may read. I came across this little poem which oversimplifies but which I think expresses the thought. It goes as follows:

> Man used to be a tadpole learning how to swim,
> And then he was a frog with his tail tucked in,
> And then he was a monkey hanging from the tree,
> And now he is a professor with a Ph.D.

His strength is as the strength of ten because he has taken 600 hours in social science and he knows all there is to be known about everything. He is omniscient and omnipotent and is exercising all the functions that we used to attribute to God.

• (4:10 p.m.)

To come back to the point I wish to make, which I think is a vital one, these trends marked by the new social jingoism that I have outlined briefly this afternoon inevitably result in social and political action. This is exactly what is happening in this legislation. The ideas of creative individuals in society, the academic scribblers, eventually penetrate down through society to our social institutions and are implemented in the form of social and political action.

Legislation has been brought before this house, as I have already indicated, that is not based on values enshrined within our Judaeo-Christian past but is an attempt to shape our society in terms of the new secularism, humanism and materialism. This is the motivating principle behind the legislation with which we are confronted at the present time.

If we carry this through to its logical conclusion, it results in some of the episodes that are a blot on 20th century civilization. The Nazis, those madmen in authority, without a

doubt twisted the science of eugenics to develop a theory for the establishment of a pure race, a master race. They introduced a "very interesting" dimension into the process of social change, if I may quote a popular television program.

Until this century social change involved man changing his environment for the general benefit of man. We are now moving into a new, more critical and dangerous area of man changing himself in biological terms in order to adjust to his environment. This was first predicted by Aldous Huxley in his "Brave New World", when by means of pseudo-scientific and test tube methods he first satirically conceived of the possibility of biological engineering as contrasted to social engineering.

When the Nazis came to power in that great civilized nation of Germany, they introduced a master race theory that was based on the misapplication of the science of eugenics, hoping thereby to produce a generation of supermen. Some of the overtones of this idea, which involves misuse and abuse by means of pseudo-science, I think are the motivating principle behind this legislation. This legislation is designed—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but being a senior member of this house he will know the rule of relevancy very well. I do not think he is addressing himself to the amendment that he has moved.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** I am right on the button here, Mr. Speaker. As I said in my opening remarks, I am introducing the new dimension of inviting a clergyman or spiritual adviser to consult on this question of life or death. I am indicating exactly how we have reached the present situation where we are negating what used to be a vital and fundamental part of our western society. With great respect to Your Honour, it is within this background that I think it is necessary to make this particular point. However, I am almost at the end of my remarks.

Our own society is deeply saturated with these new values, and they have a devastating impact on basic social institutions, which we know are the family, institutions of education, the church and the state. Had I time this afternoon I would perhaps have gone into this matter a little more. We all know that social and moral confusion is rampant in our own society as well as in many other parts of the western world, and this confusion is directly related to some of these pseudo-scientific notions. This social jingoism has so saturated our society that it has become the motivating principle behind our own pattern of life without our hardly being aware of it.



What this amendment is asking, Mr. Speaker, is that at least we nostalgically recognize that there are dimensions other than the purely physical, that the members of the therapeutic abortion committee examine more than the physical and medical problem. Certainly we should make obeisance to the science of psychiatry and bring such a gentleman into consultation on this important matter, because he does add a psychological dimension. More especially, where the patient so desires, she should have the right to request the attendance of a clergyman or a spiritual adviser.

We now recognize the psychosomatic dimension. In the science of medicine, therapy involves the treatment of the whole person. If we are going to avoid some of the harsher aspects of the amendment that is being proposed by the government, we should at least recognize that we are talking not just of a physical and a medical problem. I am sure that those of us who have been involved in social work know from personal knowledge and experience that abortion, concerning as it does human life, leaves deep-rooted psychic and spiritual scars that are often not healed no matter what therapeutic approach is taken later.

Therefore I urge without further words that the minister accept this amendment, that he at least recognize and acknowledge that while we are moving in a dangerous, new direction in our outlook toward the nature of man and society, we are nevertheless looking nostalgically to the past and admitting that what has gone on in the past in terms of our Judaeo-Christian approach to life has not been entirely wrong.

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the very sincere presentation of the amendment by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). Although I will not reply to him in philosophical terms at this stage, if we ever get to third reading I might well discuss again the relationship of law and morals as it affects this bill.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** We will all be older and wiser by that time.

• (4:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** We are getting older every day, in any event.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** But not much wiser.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** And acquiring the added virtue of patience. What the amendment of the hon. member strives to do is to make specific provision for the membership of the therapeutic abortion committee. When the bill went through the committee stage before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs the government, and I on behalf of the government, considered over 30 amendments and accepted about 25. What we are dealing with is the committee's report at the report stage of the proceedings. Our position will once again be that we accept the committee report and accept even those parts of it that went against the government's position. Since we accept the report I am afraid I must recommend to the house that we reject the hon. member's amendment. I shall try to explain why.

Under proposed section 237 (6)(f), as contained in clause 18 of the bill, the requirement is that a committee such as is here being considered shall consist of not less than three duly qualified medical practitioners. Subsection 4(c) of section 237 involves purely medical considerations. We argue that the make-up of the therapeutic abortion committee ought to be that of medical practitioners. The therapeutic abortion committee must by certificate in writing state that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of a female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health. That appears to be a medical decision. It is a medical assessment of whether the life or health of the mother is endangered. The doctors must assess whether her life or health is endangered. That being so, there appears no justification for having persons on the committee who do not have the necessary training and qualification to serve on it. In other words, members of the committee must have medical training and medical qualifications.

The hon. member's motion speaks of a psychiatrist. One can conceive of a great many cases where a woman seeking an abortion is doing so because of a heart or a kidney condition or some other physical ailment. There is no need for psychiatric help in such circumstances. Such matters are best left to hospital boards. It is our position that in establishing these committees hospital boards ought to be given as much flexibility as possible in order that they may make use of all available medical expertise needed to pronounce upon the life or health of the person involved.

The hon. member also suggested that a clergyman ought to be a member of the therapeutic abortion committee. Here again I say to him that the decision to be made by the committee is a medical decision. That does not stop a woman from seeking spiritual help.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** This is straight humanism.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** But there is nothing to bar a woman from consulting her own spiritual adviser before she sees the doctors. She can consult her spiritual adviser about the moral decision involved in order to assess her moral position before she approaches any doctor or hospital. So far as I am concerned I would encourage a woman faced with such a problem to obtain whatever spiritual advice and guidance she may to assist her own judgment and conscience. But having done that and having decided she wants an abortion, she then comes under the terms of this proposed section. The judgment whether continuation of the pregnancy will affect the life or health of the mother is a medical judgment, and I say that prior to seeking medical advice the woman is entitled at all times to consult her own spiritual adviser. I encourage her to do so. But, with the greatest respect, a spiritual adviser cannot contribute to the medical judgment contemplated by the clause.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Practitioners of psychosomatic medicine would not agree with that.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** As to whether any member of the committee should be a specialist in any field such as psychiatry, that, once again, ought to be left to the judgment of the board of the hospital. There might be circumstances in which no psychiatrist at all is needed. A psychiatrist might be of no assistance whatever on the committee. Boards of individual hospitals have been left with plenty of flexibility to designate the specialists needed on any therapeutic abortion committee. We would prefer to leave the judgment in these matters to the hospitals and to the medical profession.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to enter this debate this afternoon, but I feel compelled to do so because I must answer some of the minister's suggestions. As I said before, the entire bill is window-dressing and the minister knows it. Every hospital has a committee of doctors. Operations, whether for the removal of an appendix or for an abortion, are

reviewed by these hospital committees. Any doctor who does not meet the standards of the committee may be disqualified. The minister knows this.

What the minister has done, and I emphasize this, is to try to please two segments of our population. One segment wishes to see greater flexibility in our abortion laws and the other wishes the law to remain as it is. This particular amendment to the Code is being brought in with a view to pleasing those who want the grounds for abortion to be extended; yet when one scrutinizes the bill closely one sees that it does no such thing.

The provisions setting up therapeutic abortion committees are an insult to the medical profession, and I say this seriously. Doctors practise in good faith. If any doctor thought an abortion was necessary to preserve the life or health of the mother, I am sure he would act in good faith. Adding a committee does nothing. It is utter nonsense.

Sometimes I blame the minister for the length of this debate although, to be fair, one must blame the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). Here the minister is piloting the Prime Minister's ship.

**Mr. Gibson:** Here we go. The same old speech.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I think the hon. member says a great deal without making a speech, just like his father.

**Mr. Gibson:** We have heard it all before.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Well, I will not answer the hon. member's remark because I know he cannot help himself. He exercises his greatest eloquence when sitting down.

I return to the subject matter about which I was speaking. If the government had amended the Code as we suggested and had added the word "unlawfully" in the requisite section, it could have amended the law very simply and satisfied those who want to see more liberal abortion provisions. As I said, we must assume that doctors act in good faith. But, of course, that has not been done. Except for the provision setting up a therapeutic abortion committee, the basic law affecting abortions has not been changed and the minister knows it. He is trying to bluff the public. He hopes the public will think the government is trying to do something concrete. What makes me sick is that the business of the nation is being unduly delayed because of this piece of nonsense.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

**An hon. Member:** The opposition is holding it up.

**Mr. Woolliams:** On Friday we moved a motion to adjourn this debate but government supporters voted against it.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Protracted debate on this bill is holding up the business of the nation. We ought to consider the problems of western Canada; we ought to get on with the nation's business. When we consider all the problems facing us, inflation, the high cost of living, no housing and the mounting economic crisis, we realize that parliament's time is being wasted with this nonsense. The government is introducing window-dressing. I will say no more. I hope I have made my position clear.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting for quite some time for the opportunity to speak on the motion of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale).

I must say, at the outset, that I fail to understand and regret the anti-parliamentary attitude of my colleagues across the way who manage to bellow when a member starts to speak.

This having been said—and I trust they will understand—I should like to say that I regret infinitely, on my behalf and on behalf of my colleagues of the Ralliement créditiste, that the minister should not have deemed it advisable, in his reply to the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, to say at least that he would study seriously the proposal, before stating that he is opposed to it.

The proposal of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris would define the therapeutic abortion committee of any hospital as follows:

—"therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than four members, two of whom shall be qualified medical practitioners and one a psychiatrist appointed by the board of that hospital, as well as a clergyman, or spiritual advisor where this is requested by the patient for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital.

Mr. Speaker, we have had the opportunity, on the motion of the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) which preceded this one, of studying its motives or reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask for your co-operation—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please.

[*English*]

I ask the co-operation of hon. members in order that the remarks of the hon. member for Lotbinière may be heard.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, where was I? It does not matter. I will continue my speech.

We had the opportunity when considering the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi to study the motives that induced hon. members, particularly those of the opposition, to examine another definition and another composition of the therapeutic abortion committee of a hospital. Why, Mr. Speaker?

Quite simply because we believe that the definition in the omnibus bill states very vaguely that this therapeutic abortion committee will be composed of three doctors. Nothing more.

That is all the bill says concerning the therapeutic abortion committee. It says that it will be a committee accredited by the accreditation committee but it does not say what will be the competence, the specialization and the scientific affiliation of the members of this committee.

The government's proposal does not give any definition of competence and does not give any indication of the competence of the members of this committee. It says simply: appointment of a therapeutic abortion committee accredited by the accreditation committee. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that we are going far with these vague definitions—I could even say "woolly" but I will hold my tongue—which really do not represent a safeguard for the patient, the family, the hospital and particularly the doctors who will be on that committee.

Mr. Speaker, we, of the opposition, are making several attempts to define more clearly, more comprehensively and more safely this famous expression: therapeutic abortion committee.

Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that the expression therapeutic abortion committee and the creation of such a committee is the basis of this legislation on abortion, in short, the cornerstone which supports all the legislation on abortion.

We must remember that this therapeutic abortion committee will have the responsibility of applying this legislation, of studying the interests of the patient, the interests of this committee as well as those of the common and individual good.

One should not forget, Mr. Speaker, that if the therapeutic abortion committee, in a hospital, is not competent, does not work well or cannot perform its work adequately, scientifically and in the safest possible way, this definition of a therapeutic abortion committee is no longer a definition but almost a condemnation of the efficiency of this committee.

As for us, we are most concerned about this definition suggested in the legislation, especially by the words: and made up of three qualified medical practitioners. I certainly agree that doctors are all qualified practitioners, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) said. Besides, it does not necessarily mean that we are meeting the needs.

Having said this, we should also remember that the patient who comes to see the doctor or the therapeutic abortion committee comes there for several reasons. I would be out of order if I elaborated on that, but may I be permitted to say, very briefly, a few words about the various reasons that bring a patient to a doctor.

Among those reasons, the first one that comes to our mind is reluctance to have children. One can well realize that this reason requires the presence of a psychiatrist or a psychologist who will be able to help the woman understand that maternity is a good thing for her, that it would be against the law of nature to reject maternity on the ground that she does not want a child, that maternity is a natural need and that, all in all, it is a good thing for her.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, it is not every qualified medical practioner who could participate in this discussion, in this extremely important and fundamental dialogue, or bring about this atmosphere of confidence that should unite a patient and her doctor. We should act immediately upon this reasoning, which seems to me most logical and justified, and see to it that on this therapeutic committee also sit a qualified person, able to consider with the patient this specific subject, that is, rejection of maternity. Of course, there are other reasons that also demand the presence of the same qualified medical practitioner, for psychiatric or psychological matters.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the proposal of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), who says that

there should be two qualified medical practitioners and a psychiatrist, appointed by the board of the hospital. And, I find it marvelous that the hon. member for Brandon-Souris has not only defined in his amendment the expression "therapeutic committee", but has also asked that a psychiatrist sit on this famous therapeutic abortion committee; I find this necessary and most desirable.

As such a committee undergirds this legislation on abortion, as it is the corner-stone of therapeutic abortion, this safeguard clearly becomes imperative; all potential patients who could appear before the therapeutic committee, should rest assured that they will be understood, and helped, that they will find friendly and competent people to help them. This does not necessarily mean that the committee will accept every application for abortion.

But, if we do not appoint to this committee on therapeutic abortion a psychiatrist chosen by the board of this hospital, there could quite clearly where a patient will appear before the therapeutic committee and apply officially for a therapeutic abortion. And as the committee would comprise qualified medical practitioners—not necessarily a psychiatric, not necessarily a specialist in another branch, but qualified medical practitioners, for instance—we can see at once what could happen if that patient came before the committee, asked for an abortion and has to deal with three qualified practitioners that might not have the required competence to study the motives—not to pass judgment, for who has the right in this house to pass judgment—and the reasons prompting her to procure her miscarriage.

If her request, Mr. Speaker, comes from the fact that her pregnancy may endanger her physical health or her life, then, I say that the qualified medical practitioners or others are competent. But should those motives impair her mental health, will a qualified medical practitioner be able to give that patient the same co-operation, help, understanding, as a psychologist or a psychiatrist?

Mr. Speaker, I say that if the minister cannot understand that—something which is so clear, in my opinion, that common sense shows through in every way—then he is a blind man who yields only to socialist forces, whose aim is to reduce human beings to mere numbers, with the result that nobody can or tries to understand them. Instead, they are all to be tarred with the same brush, put in the same basket without anyone seeking the reasons or the circumstances concerning those particular persons.

[Mr. Fortin.]

Mr. Speaker, it is of vital importance, I think, that a psychiatrist be on a therapeutic abortion committee. We must urge the minister and this irresponsible government to make at least one intelligent move before refusing to study this amendment or its effects.

A psychiatrist will easily understand the reasons for an abortion. I was talking earlier of a mother's wish, for instance, to refuse maternity.

There are many other cases. Let us take for example that of an unwed mother.

Let us consider the woman who has three children and who does not want a fourth one for the simple reason that she has already too many with three, that her time is already too much taken up. Would that be a serious reason, Mr. Speaker? The therapeutic abortion committee has not the psychological or psychiatrical skill to co-operate with the patient in order to get to know her reasons—not to judge but to help her—and maybe to avoid then certain useless abortions.

In short, basically, this is the real issue, to avoid useless abortions, especially when we know that abortion is the rejection of a human being and, indirectly the death of a human being. Consequently, this constitutes an infanticide or an homicide, depending upon one's point of view.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot prevent this general butchery, let us at least make sure that useless abortions, those requested for no serious or justified reasons, will be prevented.

This is why we, in this corner of the house, are particularly happy to support this part of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris which tends to ensure on the therapeutic abortion committee the presence of a psychiatrist appointed by the board of the hospital in order to give a better service to the woman who will appear before it.

According to the hon. member's proposal, the committee will comprise a "clergyman"—whatever his faith—or "a spiritual advisor where this is requested by the patient".

It should be noted that the hon. member respects the freedom of the individual, and this cannot always be said of the members opposite. And the amendment says:

—for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital.

Mr. Speaker, this means clearly that two things have to be borne in mind, quite different although connected, when the therapeutic abortion committee is set up:

On the one hand, the psychological aspect has to be considered, or the reasons why abortion would be granted or rejected, and, on the other hand we must think of the moral problems possibly deriving therefrom.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the hon. member for Brandon-Souris is right when he asks for the therapeutic abortion committee to be comprised, on an optional basis, of a clergyman or a priest, but only where this is requested by the patient. A clergyman or a priest should be permitted to come to the committee and study the case of the patient.

Mr. Speaker, everybody agrees that the abortion bill may have serious moral implications. We do our best however to avoid any comments on that point, for we did not come here to preachify.

However, it is an awful thought that we may pass a legislation knowing full well that it may raise serious moral problems for some people.

Then, we must be sincere enough to provide a way out in the legislation which would give the patient—and, in that, she will be protected by the law—the additional guarantee of being able to consult a priest or a clergyman officially, if she feels a moral problem is involved.

Besides, if the therapeutic abortion committee feels that the case of a given patient raises a moral problem rather than a psychiatric or a medical problem, then it could officially on its own call in a clergyman or a priest in order again—and we now come back to the subject-matter of the amendment—to provide the patient with an adequate and complete service, in short, to show her more understanding and give her greater assistance. I think this is essential.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, the government would certainly be unwise to reject the amendment without giving it serious consideration and going to the root of the matter, as one general would put it.

Mr. Speaker, there are in this committee, in brief, two qualified medical practitioners, a psychiatrist, plus—if it is the wish of the committee and if the patient finds it advisable—a clergyman or priest, for a maximum of four persons or a minimum of three.

Such a membership guarantees adequate service and understanding from the point of view of science and professional ethics—with the two qualified medical practitioners—also moral and mental intelligence of the problem and causes, and a study of the deeper motives of a patient, and in addition, with the presence of a clergyman or a spiritual advisor—at the request of the patient—comprehension and, perhaps, an encouraging dialogue for the patient.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I say that in most cases of abortion, rejection of motherhood or quite unnatural reasons can be noticed. Quite often, such people have failed unfortunately to understand the meaning and the great importance of motherhood, they did not wish a pregnancy which may have been accidental, and consequently—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him is expired.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are the following: The hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale)—National Parks—Alteration of land tenure principle; the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster)—National Defence—A.B.M. system—Missile site in Michigan area; the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch)—Security Guards—National Harbours Board—Vancouver.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 30, Mr. Dinsdale.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is the house ready for the question?

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this amendment, but in view of the eloquence and the common sense shown in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), I feel duty bound to give it my wholehearted support as I think it is the only amendment, or almost the only one, which is directly related to morality.

The amendment now under consideration reads in part as follows:

—be amended by deleting paragraph (f) of subsection 6 in clause 18 on page 44 and substituting therefor:

"(f) "therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than four members, two of whom shall be qualified medical practitioners and one a psychiatrist appointed by the board of that hospital, as well as a clergyman, or spiritual advisor where this is requested by the patient for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital."

In that amendment I note a reference to a clergyman or spiritual advisor. Moreover, in his short intervention following the explanation given by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, the Minister of Justice said that in the bill there is nothing to bar a woman from consulting her spiritual adviser or requiring his advice or guidance. He even went further and said that he would encourage a woman faced with such a problem as abortion to see her spiritual adviser, a clergyman or anyone of her own faith, an expert in moral or religious matters, who could be of assistance to her in the decision to be made.

I extend warm congratulations to the Minister of Justice whom I recognize, through his remarks, as a believer and a Christian. But if the minister is a believer, why does he not show it in the bill?

In my view, that would eliminate once and for all—it is not very much trouble, only a few sentences to change—all suspicions or all that is going counter to morals, in such an important decision.

It would not be such a difficult problem to amend this clause. That would prove the minister is sincere about this bill and that he feels a moral responsibility in this regard. In fact, the government would take upon its shoulders the moral responsibility for this bill

At this stage, I would like to say that if we, the Créditiste members, have been speaking as often as we have on the proposed amendments, it is because we love our country very dearly, as I think we have proved it. We have set our heart on keeping intact our inheritance. The population of Canada does not exceed 21 million. The situation would be entirely different if our country was overpopulated as in the case of India.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

I think that what we are now trying to prove—like some other members who have also spoken, for instance the hon. member for Brandon-Souris whom I congratulate—is that our heart is set on preserving our cultural and moral inheritance which accounts for the fact that we are a responsible people.

I also believe that we love our children including those yet to be born.

I say here that it was extremely important, because if, for more or less trivial conditions or reasons, a girl or a woman requests an abortion on psychiatric grounds, for a matter of mental health, I think that a psychiatrist will have to decide the question.

That is why I find well-founded and called for this amendment. It asks or requests the Minister of Justice, as well as the present government, to accept that a psychiatrist and also a clergyman be included in the therapeutic abortion committee for the purpose of safeguarding morality.

I believe our sense of responsibility impels us almost to heroism at this time. Today, it is very distasteful to me to speak, in this house, about the morality of abortion because, when one defends true morality, the morality which is practised by the majority of Canadians, we are called mentally retarded.

As for me, it does not bother me at all; indeed, I do not care in the least. When someone or other calls me what he wants, it does not bother me at all, but I know that the future always belonged, in Canada to the people who could stand up—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I would ask the hon. member to kindly restrict his remarks, as he did at the outset, to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris.

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I said that we, Canadians, have always shown a sense of responsibility.

About the minister's remarks or about the amendment to the bill, namely, that those therapeutic abortion committees would be more complete, more just and better assured of avoiding mistakes, I fully support this

measure designed to amend Bill C-150 by providing that such committees include a third member, that is a psychiatrist and a third spiritual advisor or a clergyman.

• (5:00 p.m.)

**Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words to congratulate the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) who introduced an amendment, which is the contribution of the members of the Progressive Conservative party in order to make this bill more acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I think the argument put forward by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris is serious. He did not elaborate very much but I think the outline he gave us while presenting his amendment to paragraph (f), concerning the composition of this therapeutic committee, deserves some consideration.

I think he has presented us with a picture of the Canadian society based on the accomplishments of the State and the Church, but I am most surprised at the answer and observations of the minister who, as usual, defends the pluralist society that I would rather call the socialist and communist oriented society. We are presented with a legislation that protects one or two per cent of the population at the expense of the 98 per cent others who as I said, represent the society based on the State and the Church.

I simply wanted to congratulate the man who has had the courage to introduce this amendment.

As for the observations of the minister, who told us that we are simply accepting the report of the committee which says that the only requirement should be the appointment of three doctors, they bewilder me.

Then, Mr. Speaker, if we consider the minister's remarks and if the house finally agrees to accept nothing but the report of the committee, what is the purpose of this fight? What is the purpose of all these amendments accepted by the Chair? The whole thing is a farce.

The minister informs us that only the committee's report will be accepted. What does it contain? I really wonder, what we are trying to do and why does the Chair accept amendments such as the one before us. The minister should have been consulted to find out whether it was really worth being discussed. That may help explain the attitude of the hon. members; I believe they were clever enough to accept the information of the committee and to disregard all those amendments which are being submitted and which the Chair sees fit to accept. Does it mean that the Chair accepts amendments which it knows beforehand to be unacceptable to the government? In that case, our efforts are futile. In my opinion—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I would like to remind the hon. member that the Chair is the servant of the house and not of any party. Moreover, I would like to ask him to limit his comments to the amendment before the house and not to discuss all the other amendments which have been disposed of.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I am talking on that very amendment, on paragraph (f). I am quoting the minister's words and saying that the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), according to the words of the minister, no longer has any meaning.

Why are we discussing this amendment? That is what I am wondering about. We are indulging in a child's play, according to the minister, who made that statement forty-five minutes ago. In that case, let the department be firm and put an end to it once and for all. Let us proceed with the vote. To put it very simply, it is quite useless to submit an amendment of that kind, for instance, which is meant to do justice to the whole population, to all Christians in Canada, and not only to communists and socialists.

I asked earlier that there be two gynacologists. This amendment reads partly as follows:

"therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than four members—

I agree with the hon. member. If the medical group must be represented, very well. But man is not only an animal; he is entitled to have representatives, he has the right to resort also to spiritual doctors. That is why I find this amendment wonderful, because it meets a need in our society, a need which a certain group of Liberals may dispense from today, probably because their leader's favourite authors are Karl Marx and Mao Tse-tung.

But we are not in that case and we must try to meet the needs of the people by means of an amendment, and I think this amendment is consistent with the wish of the majority of Canadians. I dare say a "majority" because I wonder whether, when discussing

in this parliament, we are still in a democracy. But I hope the government will come back to democracy and will think a little more of complying with the majority's wish, instead of 1 or 2 per cent of the population.

This is why I feel we should adopt those amendments without the slightest hesitation. Speaking about the clergyman, the hon. minister adds quite ingenuously that he would encourage women to consult clergymen; but the point is that there will be no clergymen on the committee. This is what our argument is all about.

There will be no counsel on the committee. A member may recommend to the future mother to confer with a clergyman, but I can assure you that, under the circumstances, and considering the way the measure is drafted, the pregnant woman will find it rather difficult to consult the clergyman who sits on the committee, because there will not be a clergyman. Perhaps there will be some socialists, but there will be no christian representative.

Mr. Speaker, these are the two main arguments which struck me in the remarks of the minister. When he says that it is to dispel widespread fears, it does not make any sense; people are justified in fearing the present bill because we are heading for a society of absolute licence where socialism and communism will prevail. That is where we are heading.

The socialists are happy. They laugh. They triumph.

The minister said earlier that he learned a great many things since the beginning of this debate, to be patient for one. I think that tomorrow he may learn something else. He will learn that society is angry at him. Let him be careful. It would be a good thing for him—though I do not wish it—if he were a little jostled, because the amendment we are discussing has been well thought. It has been proposed by a capable man, an old hand at politics. Moreover, I believe we should adopt it even though all the amendments, like the bill, should never have been brought at the political level. However, such is the case. We are not those who have brought it up and this is why we are strongly opposed to the bill being carried on for the benefits and particularly for the glory of socialists, since tomorrow we shall be shedding tears of blood for having let this happen.

Once more, I say that I shall vote in favour of this amendment, which requires that at least four members be appointed on the therapeutic abortion committee, to allow the greatest majority of our people to have access to legislations we are supposed to vote in their name, not only at the medical level but at the moral and social levels as well.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

• (5:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the amendment now before us which deals with Bill C-150 and more especially paragraph (f) of clause 18, ranks among the most important we have seen up to now.

If we consider that the role of an elected and responsible government is to provide the people with the results that they wish to obtain in the management of public affairs and as long as it is normally and morally advisable, it is necessary to establish and maintain a democratic formula promoting life in society based on equitable laws through which each individual would enjoy social, political and religious freedom as far as the unprejudiced application of the laws is concerned. An individual and collective effort is necessary to ensure prosperity, security and cultural progress.

The amendment under consideration today proves however that we have a long way to go before attaining a high degree of civilization. The family, on which society, is founded is nowadays forgotten, neglected, humiliated and scorned. Whether it is pleasant or not to be reminded of this, nevertheless it is a fact. Today, we are studying an amendment dealing with the status of woman in our society.

On April 15 last, the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) put motion No. 30 which is simply meant to protect the mother, the main member of the family. This amendment will probably have opponents, especially men who claim to be the liberators of women, but who speak of their liberation through abortion. This is simply to slight them.

The 70,000 Canadian women who took the trouble to write to the Prime Minister last week did not do so to demand abortion. On the contrary, they objected to that legislation about which most of them have never been consulted. With a few exceptions, Canadian women have never demanded abortion. Regarding those exceptions, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from an article published in *Le Soleil*, on Friday December 6, 1968, under the title: "Une femme qui désire avorter n'a pas à se justifier devant un comité".

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I remind the hon. member that the article he wants to read, in order to be accepted, must have some connection with the amendment of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). Otherwise, I shall be obliged to call him to order.

**Mr. Godin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about an amendment that provides for the setting up of a four-member committee. Now, the article I want to quote deals with the exceptions, those Canadian women who are against such a committee and in favour of abortion. I want to prove, Mr. Speaker, that they are very few and I hope you will allow me to quote one of their statements. So far, only the statements of those who are against have been submitted. Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the statement of a lady who is for abortion and I hope that will be agreeable to you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I told the hon. member he has to deal with the amendment before us and from the information he has just given, his comments are not related to it. Very kindly, I would ask him to restrict his remarks to the amendment.

**Mr. Godin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you once again for your observations, but I have not yet started to read the article. I find your ruling rather premature. Finally, who knows what I have here?

It concerns a former secretary of state who is still invited to address university students. She is not a criminal woman, but a former minister and former cabinet member who once said about this problem:

Miss Judy LaMarsh, former secretary of State, said Wednesday night that if she ever became pregnant, she would prefer illegal abortion rather than an appearance before a committee to claim that she should be procured legal miscarriage.

Miss LaMarsh, who was speaking at the University of Toronto at a students' debate on abortions stated that she was personally against the proposal requiring a pregnant woman to appear before a board of psychiatrists, doctors, barristers and priests, if she wanted abortion.

"If I were pregnant I would prefer miscarriage with a spoon and a knife in a dirty kitchen," said Miss LaMarsh.

Mr. Speaker, you know that a pretty and desirable woman has much more chances than Miss LaMarsh of becoming pregnant.

I go on with the quotation:

She added that restrictions on abortion should be removed from the Criminal Code and that women should have the right to discuss only with their attending doctor the possibility of an abortion.

This supports what has just said the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), namely that clause 18 should not have been included in the Code. I go on:

When a student suggested that women wanted abortions merely for the sake of decency, Miss LaMarsh replied: "I wonder if he would think in this way if his girl friend or his sister were in that position—at 17 years old, maybe, without any money and without a husband."

Miss LaMarsh said that it should be "easier" to have an abortion than to give birth to a child.

She has also stated that the amendments to Criminal Code permitting therapeutic abortions, as introduced by Prime Minister Trudeau, were not going far enough.

This is terrific, Mr. Speaker. I continue the quotation:

In fact, these amendments would allow therapeutic abortions where pregnancy would endanger the life or the health of the mother, but would require the written consent of a special committee in an approved hospital.

Miss LaMarsh said later during the interview that, although she does not believe that a woman can really do anything she likes with her own body, she fieels a woman has the right, if her doctor agrees, to procure herself an abortion, and the state has no business limiting her freedom by legislation.

During her 20 minute speech, she stated that the proposed amendment to the Criminal Code "makes very little account of the social problems of the great number of married and unmarried persons involved".

"A stirring error".

Miss LaMarsh added that she was not interested in knowing if the "stirring mistake" in the pregnant woman was a human being or not.

"What I am concerned about, are the parents of that mistake. I am worried about the young men who become the fathers of those mistakes, and the young women whose lives may be destroyed".

When one of the panelists suggested that abortions should be covered by medicare and by the health insurance scheme in Ontario, Miss LaMarsh struck the seat beside her, saying—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. It is quite clear that the article referred to has nothing to do with the amendment under consideration.

**Mr. Godin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion, I should like to express my gratitude to you for allowing me to read that much of it all the same.

At any rate, Miss LaMarsh points out again that it should be easier to have an abortion than to give birth to a child.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I were pregnant—again a conjecture—what would I do? Before whom did Miss LaMarsh express her opinion? Before doctors, heads of families, experienced people? Indeed not. The only person in favour of abortion in the country who dared come out and speak out, chose to do so before inexperienced students.

This is what such people think.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Since the human being is the most valuable creature in any organized society, it has undeniable rights to the spiritual as well as the temporal good, and these should be fully respected and safeguarded.

If natural law confers rights, at the same time it imposes corresponding duties. In fact, the right to life, for instance, involves the duty to preserve life. The right to a decent life involves the duty to behave with dignity moreover, if the right to have a family derives from man's natural right to freedom in the choice of a state in life, it is incumbent on a member of parliament to take social, cultural and moral measures of such a nature as to increase stability and assist man in fulfilling his particular role.

The abortion legislation as proposed would allow abortion in cases where the health of the mother would be endangered. This is given a wide interpretation. As will often be the case, women will now have a legal means to get aborted at the slightest excuse. Indeed, we will have abortions at will and this may come in direct relationship with the decline in the birth rate which is due to the pill. It will more or less amount to self-extermination for the human race.

Mr. Speaker, we know that reproduction does not stand as the No. 1 problem for the Canadian people. So, I wonder why we deal with abortion since there is no problem there. Why do we talk about abortion, when the main problem has to do with distribution, and this has been proved?

The government sends ambassadors and workers throughout the world in order to find customers, to find consumers for our products. So, why do we talk about abortion, why do we try to pass this piece of legislation which will as a result destroy the next generation, the generation of tomorrow, that could have taken advantage of our surpluses and thereby become our best consumers?

[Mr. Godin.]

Using charity and goodwill as a pretext, we have entered into special arrangements with the bad Russians who were against us in the last war.

In the past few years, we have entered into contracts, we have granted subsidies and advantageous loans for purchases of Canadian wheat by the Chinese who are getting ready to wage war on us. To what nation must we give way?

At this point, may I be permitted to quote an excerpt from a speech delivered in Prague in 1869. I quote:

> Let us not prevent marriages between our men and Christian girls; because, through the latter, we break into the most inclusive circles.
>
> But, mainly, let us invade the teaching field. In this way we shall spread the ideas that are useful to our cause and we shall mold the minds as we see fit.
>
> Let us spread the idea of common-law marriage, in order to destroy in Christian women their devotion to the principles and the practices of their faith.

It is obvious that, if the idea of common-law marriage has been advocated for a hundred years, abortion would be rather helpful to those people, who have practised it more freely than within marriage.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I ask the hon. member to let us know, after those comments, in what way he intends to deal with the amendment now before us. Otherwise he shall have to be called to order again and the hon. member is well aware of the rules in this regard.

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. The hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce on a point of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Allmand:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. During the course of the speech being made by the hon. member you have risen four times to bring him to order on the point of relevancy. I fully support you in this respect and I want to cite to you Standing Order 34 (2) which reads as follows:

> Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House, or of the committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance, or repetition, may direct him to discontinue his speech, and if then the member still continues to speak, Mr. Speaker shall name him or, if in committee, the Chairman shall report him to the House.

We in the house have had enough of irrelevance and waste of time, and I would ask you to enforce this rule if the hon. member continues to be irrelevant. I ask you to direct him to discontinue his speech if he continues to be irrelevant. You have interrupted him four times already and have asked him to be relevant but he has flagrantly disregarded your remarks. I ask you to enforce the rule, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I thank the hon. member, that is exactly why I made certain comments on the last call to order.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand), I refer to the same standing order which reads:

> Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the house, or of the committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance—

• (5:30 p.m.)

I should like to emphasize another side of the question, as the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce has not done so. When the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) rose to speak, he asked the Chair's permission to make a quotation. You called him to order without knowing what the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) wanted to say or quote. I believe it is one of the first calls to order that could not come under standing order 34(2).

This call to order may have caused the hon. member for Portneuf to lose the thread of his ideas, of the matter in hand, since psychologically speaking, it is more or less what usually happens.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask you to kindly allow the hon. member for Portneuf to pursue his very interesting and brilliant remarks.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. Both hon. members made their remarks very clear to the Chair. I thank them most sincerely and ask the hon. member for Portneuf who still has a few observations to make, to kindly limit his remarks, this time, to the amendment.

**Mr. Godin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for having thanked my colleagues and I am coming back to the amendment through a last quotation, which is the most important of all, and I am still quoting from a speech delivered in Prague in 1869. There are only three lines, I quote:

> At the appointed and predetermined time, we shall unleash the revolution which through the ruin of all classes of Christendom, will enable us to enslave all Christians once and for all.

That is why, I asked a while ago for the benefit of what nation shall we have to yield? Are modern wars, with the modern weapons we know, putting the authors of that speech in fear of a revolution in Canada? Is it to be feared that Canada will be actually destroyed before being taken over? Would that be the means they have found—abortion—to prevent us from reproducing ourselves, so as to be able to seize the country without any trouble? Is Canadian parliament the tool of those people?

Those are the questions that come to my mind in the face of the statements of the minister who again opposes a very simple amendment which reads:

> "therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than four members, two of whom shall be qualified medical practitioners and one a psychiatrist appointed by the board of that hospital, as well as a clergyman, or spiritual advisor.

The minister told us that he actually urged people, women, to see a psychiatrist or their clergyman.

Now, if the minister agrees, we do too, and we want to make even surer. Promises and unwritten commitments are not good enough. That is why the hon. member for Brandon-Souris moved this amendment, merely because he wanted the wishes of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to be spelled out in the act. It is nothing else. That is why I still support the amendment in question.

Now—as I repeated a while ago—is there anything more drastic than abortion to complete the infamous work of the pill? Since it is related and precedes abortion, I feel that it is closely related to the amendment in question, and considering the fact that the pills are not entirely satisfactory, might the bill not be designed to help pharmacists?

When we know that a woman can conceive only 60 days a year, why all the publicity, for instance, about the famous pill and why speak about abortion? Why speak about abortion for a period of 60 days per year? And considering that a woman—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. Godin:** Mr. Speaker, I need only one more minute.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Godin:** It is very brief, Mr. Speaker.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The time of the hon. member is over.

The hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte).

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be called to order too often, because we realize that on the other side of the house, even if they do not want to listen to our speeches carefully, seriously, they watch us closely in an effort to catch us up.

And your role, Mr. Speaker, becomes extremely difficult, I agree. You cannot possibly know every thing. You are not a walking encyclopedia and consequently how can you judge every technical, medical, scientific or other question, while saying at the same time that we are within the subject or not? That is far from easy.

It is quite understandable, Mr. Chairman, that we should sometimes get away from the subject, at this stage of the debate that has been lasting for weeks. We are so deeply involved in the subject that even for a simple amendment we have at the tips of our fingers all the relevant arguments.

While considering the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), we are still in the realm of the subject I believe, when we bring forth all possible arguments to prove that it is very important that the advisory committee, in an accredited hospital, should prove that it has all the required qualifications to perform abortion. We want this committee to make decisions but only when we are reasonably sure—I do not say absolutely sure, but reasonably sure—that it will be able to avoid making mistakes and yielding to sentimental pressures and blackmail.

The purpose of the amendment now before us and which is closely related to the amendment discussed earlier is just to avoid that.

I want here to congratulate and thank the hon. member for Brandon-Souris for having considered the question of abortion from a point of view which is very much the same as ours. He certainly deserves to be congratulated for his amendment goes, at least in some ways, a little further still than the previous one and I quote:

> "Therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than four members, two whom shall be qualified medical practitioners and one a psychiatrist appointed by the board of that hospital, as well as a clergyman, or spiritual advisor where this is requested by the patient for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital."

Mr. Speaker, we realize, in reading this amendment, the continuing concern of those who, in this house, radically oppose abortion as such. They want to protect people, to the best of their ability, so that if, unfortunately, abortion were accepted as such, we would know at least that every care has been taken to avoid every kind of abuse.

We understand very well the recommendations made a moment ago by the minister when he said that, personally, he was quite in favour of the suggestion, but that there was no need of including it in the bill since it would be done through a simple advisory board without it being indicated in the law.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the minister thinks he is smarter than the law but it is unfortunately common knowledge that i's should be dotted and that t's should be crossed—and more particularly so here, taking into account the experiences undergone elsewhere. It is essential to dot the i's, rather than rely on the fact that there will be advisors, people who will have to think things over, to sound their conscience and to ponder upon a possible abortion. Will qualified physicians then go and take the advice of clergymen and psychiatrists? Are we to expect such a thing? This is not good enough, not by a long shot. That is why the amendment becomes important, if not essential, for who will agree to abortion?

It has been said ever so often—and I will say it again—that according to duly qualified medical practitioners, cases where the mother's life must be weighed against the life of the fœtus she bears in her womb, are extremely rare; there may be three cases out of ten thousand. Consequently in 20 cases of abortion, consideration and advice will not be sought for purely medical and scientific reasons. Therefore, the committee that will have to decide must be apprised of all the factors, in order not to be tricked by those who would try by every possible means to procure a legal abortion.

Out of a hundred cases submitted to a physician to secure abortion, at least 95 per cent will be unwarranted. Yet since people will go and see their physicians for that purpose, they will naturally do their utmost to succeed.

That is why, with pressures brought to bear upon him from all sides even though he is well qualified, the poor physician will be in an extremely complex situation and most of the times, his decision will be contrary to his own conception of his patient's condition. If he is alone, it will be extremely difficult for him to arrive at a decision. On the other hand, by adding two members to the committee, we would partly relieve him of the responsibility.

Once he is able to consult a psychiatrist the latter becomes perhaps the most important person, more than the clergyman, because according to the representations we received from the various Churches, namely from the Roman Catholic Church, we know they are opposed to abortion. Moreover, I do not think the woman requesting an abortion would be disposed to consult her parish priest or a spiritual advisor.

Now the fact remains that even a clergyman or a spiritual adviser can give sensible advice which would surely not be prejudicial to the diagnosis which the senior physician will have to make.

I say that the most important individual in that case will be the psychiatrist and I refer again to that famous number which impresses me very much. As there is practically no case when abortion has to be performed to save the life of a woman, the reason of health has been added. Now, the psychiatrist becomes the key man in such a case, because the person who will go before the therapeutic abortion committee is already somewhat mentally affected and ill, since she is ready to accept something which is unnatural. The fact that she started by asking medical advice for an abortion while being comparatively healthy indicates that her mental health is especially affected. This is why I feel that, when he suggests a psychiatrist, the hon. member for Brandon-Souris realizes quite well the disastrous consequences of the problem which has been before us for some time.

The problem is extremely serious, because a pregnant person is perhaps not in a position, especially on account of her special condition, to judge matters adequately by herself. We only have to remember the peculiar behaviour of a pregnant woman; she is somewhat disturbed—and this applies to all women—and then her reasoning and her judgment are not as logical as they would be in other circumstances.

This pertains to psychology, to the mind and to mental health. Nobody would then be in a better position than a psychiatrist to advise most judiciously and most objectively the attending doctors on the person wanting an abortion.

I find therefore this amendment most appropriate. I find it serious. I find that once again it fully supports us in our fight and we shall keep on fighting until the minister can or will decide to take our comments into account.

A four member committee still better than one comprising only two members, since there will be four persons to look after the interests of the patient. I am also in favour of a committee made up of properly qualified people, that is, who know the human mind because they have made a special study of the subject and who are familiar with all the possible distortions it may present due to various circumstances.

I therefore think that by specifying that a psychiatrist will be consulted, we do not repeat what is normally inferred when we refer to qualified doctors. That is what the minister said just now, that it was necessarily inferred. But we take that precaution knowing human nature as it is and knowing also that the easiest way out has many supporters in the world.

• (5:50 p.m.)

We therefore know that there may be a whole string of reasons, besides the real ones, which can bring someone to ask for an abortion. That is why if ever abortion was accepted, we would want the law to be very specific so as to discourage those who would want to resort to it. As the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) pointed out, there is no reason why we should be in favour of such a thing.

I do not think that the problem is worse from the population point of view. On the contrary, our country does a lot of publicity to attract immigrants. At this time, I would like to make the distinction—once again, people may think that it is my hobby, but I feel very strongly about it—between the province of Quebec and the other provinces.

It could be that in the other provinces people are not so much opposed to abortion because they depend on immigration.

**Mr. Speaker:** I hope that the hon. member will see to it that his remarks are relevant to the amendment.

I believe that he has already indicated for the information of the hon. members the difference between the province of Quebec and the other provinces, as regards this bill, inasmuch as the general principle of the legislation is concerned. I feel however that his remarks, at this time, should bear on the matter before the house, and I know that the hon. member will manage to present his argument in this context.

**Mr. Matte:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What I was trying to say is that, to me, the amendment is restrictive. I am in favour of the amendment because it will reduce the number of people resorting to abortion. And if we do not accept the amendment, the result will be that many people, throughout the country, will appeal to the advisory committee to be authorized to get an abortion. I find that extremely unfortunate for Quebec especially because, even though other provinces can rely on immigration, Quebec can rely only on its own progeny, and the problem is now quite alarming: in the last ten years, the Quebec family has dropped to 1.9 children.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member puts forward the very argument I was afraid to hear in the house. He knows that the subject now before us is an amendment to the legislation designed to increase the number of members on a special committee, including the appointment of a psychiatrist and a spiritual advisor. The hon. member should direct his remarks to that.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, this time I will try not to depart from the subject, because being called to order like that is likely to give us a complex and force us to resort to a psychiatrist.

So I simply say, to conclude, that I think the quality of the members of the committee should be specified, and not be indefinite as it is now with the committee having to be comprised of qualified medical practitioners. The term "qualified" seems adequate to the minister but, as far as we are concerned, this amendment specifying the exact quality of those who are called upon to be members of the committee is necessary to limit the scope of this clause of the omnibus bill.

Even if both amendments, Nos. 29 and 30, which are of a similar nature, were lumped together, that would still mean 4 or 5 members. But if, moreover, it was specified that one of the two qualified medical practitioners must be a gynaecologist, there could then be a gynaecologist, a medical practitioner, a psychiatrist as well as a clergyman and a spiritual advisor.

Then, we would take a much lesser risk, and we would meet the wish of the people who would see that we are really concerned with protecting the life of the mother, and not satisfying a certain group of people who would like to have such freedom that it would become licentiousness.

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to avail myself of the few remaining minutes to support the amendment of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). I think this amendment is logical and goes to the heart of the matter. We are about to pass a bill which will have very serious consequences, as it affects the very basis of human nature. It is as the root of the tree. If we want the tree to be in good condition, in good health, we must take care of its roots. If the roots become sick, the tree will die. If the nation is in danger, if the very basis of the nation is undermined, it will be the fault of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), the fault of the government. This bill might shake them. I believe that we should recognize that this amendment is moral, logical, social and that it must not be rejected on any ground.

This amendment should be accepted because the one who moved it deserves all our congratulations. I am asking the hon. member, once again, if it is possible, to ask his friends to support his amendment because up to now only one member has supported it.

This amendment certainly deserves a lot of support, because it carries a lot of weight. Moreover, it is so logical, so moral, so social, that I think it is impossible not to take it into account.

The Minister of Justice said in his statements, that he was ready to advise mothers to turn to a spiritual advisor, a moralist, a psychiatrist. If the minister is ready to do that, why does he not include it in his bill?

The minister stated publicly that he was ready at least to recognize that this amendment is logical. Why not include it in the bill and have it inserted in the Criminal Code? After a bill has been passed, it comes into force and then that legislation is maintained by the State. If that amendment does not appear in the Criminal Code, those who have to enforce the law will not bother about it. Therefore, the minister implies only that the

amendment, though logical and commendable, cannot be accepted.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Latulippe:** I should like to point out that it is six o'clock.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but, it being six o'clock, I do now leave the Chair.

[*English*]

At six o'clock the house took recess.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Latulippe:** Mr. Speaker, before recess we were discussing an amendment which I called just and tremendously great.

That amendment is more complete than any of the preceding ones, because it asks for, and I quote:

> —not less than four members, two of whom shall be qualified medical practitioners and one a psychiatrist appointed by the board of that hospital, as well as a clergyman, or spiritual advisor where this is requested by the patient for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy—

Mr. Speaker, as this question deals with morals, since it is impossible to appeal to conscience without touching morals, I should like to say a few words and broaden the outlook on the question of morality. Indeed, it is the greatest, the noblest thing, since morality ensures our inner balance and nurtures hope. It is the same thing for the population as a whole.

Since the population is made up of individuals, if we can preserve in each person the sense of morality, on the human and social plane, society itself will be stabilized, thanks to this morality, to this fundamental moral law needed by every man. Without such a law, no person is stable. Therefore, a nation without morality is an unstable nation heading for anarchy and ruin. No morality means no hope.

This is partly why this amendment, tending to allow the patient to request a spiritual advisor seems to me essentially logical, human, and commendable, for I will say it again, moral laws are essential to any nation.

We must withdraw contemporary societies from the influence of artificial, legalistic rules and bring them into the vivifying world of duty and moral obligation. So we have a moral obligation to protest against this bill, because this is a matter of conscience.

Never before, I believe, has Parliament been faced with such a matter of conscience. Those who have no conscience, who follow like sheep, who let themselves be lead to the slaughterhouse, we cannot blame them, neither can we blame those who have a conscience, who wish to upgrade the nation, who want to ennoble the human being, who wish to protect individuals, to protect the nation, and who are against anarchy.

We are against anarchy and the legislative proposals on which we are to vote will surely and definitely lead us towards anarchy, because nations that have adopted similar legislation, similar positions, have known anarchy, have lived in terrible anarchy.

Every society and every nation should then be ruled by the same basic law: the respect of man. That is what I am driving at. The respect of man for man and of the state for the individual is at the very root of the social and human order.

Now, this amendment leads us directly into such moral considerations. It makes us turn our minds to morality for the protection of our society, for its very survival, and for its development and its future growth. We need such a high moral law.

Order postulates a law which sets a goal and which requires means to attain that goal. In nature, goal and means blend into one, because things and people are subjected to a vigorous determination. Whether it be the physical universe, the vegetable or animal kingdom, the goals and the means are summed up in the universal law of self-conservation and of respect for man.

A society established on the principle of respect of man must not confuse the end and the means. The state must not embody the end as well as the means. It is impossible to be both instrument and purpose and that is precisely what the present government is proposing now. It brings forth the instrument, while the purpose of the bill before us is to make abortion currently and generally obtainable and to remove all scruples about abortion. That is exactly what makes abortion so valuable, because once more it is concerned with the very essence of individuals, of life and of the human beings who

will come after us. We shall not live forever and after we have been replaced things may be better. After our times, new, better, perhaps more sociable and natural things will come up because of our accomplishments, and if we have misbehaved, we will pay for it in the other world.

In our society, the role of the State is to legislate and to administer the law. It is up to the State not to embody at the same time—it must not do so by a strict application of the law—the end and the finality of society, that is to be enclosed in a specific institution. It is therefore necessary for the basic law of the human society to be embodied in a specific institution which would hold the supreme power above the State and out of its reach.

The motion under consideration leads us directly once again to a matter of conscience and ethics. It also shows that it is necessary to put that institution out of the reach of the State. A moral law is powerless in itself. It would be too easy for the State to abolish it or to violate it to its own advantage if it felt like it. Of course, the State always and necessarily has authority since it is in power. Then, having regard to that power, what will the Minister of Justice do?

• (8:10 p.m.)

The minister acknowledges that the bill must be based on morals, but he does not want morals to be part of the Criminal Code. He does not want such a written law. Then, what are we to think of the minister? What about that Minister of Justice? Perhaps he should be called the Minister of Injustice, for he advocates or accepts certain reforms or certain moral laws only in principle, whereas he actually refuses to accept them.

So, such a minister reflects supernatural hypocrisy; it is not even natural hypocrisy. The basic law of society must not be violated by anybody and above all by the State. If everything is relative as far as humanity is concerned, in this case this is an absolute imperative. Otherwise, all would be lost.

Mr. Speaker, just as the means must be subordinated to the end, so the State must be subordinated to moral power. This is natural and necessary in the order of things. There is no denying this, Mr. Speaker.

Embodying the supreme law of the nation, the moral power must be a real power. Life is not sufficient. It must have moral power and not material power. The only real immaterial power is justice. Moral power and judiciary power must be one power only.

[Mr. Latulippe.]

However, this becomes a matter of conscience, Mr. Speaker.

The amendment now under study should certainly be accepted by a great many hon. members, by the hon. members on the other side of the house, by those who, up to now, have refused to accept any amendment to this bill.

And yet, the amendment under consideration is one of the most complete, most human, and most social-minded ever seen. So, humanity will be what man makes of it. Man harvests what he sows. Therefore, if he spreads disorder in our society, if he prevents society from multipling itself by immoral laws, like the one we are now considering, we shall be subjected to dreadful calamities.

As far as I am concerned, I shall not take that responsibility. If the minister and members opposite want to accept such a responsibility, they can do so. We are here as conscientious objectors. We want peace and happiness for the nation. We want the nation to progress; we want to be replaced by others who are logically supposed to replace us according to the destiny of creation. And, we have no right to interfere with such things.

The world that is dying under our very eyes is that of ideologies, objections, myths, of right supported by force, of false values or false ideologies; when in contact with reality, these degenerate into material values.

People consider only the material point of view, for they do not care for the spiritual point of view. They do not care about morals. There are no more morals, there is no more conscience on the other side at the present time. However, I feel that all government. members cannot be deprived of a conscience.

Among our friends opposite, some are still conscientious. I ask them to stand up and defend the bill, so that we can at least have that logical, great and ultimate amendment adopted.

That amendment should at least be inserted in our Criminal Code, so as to provide some measure of protection, a little conscience, a little hope, for our nation, today and tomorrow.

The world of quality and of masses, the world of all those who, avid for power or money built their empire on the traffic of men, of their flesh, of their mind, of their conscience or of their faith, the world of the ignored, despised, crushed man, used as an instrument, the world of pride, of violence, of fanatism and of war, is an inhuman world.

Therefore, this is what we are in the process of giving the people, the future nation: an inhuman world. Yet we were not elected to indulge in inhuman things. We are human beings and so, we must know what is moral, what is a human being, an individual. We must recognize its greatness, its sublimity.

So, the break of dawn, the new-born world will be the world of reality and of living men, the world of genuine human values, both material and spiritual. That is what we want, that is what we stand for, with this bill and with the amendment proposed in it. The world of quality is the world of the elite, of all those who, on this earth, are the most worthy of our times, in short the world of moral law, of tolerance and of peace. It is the world of the man who is understood, considered, respected, treated as a human being, the world of the happy city, built by free men for free men who are masters of their own destiny.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Order. The time allotted to the hon. member has expired. The hon. member for Shefford.

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, we are studying, clause by clause, the amendments which have been introduced in this house concerning bill C-150.

Some similar amendments have been tabled previously, but we must still express our views on each of these amendments which are, I think, very important.

If we have a close look at the amendment No. 30, introduced by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) we notice that it is rather similar to the previous one. We sincerely regret that the minister does not seem willing to accept any of those amendments which were not been moved for fun, or for mere pleasure.

Each of them is important if one takes trouble to study the documents, the briefs, to read the medical books and to learn from the experience of other countries which have already enacted such bills.

The main purpose of this amendment is to clarify in bill C-150 the wording of the provision which compels us to appoint abortion committees where this wording would specify in advance the members who would be appointed to these abortion committees.

Now, the hon. member for Brandon-Souris suggested that a psychiatrist be appointed with two doctors and a clergyman of the religion or the belief of the female person who wants to have an abortion. Well, the main purpose of this amendment is to specify in the legislation who within the abortion committee, will have the final say from the psychiatric point of view.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Why should there be a psychiatrist on this committee? Because medical science proves that in the case of abortion a psychiatrist is very important because of the many psychiatric symptoms which induce women to go to certain doctors to get an abortion.

How could a doctor study the reason a woman has to want an abortion if he is not himself a psychiatrist? I have here, in front of me, books written by doctors who give hundreds of psychiatric reasons for which a woman might want to get an abortion.

The legislation does not specify anything; it does not oblige the hospital board to have a psychiatrist on this committee. That is where we find the legislation is not clear enough, it is incomplete, ambiguous, it will open the door to a lot of abuses.

I am shocked to see that the minister is stubborn to the point that he will not accept any of the amendments proposed in the house.

Mr. Speaker, I simply have to mention the books published on the subject by doctors, books sold by the *Éditions du jour* and written by Dr. Serge Mongeau, in collaboration with other doctors. Speaking of psychiatric conditions, he says this, at page 45, about unwanted pregnancies. He emphasizes cases where the psychiatrist alone could tell if such or such a woman is right or wrong to get an abortion.

Unwanted pregnancies

That reluctant approach can appear at the very beginning, for instance in the case of the bachelor girl who cannot foresee any way of keeping her child.

Further he is more specific:

Except in some very rare exceptions, the majority of women appear to be more or less in two minds when pregnant. At times the child is seen as a threat, at times as the object of tender love. The psychological state of the woman, her environment, her health, her relations with her husband, all condition her attitude towards the child she bears.

Those are some psychiatric reasons—and I shall enumerate others—which induce a woman at the start of her pregnancy to either want or reject her child. Statistics prove, however, that a woman who wanted to be aborted because she did not want her child, later on, after one, two or three months,

had changed her mind and from then on wanted to bring her child into the world.

Mr. Speaker, those are psychiatric reasons for which a woman wants to be aborted or not. How are those psychiatric reasons to be judged if there is no psychiatrist on the committee?

Dr. Soddy, another expert in the field of psychiatry, has this to say:

> Soddy distinguishes two forms of non-wish, in the face of pregnancy: "the absence of a positive desire for the child for his own sake, as an individual with his own rights; a negative attitude towards the child or even his rejection". Depending on the category, the character of the mother-to-be, the social possibilities and numerous other factors, four alternatives can be considered:

He goes on to explain, for instance, why a woman may finally accept her child, even though she may in the first instance have rejected it and wanted to be aborted, because the psychiatrist convinced her to have the child.

I continue:

> Even when the discovery of pregnancy has caused the future mother to be slightly dismayed, it can happen, particularly when she receives adequate help, that the child who was first regarded as undesirable becomes fully accepted. In Yugoslavia, where abortion is legal if approved by a committee created to study the requests, this intervention is refused to 10 to 20 per cent of the women who request it. In 1960-61, an inquiry revealed that out of 762 women who had not been granted an abortion, 52.5 per cent in 1960 and 42 per cent in 1961 carried their pregnancy to its term. Out of that number, 92 per cent accepted their child normally—

And women who had first asked for an abortion, were convinced with advice and help from the psychiatrist on the abortion committee, to carry their pregnancy to its term. However, how can the doctors on the abortion committee judge the psychiatric reasons a woman may invoke for having an abortion, if they are not psychiatrists themselves? Therein lies the illogical and nonsensical attitude of the minister regarding the scientists, medical authorities in Canada who have submitted briefs, who have given us everything we need to draw up legislation which will meet fully the needs of the public, of the pregnant women, and of those desiring abortion.

> We believe, he goes on to say, that it is necessary to try everything to motivate women to want maternity and through effective help, to make maternity acceptable to them as soon as possible. Social workers play an increasingly successful role in the special centres established for that kind of work.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

But how can we convince the women who want an abortion for psychiatric reasons if there are no psychiatrists on the abortion committee? How can doctors who know nothing about psychiatry say: Madam, for such and such a reason, you should continue your pregnancy to term. That shows that our legislation is absolutely senseless and unsuitable for the Canadian people.

I would like to give another reason, a psychiatric one, put forward by a woman who wants an abortion. What can a doctor who is not a psychiatrist decide about that? Here is the case:

> I am pregnant. I want an abortion but I can find nobody to do it; the only one who would be ready to do it charges $600, but I do not have that money. I cannot wait any longer; I will do it myself. My mind is made up.

That is a woman who could surely be psychiatrically treated.

> —I will use a knitting needle. It is dangerous, I know; I risk a lot, I know; but I cannot do otherwise. Why do doctors let a person destroy herself? You help those who want to commit suicide, but you incite people to kill themselves perhaps. Is that human?
>
> Isabelle, 20 years old.

Here is another psychiatric case which shows another reason why someone wants an abortion.

> I think that in any case, if a woman wants an abortion, she finds the means to get it. And in what conditions?
>
> Having myself had that experience, I can assure you that the steps you have to take, the refusals you have to suffer, fear and everything, are causing as much traumatism as the abortion itself. If abortion was allowed, with some restrictions, of course, there might be fewer serious consequences, physical as well as mental.
>
> A single woman, 27 years old, Montreal

That is a riding represented by a Liberal member in this house, and not a single Liberal member has spoken for or against this proposed legislation. And the article goes on to say:

• (8:30 p.m.)

> I have known two "professional" abortionists. The first one: two girls died after abortions; he was acquitted for the first one but for the second one he got eight months in Bordeaux, plus $11,000 costs.
>
> The second one: a girl died and her nude body was found in the alley of Drolet Street about 10 years ago. He was indicted; he got away without a prison sentence, thanks to his money . . . He told me that about 50 per cent of the girls who think they are pregnant—

And here we come to the psychiatric point.

—50 per cent of the girls who think they are pregnant are not and in those cases he uses some red liquid and chicken liver that, after being dipped in the liquid, looks much like a foetus. When he had a new customer he sent a chauffeur to get her and who would then get him in a hospital lobby, and this patient believed he was a doctor. He aborted 20 girls or women per week. The price varied from $200 to $300. He gave $25 to anybody who brought him a good customer.

That was a long time ago; nowadays it goes much faster.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the statement of this girl and the reason why she wanted an abortion, again we find psychiatric reasons. In the bill introduced by the minister there is no guarantee that a psychiatrist will be appointed. The minister does not want to accept psychiatric indications which would allow a woman, whether she is right or wrong, to decide whether or not she will go to a psychiatrist.

I will add here that there are other reasons, and I have many more:

If I hope that abortion will be allowed, it is because it is an obsolete, hypocritical and irrealistic legislation; it is also for the rich and not for the poor.

Wife of an unemployed worker in Mont-Laurier, 36 years old.

Mr. Speaker, further on we are also told that abortions vary according to each hospital. And yet, it is more or less the same people, the same women, the same diseases, the same psychiatry, the same pediatry, the same foetuses that are born.

The proportion of therapeutic abortions varies ... according to each hospital.

And in the United States, Mr. Hall, who has made a survey of those problems in various hospitals, says this:

Hall counted in one hospital one abortion out of 20 deliveries and in another none out of 24,417 deliveries.

It is estimated, generally speaking, that there are about 100 illegal abortions for every therapeutic abortion, and that illegal abortions are the cause of great medical risks for the mother's health or life.

And from the point of view of psychiatry too.

Further, when we are told how the committees are formed, we may wonder who the members are. Here is what is said about the committees.

The woman herself must make an application to secure a legal abortion. A special abortion committee within the Royal College of Medicine, a committee composed of a physician usually an obstetrician—

—or a gynaecologist. The law does not mention a gynaecologist. Beside that gynaecologist—

—of an ordinary citizen, preferably a woman—

It would be normal that a woman should decide on the fate of another woman, of a person of the female sex, such as the one who wants an abortion, it would be normal that a woman conversant with that matter should be on the committee.

I carry on:

—and of the head of the Social Psychiatry Board, has to determine the value of the indications to decide for mentally retarded women and to appoint doctors who will be able to decide themselves whether they should perform an abortion. Those doctors, officially appointed, will be able to decide whether an abortion should be performed, if their decision is supported by another doctor, the one who usually performs the abortion.

In the present legislation, we are not told that the doctor who is to perform the abortion will be on the committee. A doctor may decide on the abortion and another doctor, who will have no decision to take on the case, will have to perform the abortion or the murder.

Mr. Speaker, in Denmark, where they like to speak about other countries, they say, and I quote:

—the legislation provides ... "that a woman can obtain a miscarriage in special cases where physical or mental troubles—

Further on, they specify who is to be members of the hospital committees in Denmark, and I quote again:

—three members appointed by the Department of Social Affairs. Two of them are doctors and one must be a specialist in psychiatry—

A specialist in psychiatry! Denmark requests only a psychiatrist and a general practitioner. In addition, it is said, and I am still quoting:

—the third member of the committee is always the director of an agency ... called "Assistance to the mother".

The minister proposes a legislation on abortion but he does not intend to set up committees of "Assistance to the mothers". He suggests the establishment of abortion committees, but not committees to assist the mother. Nothing is said in this respect. There is no mention of it in the legislation while in a country like Denmark, committees have been established to help the mother. Why? Because a woman is refused an abortion for psychiatric reasons. At the same time, she is referred to a psychiatric committee to help here reach her term.

I have in hand a very interesting table on this subject, Mr. Speaker. Who knows today, in the world as elsewhere, what are the main reasons why abortions are requested? It is for the same reasons that we, of the Créditiste party, say that to want to allow abortion in Canada for health reasons is a false pretext. Such reasons do not exist.

Here are some figures:

In Yugoslavia, for instance, in 1965, here are the reasons why abortions were requested: 23 per cent of the women who secured an abortion have done so, not for reasons of health but of housing.

The Canadian government is not solving anything now and the minister responsible for housing has been compelled to resign because the government would not accept his views nor his proposals.

In Yugoslavia, Mr. Speaker, 23 per cent of the women who have asked for an abortion have done so because of lack of housing; 30 per cent, for economical and social reasons, because they did not have enough money to live. Moreover, 16 per cent of them have invoked family relationships; 6 per cent, illness in the family, but not their own; 3 per cent, marital relationships; 4 per cent, alcoholism; 9 per cent, various reasons, of a personal nature, and 2 per cent, various other reasons.

Well, this means that in Yugoslavia, 95 per cent of the women have secured an abortion for reasons completely different than those invoked in Canada to legalize abortion.

• (8:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. The hon. member can only proceed if he has the unanimous consent of the house. Is there unanimous agreement to allowing the hon. member to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry, but there is no unanimous consent. Is the house ready for the question?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, following the very sensible statements we have just heard from the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) I feel that the house and the people across Canada should read the page of Canadian history that the Ralliement créditiste is writing just now, showing, with the help of concrete examples, that the experience of some Communist countries among others did not bring the results expected when the legislation or amendments were passed.



Therefore, the page of history now in the process of being written in Canada should be read by the whole population.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) who has moved an amendment to the effect that the bill on abortion

> —be amended by deleting paragraph (f) of subsection 6 in clause 18 on page 44 and substituting therefor:
>
> "(f) "therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than four members, two of whom shall be qualified medical practitioners and one a psychiatrist appointed by the board of that hospital, as well as a clergyman, or spiritual advisor where this is requested by the patient for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital."

Now, in support of such a logical amendment, I cannot imagine we could not secure a majority in the house, which should not defeat the government, but could at least prove to the entire population that dictatorship does not exist in this parliament and that government members are ready to vote according to their conscience, if they have one.

Some Conservatives, and we see it now by this amendment, are free to bring in amendments which undoubtedly would relax the omnibus bill, especially if that amendment were accepted since it asks that a clergyman be appointed on a patient's request.

As for myself, being a Catholic, if members of my family with the upbringing they had, either my wife or even my daughters, if they want to have, in addition to a psychiatrist, a clergyman of any religion whatever, I believe that in a Christian Canada first of all, and then because we are Catholics in Quebec and because others belong to other denominations, we must have at least the right to consult a minister in order to enjoy through such an amendment a certain freedom in our country.

Then Catholics in Quebec, especially government members, will have, as of today, to take into account one thing, namely that the amendment which is brought in by the Conservative member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) is also backed up by all the Knights of Columbus of the province of Quebec.

Members on the government side will have to keep that in mind.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) must also take into consideration that the amendments brought in up to now, and the one moved today, are supported by the 70,000 Catholic parents who have asked for the withdrawal of the omnibus bill or at least for the acceptance of the amendments moved by the opposition.

With such an abundance of protests, do you know what I was told by my constituents whom I met during the week end. They told me: "There is only one solution left to the Liberals, especially the Quebec Liberals who do not even dare to assert themselves: either to accept the amendments as such or to resign." You have the choice, my good friends, if tomorrow the government members reject that sensible amendment, because I know that in their midst, there is a large number who every day come to tell us in the lobbies or elsewhere: "Continue to fight, because we cannot say anything." The coward who hides behind the curtains does not have the courage to rise and to seek justice for his fellow citizens.

We taxpayers are in favour of such sensible amendments, because they would allow us to include in the committee a clergyman whom we represent as the members of any denomination in Canada. The passage of such an amendment would give us a little more freedom in Canada and we are convinced in advance that when the question will be put, the authoritarian vote of a Prime Minister who establishes a dictatorship will compel all members of his party to follow him and come back to the fold. Moreover, when the time comes to close the door of the sheep-fold, those people, instead of listening to the voice of truth, will still object.

I am not an expert in medicine, but I am a legislator who has been elected by his constituents and in that capacity, I maintain that we must rely on competent persons, such as those we met in the committees as well as those who lodged some protests—I have submitted to the Minister of Justice more than 8,000 names—those who gave some explanations and who inspired us as they are now inspiring the hon. member for Brandon-Souris to put amendments which would tone down the omnibus bill a little.

But no, under a dictatorship, the tables would be turned and still a government who would claim a majority, could get a legislation passed as it wanted it, without amendment.

Mr. Speaker, as legislators, with our conscience and the courage of our convictions, we must express aloud what the people think but do not say, and if, in this house, the dictatorial muzzle imposed on government members unfortunately prevents the truth from being known, we of the Ralliement créditiste, shall go on fighting to bring it to light. We support unreservedly the amendment moved by a Conservative member.

**Mr. J. A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières):** Mr. Speaker, I only rise to ask your permission to read an editorial from a Catholic French-Canadian newspaper which was founded by the Oblates Fathers. I am referring to *Le Droit* of Monday May 5, 1969, and for the enlightenment of those of our friends who have no opportunity to read this newspaper, I should like to put this article on record. It is entitled: "Le bill omnibus et les créditistes".

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I suspect the hon. member if rising for the same reason that I am rising, that is to remind the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) that at this point the debate should be directed to the amendment. If the editorial deals with the amendment specifically, then it is in order. However, I invite the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

• (8:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening for two long weeks, and in order to explain my position—

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order please. The hon. member for Lotbinière on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, we are very glad that the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) is taking the trouble of reading that stupid editorial. Besides, he will thus show that he is as stupid as the editorial.

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

The hon. member says that I am as stupid as that editorial. But I do not want to have anything in common with the hon. member.

I go on—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I might point out to the house that we could go on at some length dealing with points of order and points of privilege, but I would caution hon. members against using this type of device to prolong discussion. If I may make an observation, this sort of thing does tend to diminish the importance of a point of order or a point of privilege, both of which are important parts of our procedure. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Speaker, after listening for two weeks to a lot of things being said by our colleagues in the Créditistes party who have referred to all kinds of reports, books, booklets and editorials, I should like to put forward something in rebuttal. This amendment proposes that there be various types of doctors on these committees which decide who should be aborted and who should not. To prove their point, these hon. members have referred to a lot of things over the last two weeks. I am now trying to prove my point.

I contend this amendment is not justified because its objective is already met in the bill presented to the house. I want to read two paragraphs to help prove my point. Since they are in French, I will read them in French.

[*Translation*]

Several people will hold the Créditistes' filibuster of Bill C-150, known as the omnibus bill, to be highly virtuous. But we should not make such a mistake when they only pursue political interests—

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I can entertain only one point of order at a time. I recognize the hon. member for Shefford.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that I and my colleagues have stuck to the amendment under consideration which deals especially with the members of the committee, the psychiatrist in particular. I should then ask the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) to stick to the subject and, more especially, to the psychiatrist whom he should consult more often.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I certainly appreciate having the support of the hon. member for Shefford, in this matter but I point out to the house that under our standing orders we are restricted at this point to a specific amendment. I know the hon. member for Trois-Rivières is as much aware of this as I am. If the editorial in question relates to this amendment, I would certainly be pleased to hear him; otherwise I caution him against referring to it because not only would the reading of it be a violation of our standing orders, but it likely would precipitate the sort of situation we would want to avoid.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Speaker, I intend to be as calm and objective as I can be. I intend to follow the fatherly advice that you have just given us, that is not to stray from the subject of the amendment.

I have respectfully listened during twenty minutes to the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe). He said we were against morality.

The other day, one of his colleagues said we were murderers and we did not protest too much.

I would simply like to take a few minutes to read two paragraphs tending to show that if we refuse this amendment, which calls for a psychiatrist, a pediatrician, etc., it is not because we are for vice and against virtue. On the contrary, our attitude is justified, and I want to prove that I am not the only one to say so. If I were, my friends the Créditistes would not believe me. I shall, therefore, be brief. I need only a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker. I quote:

Those who approve this bill know as well as do the Créditistes that morality condemns and will continue to condemn certain practices opposed by Réal Caouette's followers. One needs not be a theologian to understand that. The legislation under study does not condone vice; it states simply that the State will not longer act as the conscience of the citizens.

The Creditistes know very well what is involved and their filibuster seems much more political than virtuous.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**An hon. Member:** The offended virgins.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your kindness.

Please note that we shall allow the hon. member for Trois-Rivières to read any editorial he wishes to read, but we shall read ours and you have not heard the last of them.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I point out to the hon. member for Shefford that the Chair has in the past tried to be as generous as possible within the confines of the rules. I would say that that generosity has been extended in ample measure to the hon. members who represent the Ralliement Créditiste. At the same time, I point out to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières that the editorial, in so far as I have been able to hear it, does not really fall within the four corners of the amendment. I wonder therefore, whether it is not in the interest of the house to forgo it at this point. I have not heard very much of the editorial and I do not want to prejudge the issue, but I would caution him along that line.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Speaker, I fully agree that it is your duty to maintain order here. I would be the last one to waste the time of this house. And to show my co-operation, my full co-operation, I will read only five lines and then I will resume my seat. I will not even make any comment. After that, you will be able to decide whether I was out of order.

I quote:

> The créditistes know very well what is involved and their filibuster seems much more political than virtuous. They want to annoy the government and have the closure imposed to them, in the hope of posing as martyrs in the eyes of the public and gain new supporters.

Mr. Speaker, I resume my seat. That is enough.

**Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska):** Mr. Speaker, I understand your difficulties in applying the rules sometimes, but I will do all that is humanly possible to keep to the amendment now before us.

I do not know if it is through an oversight or through inadvertence but what would normally be likely to make those who will have to tackle the problems arising out of this legislation, proceed more carefully has been overlooked in this bill.

I realize that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, seems fully justified under the circumstances.

It proposes to replace paragraph (f), clause 6 of the bill now being discussed by the following:

> Therapeutic abortion committee for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than four members, two of whom shall be qualified medical practitioners and one a psychiatrist appointed by the board of that hospital, as well as a clergyman, or spiritual advisor where this is requested by the patient for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital.

The mover of this amendment to the clause of the bill, and all those who approve it are showing their wisdom. It is quite in order and logical that all precautions be taken.

The member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) has also moved an amendment along the same lines which was discussed this afternoon. I do not understand at all why the sponsor of the bill is not more understanding when it is a question of taking precautions which he would be quite ready to recommend in another field. It looks as if the clauses of this famous omnibus bill are dictated by some occult influences which try to achieve their nefarious purpose, to amend and to undermine the natural established order.

I do not want to leave the hon. members under the impression that I consider the bill unacceptable, even with this amendment to clause 6. But we could however perceive in the mind of the supporters of this legislation whose inspiration is doubtful that they are not quite deprived of practical sense when it comes to appointing a therapeutic abortion committee, but that they can at least give as many guarantees as possible about the women who would have to undergo an operation in circumstances that are never desirable, but reluctantly accepted in special cases.

The amendment recommends that the committee be made up at least four members. Among the members of the committee, there should be a clergyman or a spiritual advisor at the patient's request. It is not asking too much except that the promotors of the new morality find in this a drawback to the pursuit of their aims.

In any case, I am not influenced at all by the scientific humanists, and I am of the opinion that every precaution should be taken in

order to fully respect the individual freedom of every person.

And since we talked about editorials, I have here one that was published in a Quebec newspaper on April 22, 1969. Here is the last part of it:

> Let us think it over carefully before it is too late. Some observers said recently that England has reached the stage where abortion is practised on request and that people are now campaigning in favour of euthanasia. In Yugoslavia, the National Society of Gynaecology estimated last year that the number of abortions was then greater than the number of births in that country, that is 500,000 abortions against 400,000 births yearly.
>
> They did not believe either when they decided to legalize abortion that this would happen.

That article is signed Roger Bruneau. So, under the circumstances, I support the amendment wholeheartedly.

• (9:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

**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?

**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:** Call in the members.

• (9:20 p.m.)

*And the members having been called in:*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The house will now proceed to a deferred division on motion No. 29 and thence to a division on Motion No. 30. Mr. Laprise moved motion No. 29 which reads:

> That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting



paragraph (f) of subsection 6 of clause 18 on page 44 and substituting therefor:

"(f) "therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than two of qualified medical practitioners and one gynaecologist appointed by the board of that hospital and approved by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the province concerned, for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital."

The house divided on motion No. 29 (Mr. Laprise) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

| | |
|---|---|
| Alexander | Latulippe |
| Beaudoin | MacEwan |
| Bell | MacInnis |
| Bigg | McIntosh |
| Cadieu (Meadow Lake) | McKinley |
| Comeau | Marshall |
| Crouse | Matte |
| Dinsdale | Monteith |
| Dionne | Nesbitt |
| Downey | Paproski |
| Dumont | Peddle |
| Fortin | Rodrigue |
| Gauthier | Rondeau |
| Godin | Rynard |
| Grills | Southam |
| Gundlock | Stewart (Marquette) |
| Horner | Woolliams |
| Howe | Yewchuk—37. |
| Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand) | |

NAYS

Messrs:

| | |
|---|---|
| Aiken | Gendron |
| Allmand | Gervais |
| Badanai | Gibson |
| Barrett | Gilbert |
| Basford | Givens |
| Béchard | Goode |
| Benjamin | Goyer |
| Benson | Gray |
| Blair | Groos |
| Blouin | Guay (St. Boniface) |
| Boulanger | Guay (Lévis) |
| Breau | Guilbault |
| Broadbent | Harding |
| Brown | Hogarth |
| Burton | Howard (Okanagan Boundary) |
| Cafik | Hymmen |
| Cantin | Jamieson |
| Chrétien | Jerome |
| Clermont | Kierans |
| Cobbe | Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) |
| Cullen | Laing |
| Cyr | Lang |
| De Bané | Langlois |
| Douglas (Assiniboia) | Laniel |
| Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands) | Leblanc (Laurier) |
| Dubé | Lefebvre |
| Forest | Legault |
| Foster | |

Lessard (LaSalle)
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Egmont)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mather
Mongrain
Munro
Noël
Nystrom
Olson
Orange
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
Ritchie
Rock
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Saltsman
Serré
Skoberg
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thomson
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Winch—110.

• (9:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

The question is on motion No. 30 (Mr. Dinsdale) which reads as follows:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting paragraph (f) of sub-section 6 in clause 18 on page 44 and substituting therefor:

(f) "therapeutic abortion committee" for any hospital means a committee comprised of not less than four members, two of whom shall be qualified medical practitioners and one a psychiatrist appointed by the board of that hospital, as well as a clergyman, or spiritual advisor where this is requested by the patient for the purpose of considering and determining questions relating to terminations of pregnancy within that hospital.

Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

All those in favour will please say oui.

**Some hon. Members:** Oui.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed please say no.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the nos have it.

Is it the wish of the house that we proceed with the vote without the ringing of the bells?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

*Division*

The house divided on motion No. 30 (Mr. Dinsdale) which was negatived on the following division.

YEAS

Messrs:

Alexander
Beaudoin
Bell
Bigg
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Comeau
Crouse
Dinsdale
Dionne
Downey
Dumont
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Horner
Howe
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Latulippe
MacEwan
MacInnis
McIntosh
McKinley
Marshall
Matte
Monteith
Nesbitt
Paproski
Peddle
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rynard
Southam
Stewart (Marquette)
Woolliams
Yewchuk—38.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Allmand
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Benjamin
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Boulanger
Breau
Broadbent
Brown
Cafik
Cantin
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Cullen
Cyr
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Dubé
Forest
Foster
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gilbert
Givens
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Harding
Hogarth
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Kierans
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Laing
Lang
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Egmont)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mather
Mongrain
Munro
Noël
Nystrom
Olson
Orange
Osler
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Perrault
Pilon

| | |
|---|---|
| Portelance | Thomas (Maisonneuve) |
| Prud'homme | Thomas (Moncton) |
| Reid | Thomson |
| Ritchie | Tolmie |
| Rock | Trudeau |
| Roy (Timmins) | Trudel |
| Roy (Laval) | Turner (London East) |
| Ryan | Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) |
| Saltsman | Wahn |
| Serré | Watson |
| Skoberg | Weatherhead |
| Smith (Saint-Jean) | Whelan |
| Stafford | Whicher |
| Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay) | Whiting |
| St. Pierre | Winch—110. |

• (9:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Comtois). Had I voted, I would have voted in favour of it.

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi)** moved motion No. 33:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the word "female" on lines 28 and 29 on page 42 and the word "female" on lines 3 and 23 on page 43 and the word "female" on line 39 on page 44.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I should like, at the outset, to express my appreciation for the way in which you announced the recent vote, by asking for the "oui" and the "non" in good French. This pleased us very much. It was a very interesting, very intelligent move, but comparable qualities are not to be found in the bill before us.

We are now considering amendment No. 33, moved by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), asking among other things to delete from the bill, the word "female" wherever it appears.

It goes without saying that such a useless expression bears out our opinion: section 18 is ridiculous, and I see that the members of NDP are laughing with me. I am happy to see that for once, they support us.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) proposes to amend paragraphs a), b) and c) of a subclause 4 by deleting the word "female". to find out why we want to delete the expression

[Mr. Speaker.]

"female" from this bill, let us see what it is doing there. I quote paragraph a):

(a) a qualified medical practitioner, other than a member of the therapeutic abortion committee for any hospital, who in good faith uses in an accredited *or approved* hospital any means for the purpose of carrying out his intentions to produce the miscarriage of a female person—

Here then, for the first time in this bill, we find the famous, ridiculous and useless expression "female". I cannot possibly imagine how a person of the male sex could be aborted. Nor can I possibly imagine how a person of the third sex, a member of the club Gimini 1st in Montreal, for instance, could be aborted.

It seems to me that when we speak of abortion it goes without saying, it is simply normal, that a female is involved. The least that could be done perhaps is to mention it once at the beginning of the clause then delete it further on. It strikes me as ridiculous. As the whole bill does, to my mind. I resume my quotation, paragraph b)

(b) a female person who, being pregnant,—

How interesting for a male person to be pregnant. You see how ridiculous this bill is. It seems to me it goes without saying that the expression is pointless. To come back to paragraph b), further on one reads:

—and at a meeting of the committee at which the case of such female person has been reviewed,

Every third line, this redundant word "female" crops up again.

In paragraph (c), we read:

(c) has by certificate in writing stated that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person—

Any pregnancy is necessarily the pregnancy of a female person. I do not understand the wording, but I can venture a guess. Maybe if we search for a reason for the inclusion by the federal government of those words in the bill we will discover that the majority of Liberals in the house do not understand that a male person cannot be pregnant. That may be why it is necessary to dot the i's, especially for the benefit of the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain), and why the expression "female" must be used.

If that is the explanation, we are ready to withdraw the amendment, because we all agree to help enlighten the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, lest his feeble glimmer of understanding flickers out again.

Under Subsection 5(b), it is said, and I quote:

**Mr. Mongrain:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. For once I hear my hon. friend say sensible things and I am inclined to vote with him. But if he upsets me, I shall vote against him.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, we shall take him at his word and stop teasing him, so he will vote with us. I would ask my hon. colleagues to welcome him with a good hand because for the first time in this debate he has said something intelligent.

Mr. Speaker, there remains the same unnecessary expression in paragraph (b) of subsection 5, and I quote:

(b) require a medical practitioner who, in that province, has procured the miscarriage of any female person named—

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) has said, it is horrible and it reflects the nonsense of the clause.

It seems to me that the matter is self-explanatory, because one cannot imagine the pregnancy of a male person.

Mr. Speaker, I see several of my colleagues from all parties in the house are laughing. It is precisely because that clause is ridiculous. My colleague from Abitibi has seen fit to clarify the situation and to strike out from clause 18 that term which in our opinion is superfluous.

Mr. Speaker, let us summarize to see why we are using that term.

In subsection (4) of section 18, it is stated:

—any means for the purpose of carrying out his intention to procure the miscarriage of a female person—

In my opinion, there should be a period after the term "to procure the miscarriage."

• (9:50 p.m.)

Why? As I was saying, it is ridiculous to repeat that expression. If one asks: What is the meaning of to procure the miscarriage of a female person? The meaning is obvious and, from that point of view, both the French and the English language give the expression a precise meaning. In both languages you can find the expression "female person". Then, why after "the miscarriage of a person" use the expression "female person"? It seems to me that it is useless and ridiculous and that that expression could be avoided. It is merely a repetition. It does not clarify anything.

In paragraph (b) one can read and I quote:

(b) a female person who, being pregnant—

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, let us try and imagine that that expression is removed.

There may be another reason why the expression "female person" is used. It may be that the author of the bill did not know exactly what the female sex was, unlike the hon. members who are married, and that it was important for him that it be added.

Mr. Speaker, again it strikes me that the expression female person who, being pregnant, permits a qualified medical practitioner to use. . ." is pure repetition.

One reads further on, and I quote:

—of the committee at which the case of such female person has been reviewed—

However, Mr. Speaker, it is useless to belabour the point. It could be summed up in this way: if the hon. minister wants at all cost to distinguish between the three sexes, that is the male, the female and the other sex, it should be mentioned once at the beginning of the section and, from then on, this useless expressions should be deleted.

The hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Pilon) says that it is against maturity. It may be true; I have the impression that we are simply showing common sense, that we are reasonable. It is ridiculous, it is stupid, and I am almost ashamed to speak of such a thing. It seems to me that that goes without saying.

Mr. Speaker, on that matter of abortion, the bill says: "to procure the miscarriage of a female person" and further, in paragraph (5) (b):

—require a medical practioner who, in that province, has procured the miscarriage of any female person named in a certificate—

We recognize in principle that we cannot logically be in favour of that clause 18, because that is ridiculous, and the word "female" proves it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to show, that we are not the only ones to think along these lines; we sincerely regret that the previous amendments, aiming to appoint specialists on abortion committees, have not been adopted. We do not see why the government is once more refusing the amendment which is proposed by the hon. member for Abitibi.

It may be my turn to read an editorial; it was published by the newspaper *L'Union des Cantons de l'Est* dated Tuesday April 29, 1969. This is a most interesting leading article. I require the attention of the house and particularly of the cabinet members. They will see into what problems they are pushing us headlong, as well as the Canadian population.

They will see that if some editorialists find the position of the Ralliement créditiste ridiculous, there are other, much more able and talented who believe that our position is not only acceptable, but that it should be accepted.

Why have we moved this amendment about the word "female"? It is to show how ridiculous this legislation is, how superficial it is, and how it has been ill conceived, without taking into account standards which should insure the security of the person, of the patient, who will go before a committee.

The editorial writer, Mr. Marcel Rivard, had this to say in *L'Union des Cantons de l'Est* and I quote:

Mr. Trudeau's majority government was carried away by its own momentum of legal liberalization; it is on the verge of taking a false step in passing Bill C-150, better known as the omnibus bill. First of all, this bill is inadmissible on account of its approach—

And I would point out to you that it is a Liberal newspaper. If you check its Liberal membership cards, you will see. I continue the quotation:

First of all, this bill is inadmissible—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that under the Standing Orders he must confine both his own comments and relevant editorials to the specific amendment before the house. I have had to interject on more than one occasion tonight to point this out, and I would invite the attention of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) to this rule.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your kind remarks. Now I should like to come to the aforementioned matter.

Our editorial writer, Mr. Marcel Rivard, had this to say, and I quote:

First of all, that bill is inadmissible by reason of its presentation.

I appreciate that such expressions as "female person" are useless. The bill deals with too many subjects, and here the writer adds—

Mr. Speaker, I would rather continue tomorrow; then we shall be in fine fettle and I should like to show the hon. members on the government side that we, the members of the Ralliement créditiste are indefatigable. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call it ten o'clock.

[Mr. Fortin.]

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. It being ten o'clock, it is my duty to put the questions to be debated.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### NATIONAL PARKS—ALTERATION OF LAND TENURE PRINCIPLE

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, the question I wish to discuss tonight arises from an exchange that took place last April 18 when I inquired of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) whether the same leeway would be granted the western parks, particularly the mountain parks, with respect to the application of the rigid terms of reference of the National Parks Act as was now being negotiated with respect to the proposed new park in Gaspé.

I mentioned particularly those national parks areas that had been established before 1930. That point, of course, refers to the fact that prior to 1930 the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta did not have control of their resources. The minister, very facetiously—and this is one of the characteristics of a great deal of ministerial response—said that the code Napoleon did not apply to the province of Manitoba but if Manitoba wished to adopt it he would give consideration to that desire. Of course, the Minister was begging the question completely, because this matter does not apply to the province of Manitoba at all.

• (10:00 p.m.)

I want to use this occasion to press once again, as I have pressed many times in the house, the urgent need for the expansion of parks of all kinds, including national, recreational and historical. The present administration has now been in office since 1963. During the six year interval they have repeatedly indicated that they are going to proceed with a crash program to meet the urgent recreational demands which inevitably accompany the growth of leisure time and which particularly arise from the process of urbanization that has created a good many of our social problems. These problems, of course, are also

related to our booming and developing tourist industry. There has not been one new national park established during that time. The last national park established was the new park in Nova Scotia called Kejimkujik. I am not sure whether that is the correct pronunciation, and there is no member from Nova Scotia here to guide me in that respect. That park was launched in 1963 under a former administration and it is the last development since that time. A federal-provincial conference on parks was established—and incidentally this arose out of the Resources for Tomorrow conference—so that there might be continuous consultation between the provinces and Ottawa with respect to the jurisdictional problem arising from the provincial control of resources.

This particular group has not been functioning to any great extent. A recreational parks program was set to roll but nothing has happened with respect to recreational parks. We all realize that our national parks are under extreme pressure from a growing demand, and if we are going to preserve our national parks as museums of natural history, we will have to expand. We will have to double the number of parks and supplement park facilities by a very aggressive recreational park program. I will mention here, in particular, the Cyprus Hills park on the Saskatchewan and Alberta border which provides an opportunity to preserve for posterity a typical prairie land area where, as says the old song "Home on the Range", the deer and the antelope play. That land is still available, but urgent action by the federal government is needed.

So far as the mountain parks are concerned, the great difficulty has been the bureaucratic attitude toward the basic rights of the people, particularly in Banff and in Jasper. In 1962 a zoning policy was established and was well accepted by the residents of those two mountain parks as a means of preventing any further encroachment on the wilderness area. Since the new government came into power, there have been repeated attacks on the residents of these mountain parks, describing them as greedy, self-seeking despoilers of nature and resources. That, of course, is hardly designed to win friends and influence people. From my knowledge of these people I can say that they are just as anxious as are Canadians elsewhere to preserve Canada's natural heritage.

We need more parks. We need them in Quebec, where there are no national parks, and we need them in Ontario where there are no national parks worth mentioning. Members on this side of the house are not the only ones to take issue with the government's neglect in this regard, and also with its bureaucratic approach. The Edmonton *Journal* of April 10 had this to say about national parks:

> Edmonton Strathcona MP Dr. Hu Harries returned from Jasper Wednesday "appalled" at the conditions under which Jasper Park residents and businessmen must live and operate.
>
> He said he found townsite businessmen "insecure and fearful of the government bureaucracy", which he termed "quite an unreasonable oppression".
>
> Dr. Harries, a Liberal MP, spoke to a Jasper Chamber of Commerce meeting Tuesday night and told his large audience national park residents "should go to Ottawa to present their case at every possible opportunity".

The hon. member from the Rocky Mountain constituency (Mr. Sulatycky) also made the same accusation about the bureaucratic attitude of the government toward the fundamental rights of these people. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) recently said that the government has taken control of the decision making process from the bureaucrats. Here is an opportunity to demonstrate that fact. I say the government should accept its responsibility in this matter.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised to see that the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) did not actually deal with the problem he raised in the House of Commons, on April 18, 1969, when he made remarks as to the possible establishment of a national park in the Forillon peninsula, in Quebec. I would have liked to have his opinion on this. It would have been very useful for the matter of clarifying the debate, to know how he stands—

[*English*]

**Mr. Dinsdale:** That was my last statement. I am all for it.

**Mr. Chrétien:** Good.

[*Translation*]

Then if he agrees with that, I thank him for his support and must give him the assurance we are making progress at this stage.

The Quebec Minister of Tourism will be in Ottawa tomorrow and I hope we come to an agreement as to the establishment of a national park in the province of Quebec,

which will complete the series of national parks we have created in Canada. Unfortunately the province of Quebec is not in on this.

The hon. member made a remark to the effect that no new national parks have been established in Canada since 1963. It may be true, but I am happy to tell him we are negotiating about the establishment of such parks in many parts of Canada, and particularly in Quebec.

There will be another national park in New Brunswick.

He has heard members of his own party ask me to create another park in Newfoundland.

We are in the process of negotiating with the western provinces, especially with Manitoba, to have another national park.

Negotiations are under way with Saskatchewan and Alberta with a view to creating a truly Prairies park.

There is some controversy, at the present time, with regard to the possibility of having national parks in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories.

To my mind, it is imperative to have some immediately in those areas, which are extremely vast. The natural sites are absolutely fantastic and we should not miss the opportunity of setting aside, for future generations, sizeable areas for conservation programs.

I know many Canadians are interested in that policy. I can assure the hon. member that we hope, within the next few months, to have three, four or perhaps five new national parks in Canada. A few months ago, I made a speech in which I said that in the next 25 years we should have the courage and the foresight to create at least 30 to 40 new national parks in Canada.

I thank the hon. member for his remarks.

[*English*]

## NATIONAL DEFENCE—A.B.M. SYSTEM—MISSILE SITE IN MICHIGAN AREA

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, my question in the House of Commons on Wednesday, April 23, was to the Minister of National Defence and involved an inquiry as to the location of the anti-ballistic missile site for the Michigan-Ohio area of the United States. As you are aware, a large part of northern Ontario is immediately adjacent to the upper peninsula of the state of Michigan.



Indeed, in the past we have become accustomed to large United States defence installations being located immediately adjacent to the Canadian border. This is because the Sault Ste. Marie locks are one of the most important shipping canals in North America, handling more tonnage per year than the Panama or Suez canals.

The strategic importance of Sault Ste. Marie in wartime cannot be over-estimated because of the large quantities of iron ore which are shipped from the Lake Superior area into the blast furnaces of Cleveland and other points in the United States. Historically, Camp Lucas and the U.S. forces located there have protected these locks. This was graphically illustrated in the second world war when large barrage balloons hung over the Sault Ste. Marie valley on both sides of the Canada-United States border. During the past several years there has been located at Raco, a place west of Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan and in the upper peninsula a Bomarc missile site which, I suggest, belongs to the age of nuclear bombers. Its equivalent in the age of intercontinental ballistic missiles is the A.B.M. system.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Within the past year it was announced that Kincheloe Air Force Base, located 20 miles south of the Canada-U.S. border in Michigan, would be phased out. This base was not only a strategic air command base but served as a base for a fighter squadron also. The economic repercussions of closing this base, on which thousands of men were employed, could constitute a serious economic set-back for Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan. It would not surprise me if some pressure were brought to bear to put an A.B.M. site at Kincheloe Air Force Base in order to restore the economic fortunes of Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan.

Having made these few remarks about the history of the area, Mr. Speaker, I submit that unquestionably this area could be very important strategically in time of war. When the decision to establish the A.B.M. system was made by President Nixon two locations, including Malmstrom Air Force Base and Grand Forks Air Force Base, were specified in the mid-west; however, the exact location of the base in the Michigan-Ohio area has not been specified. Considering the past tendency to locate defence bases in the vicinity of Sault Ste. Marie, it is natural to suspect that this site may be chosen as well for the A.B.M. system.

Considerable concern has been expressed in western Canada about the effects of radioactive fall out from nuclear warheads of A.B.M. system missiles intercepting in-coming I.C.B.Ms. Naturally, I share this concern with the other people from Ontario, especially if an A.B.M. site is to be located in upper Michigan. I am aware that our defence department has had secret consultations and briefings with the United States department. My question is, where is the A.B.M. site for the Michigan-Ohio area to be located?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), perhaps it might be well to read to him some words President Nixon spoke when he asked Congress on March 14 to deploy a modified ballistic missile defence system. In reviewing the various options open to him he said, in part:

> To begin a measured construction of an active defence of our retaliatory forces.

He went on to say:

> We will provide for local defence of selected Minuteman missile sites and an area defence designed to protect our bomber bases and our command and control authorities.

So far as the Department of National Defence is aware, the United States authorities intend to proceed with two Safeguard sites: one at Great Falls, Montana and the other at Grand Forks, North Dakota.

In announcing this Safeguard system President Nixon said:

> The modified system has been designed so that its defensive intent is unmistakeable. It will be implemented not according to some fixed, theoretical schedule, but in a manner clearly related to our periodic analysis of the threat. The first deployment covers two missile sites; the first of these will not be completed before 1973.

## SECURITY GUARDS—NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD—VANCOUVER

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, my question this evening is based on the question I asked earlier during the oral question period. May I repeat the question? I asked:

> —In view of the decision of the National Harbours Board in Vancouver to appoint a special force to police the Port of Vancouver consisting of 15 or 20 trained peace officers under a retired mounties as chief, replacing the existing National Harbours Board force of non-professional security guards, will the minister inform the house as to the position of employment of the present security guards, most of whom are war veterans of 17 years' service?



I thought the question was urgent when I asked it and I think it still is. It is for this reason I am raising it now.

May I draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that Captain Johnson, the Manager of the Vancouver Harbour Commission, stated that the Vancouver port has a reputation for a low pilferage and damage rate. This reputation is the result of the security guard system of the Vancouver Harbour Board. Someone has now decided to get rid of the security guard system and establish a special police force to be headed by a recently retired R.C.M.P. officer. There is no need for a special police force because, the security guards have built up a wonderful reputation. However, a policy decision has been made which I understand will involve the employment of between 15 and 20 trained police officers. They will replace an existing N.H.B. force of approximately 14 non-professional security guards. I am interested in knowing why this policy change is necessary in Vancouver. I am particularly concerned with the position of the security guards to be replaced.

It is my understanding that not one of the security guards can meet the age requirement for re-employment on the new police force. The majority of the security guards are war veterans, some having up to 17 years service with the Vancouver N.H.B. security force. I hope there is some degree of sentimentality, in the Liberal government. I insist on having an answer from the minister and may I say how proud I am to see him here personally to answer a question on his first day as Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson). I insist on having an answer concerning the provision being made for the employment or security of those employed as security guards. They have served their country in war and peace and are now being displaced as a result of a change in government policy.

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I can well understand and appreciate the concern of the hon. member. I want to assure him at the outset that I will make a thorough investigation. I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that there has not been time since he raised this matter this afternoon for me to get a full briefing. I have had an opportunity to discuss it in a general way with officials of the department.

The information I received is that this is not a change of policy that is confined to the port of Vancouver. It is a part of a national

plan. Changes with regard to security regulations are being made at a number of ports. In so far as the port of Vancouver is concerned, the information I have received is that recruiting of the new force is not yet completed. Every opportunity will be given to members of the existing force to see if they can qualify. If my hon. friend is correct that the qualifications as laid down are such as to prohibit the former members from engaging in these positions I shall be more than pleased to see if there is some other arrangement we can make, some way we can ensure that their employment is continued is some form, or perhaps that alternative jobs are found for them.

• (10:20 p.m.)

I am sufficiently sympathetic, Mr. Speaker, to the needs of war veterans and of men who have punched in a great many years of service to assure my hon. friend that I will do all I can. I hope I can give him a reasonably satisfactory answer within a comparatively short time.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10:23 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, May 6, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

## PRIVILEGE

### MR. BURTON—FAILURE TO GIVE REASONS FOR WITHHOLDING INFORMATION IN RETURN RESPECTING DAMP GRAIN

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting all members of the House of Commons. In doing so I wish to make specific reference to a motion for papers moved by myself on March 4 and approved on that date, and tabled in the House of Commons on Friday, May 2. I did not raise this matter yesterday, as transportation difficulties prevented me from returning at the appropriate time.

On March 4 this motion, placed on the order paper by myself and asking for a copy of correspondence between the government of Saskatchewan and the government of Canada with respect to the processing of damp and tough grain in Saskatchewan and the transportation of grain during the period of October 1, 1968 and January 31, 1969 inclusive, was called for consideration. The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Forest) told the house that this notice of motion was acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations concerning privileged papers and authorization of the government authorities concerned. Subject to these reservations or conditions the motion was adopted.

I think all members in this house will recognize that there are privileged papers from time to time which the government may wish to reserve, although there may be disagreement on specific cases from time to time. There is also no question, with respect to correspondence between the government of Canada and other government authorities, that authorization must be obtained for the tabling of such correspondence. However, Mr. Speaker, when these papers were tabled in the House of Commons on May 2 there was no indication whether any documents had been reserved either because they were considered privileged or because authorization had been refused by the other government authority. I have noted this practice on other motions for papers which I have submitted in this session, and I am certain that the same thing has happened to other members.

The point that I wish to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is that, in my view, members have a right to know whether documents have been reserved for either one of the reasons already noted. I submit that consideration be given to making provision for reporting of this particular matter when papers are tabled in the House of Commons. I hope that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) will give this matter his attention in order that the appropriate steps might be initiated.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

Sixth report of standing committee on external affairs and national defence—Mr. Wahn.

### IMMIGRATION

#### ALLEGED SECRET GUIDELINES NEGATING EFFECTIVENESS OF REGULATIONS CONCERNING U.S. DESERTERS—TABLING OF PRESS RELEASE

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I promised the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) that I would table copies of a press release which I issued, and with the leave of the house I should like to do that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### TRADE

#### WHEAT—SALE BY FRANCE AT CANTON FAIR—PRESENCE OF CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. May I ask him whether the minister intends today to

answer the questions which were turned aside yesterday by the Prime Minister concerning the setbacks suffered by Canada in international grain markets? In particular I direct his attention and replies to the questions relating to the loss of the sale of some 800,000 tons of wheat apparently secured by France in dealing with Mainland China. Would he also explain why Canada apparently was not represented at the China Spring Fair in Canton where this sale seems to have been announced?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that in one swoop I can answer all the questions to which oblique reference was made by the Leader of the Opposition. But I will try to deal with one or two.

First of all may I assure hon. members that the government of Canada, through a member of the Trade Commission Service, was in fact represented at the fair in question. I would also like to assure hon. members that the discussions between the Canadian Wheat Board and the Chinese authorities are in fact going on at all times, that there is very close contact for specific discussions at all times for the sale of wheat by Canada to China, and that our interests in that regard are being very well protected by the Canadian Wheat Board.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, the minister of course did not explain why Canada missed this sale, but could he tell the house the rank of the official who represented Canada at this fair?

**Mr. Lang:** I do not have the specific rank of the official, Mr. Speaker, but I shall be glad to obtain it. The Leader of the Opposition said I did not say anything about this particular sale. Of course sales by France to China are not by any means new. They have been going on ever since 1961. Australia, Canada and France have been prime suppliers of wheat to China during that time, and the fact of a particular sale by France to China does not affect sales of wheat by Canada to China.

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, in my original question addressed to the Prime Minister yesterday I asked whether the acting minister would take the opportunity on motions today, 24 hours later, to give information concerning why Canada let this specific order slip through her fingers. The minister has had 24 hours in which to obtain the information: I ask him to give me information now. If the Canadian Wheat Board, as he has said, is in constant touch with these matters they must have known several days ago why we lost the sale, and how much.



**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, I believe I have really covered the situation of sales, but I regret indeed not having responded in exactly the way the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings asked his question, if in fact the other day he managed one that was in order.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Hees:** Mr. Speaker, the minister obviously is following the example of the Prime Minister in getting smart in his answers.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Hees:** I would ask him now to get that information and would he please report tomorrow on the question I asked yesterday.

[*Later:*]

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister see that the minister answers tomorrow the question he assured me would be answered today; would he do that? Come on; you can stand up.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## WHEAT—SALES BY FRANCE TO MAINLAND CHINA BELOW I.G.A. PRICE

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister without Portfolio. Can he tell us at how much below the International Grains Arrangement price was the wheat offered that was sold by France to China, and has the government protested officially to France or to those officials who are responsible for administering the International Grains Arrangement?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, precise details on the sale to France from China have not been divulged. When these details are received by us we will certainly look at them in the light of the collective undertaking by exporters to strengthen international wheat prices, and we will take any appropriate action necessary to see that I.G.A. prices are implemented.

**Mr. Gleave:** As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us whether

at present or in the very immediate future talks are or will be held between the signatories to the International Grains Arrangement so that this international agreement will be an effective instrument instead of a piece of paper?

**Mr. Lang:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The exporters meeting was held some time ago, and just very recently the prices review committee met. I am happy to tell hon. members that there was an expression of determination on all sides to work towards the maintenance of the I.G.A., and specifically to take strong action to examine those devices and techniques which had made it difficult to judge the exact prices being charged at times by the various participants.

WHEAT—CRUSADE FOR SALE OF SURPLUS

**Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Is he taking any cognizance of the many suggestions emanating from this chamber that he organize a crusade immediately to sell wheat or other surpluses anywhere in the world.

## GRAIN

VANCOUVER—ARRIVAL AT PORT OF GRADES IN LESSER DEMAND

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a further supplementary question, related to the suggestion made by the minister in Vancouver yesterday that the port of Vancouver is headed for a new grains tie up. Will the minister tell the house what is being done to avoid that further difficulty confronting the farmers of western Canada?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Vancouver situation again developed into a problem with the arrival at Vancouver of grades and types of wheat which were not as much in demand as the types for which ships were in fact waiting. This resulted in large measure because of the failure of the authorities in loading box cars to load into those cars the appropriate wheat, and the Wheat Board has taken strong action in the form of indicating to the elevator companies involved that storage will not be paid on wheat which arrives there improperly when contrary orders were in the hands of the company.

This has been done in order to correct the situation and assure that the wheat which the Board wants to arrive will arrive at the proper time.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister if he would really give us some solid bit of information and report to the house concerning who did represent Canada at the Canton Fair? Would he also say whether he meant to indicate that the railways had shipped to Vancouver grain of a different sort than that which had been ordered or requested.

**Mr. Lang:** I have indicated to the hon. member that I will do as he asks in respect of the first part of his question. The railways of course carried the grain to Vancouver which was carried there. The actual placing of the grain in the box cars is done by the local elevator agent, in accordance with orders supplied to the local agent. In many cases those orders were not filled accurately, with the proper grain going in the cars.

VANCOUVER—REPORTED SHORTAGE OF WHEAT FOR SHIPMENT

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of the acting minister. I appreciate the background information he gave about the situation. I should like to ask the minister what immediate and remedial action is being taken to make up the shortage in respect of the 4½ million bushels of No. 2 Northern which is required at the port of Vancouver.

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** I believe I did cover that as well. The Canadian Wheat Board has issued the appropriate orders to the elevator companies this week and has taken steps to ensure that those orders will be followed so that the cars which go to Vancouver from the local elevators will carry the required wheat.

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF TRANSPORT CONTROLLER

**Mr. George Muir (Lisgar):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon. In view of the fact that we are now experiencing our second tangled grain mess in Vancouver is the government, even at this late date, considering appointing a transport controller who could iron out these situations?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** No, Mr. Speaker. Indeed on the last occasion when the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce was asked about this he said he himself would act as the controller. I am happy to note that the tie-up was cleared away somewhat faster than many members opposite thought was possible. I am sure the matter is well in hand under the direction of the Canadian Wheat Board. Under their direction as well there are under way certain experimental systems of handling grain which may in the long run improve the handling of our grain between the local elevator companies and Vancouver.

WHEAT—LOWER GRADES SUPPLIED BY ELEVATORS

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister without Portfolio could advise the house what proportion of this grain that was shipped by the elevator companies was not of the grade ordered, indicating whether it was of a grade lower than 2 Northern, and whether it was damp or tough?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation, the grain in demand is No. 2 and the grain shipped in excess was No. 4.

## HOUSING

REQUEST FOR GUIDELINES ON URBAN RENEWAL

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the new minister in charge of housing. If I may I should like to congratulate him warmly on his appointment and express the hope that I will be able to congratulate him on his performance.

Is the minister in a position to inform the house when we may expect to receive guidelines in respect of the public housing and urban renewal policy of his department or the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, as I imagine the hon. member would expect, I am not in a position to give him a precise date in that regard. I have spent the last several hours in briefing sessions and I hope to be able to be a little more definitive on these matters in a few days. I am very conscious of the need for this kind of decision to be made and enunciated very quickly.

[Mr. Muir (Lisgar).]

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, while the minister was being briefed on this matter did he have an opportunity to discuss the following matter and, if not, will he consider it: I refer to the question of a supplementary estimate to add to funds available for public housing and urban renewal, since only the availability of finances can make this program effective?

**Mr. Andras:** I am conscious of the representations the hon. member has made.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, may I express the hope that the minister will not be influenced to a great extent by the unimportance the Prime Minister apparently attaches to these problems.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** I wish to ask a supplementary question of the minister.

According to what the Prime Minister said last Sunday on the program "Deux plus un", there is no housing crisis in Canada. Would the minister responsible for housing tell us whether the government is thinking of drafting a bill on housing, which would allow peoples in the lower income group, that is those who earn $5,000 to $6,000 a year, to buy a house according to the plan suggested by the minister?

[*English*]

**Mr. Andras:** Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments to the Housing Act are now on the order paper. I hope we will be able to deal with those in the house and refer them to the committee very shortly. At that time and following then I hope the policy answers the hon. member is seeking will be articulated.

POSSIBILITY OF MEETING WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I should also like to congratulate the minister responsible for housing, and I hope that we will have further dialogue. In view of the fact the Canadian Welfare Council has indicated to the Prime Minister that opportunities remain largely untested for federal initiative in promoting a socially just housing program in partnership with the provinces, can the minister now state wher

he will be meeting with provincial ministers responsible for housing?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, I will be meeting with provincial ministers responsible for housing as soon as time permits. In fact, I have had one or two phone calls, and some appointments are in process of being set up.

## THE MINISTRY

### REQUEST FOR MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my supplementary question to the Prime Minister. As I understand it, a telegram was sent to the Prime Minister expressing an interest in the establishment of a ministry of housing and urban development. In view of the fact the Prime Minister has placed housing in charge of the Minister without Portfolio, can he now indicate whether he is considering the establishment of a separate ministry of housing and urban development?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, no steps are being considered beyond the ones that were announced yesterday.

[*Translation*]

## NATIONAL PARKS

### GASPÉ—AGREEMENT BETWEEN PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

**Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Could he tell us wether he has found some new machinery for consultation which could lead to an agreement with the province of Quebec for the development of a national park in the Forillon peninsula?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, the Quebec Minister of Tourism, Fish and Game called on me this morning. We discussed this matter and I hope that we will find a solution in the best interest of the people of Gaspé.

**Mr. Cyr:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Does the minister think that a 99-year agreement could be concluded before May 15 as requested?



**Mr. Chrétien:** I am very confident, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** During the course of this meeting, did the Minister of Tourism repeat the words heard on the program "Les Couche-Tard" Saturday night to the effect that the minister had gone wrong in becoming a Liberal?

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly have not—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Chrétien:** —gone wrong enough to become a Créditiste.

[*English*]

## AIR CANADA

### STRIKE OF MECHANICS—INQUIRY AS TO LEGISLATION TO END DISPUTE

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister and has to do with the Air Canada strike which is now in its third week. In view of the right hon. gentleman's statement that the offer of settlement made to the union, or to the workers, was a most generous one, will the Prime Minister say whether following the course taken by previous administrations the government is now prepared, in the interest of the Canadian people who are sometimes forgotten during these strikes, to introduce legislation to parliament to end the strike?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** No, Mr. Speaker, we are not considering such steps. I believe we have stated on other occasions what the approach of the government was: that so long as the process of free collective bargaining has not completely broken down, and so long as there is no national emergency which calls for government intervention, we prefer to allow the process of free collective bargaining to proceed.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** In view of the fact that both sides, according to radio reports, are not even meeting, what does the Prime Minister mean by saying "so long as the processes of negotiation or collective bargaining are continued"?

**Mr. Trudeau:** As everyone knows, Mr. Speaker, during strikes there are periods when there are no meetings, and sometimes this is part of the process of negotiation.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** It is time the Canadian people were thought about.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGED INVESTIGATION INTO SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHING

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister which is prompted by a shocking and disturbing Canadian Press report of a visit by members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to at least one United Church in Otawa for the purpose of interrogating the clergy on the content of a Sunday school program devoted to an understanding of Mainland China, and the pupils' response thereto. Can the Prime Minister advise whether the R.C.M.P. now have a place in the Sunday schools of the nation; and if so, are the Presbyterians next?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member may have a related question, but I doubt that his supplementary question is acceptable.

**Mr. Fairweather:** Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent question to the Prime Minister. In view of the negotiations Canada will be conducting in Stockholm to recognize the People's Republic of China, will the information to be gathered in this exercise in participatory democracy with children be communicated to the Secretary of State for External Affairs as a possible aid to such negotiations?

## HOUSING

REQUEST FOR PRIORITY IN DEBATE

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing and is supplementary to exchanges of a few minutes ago. In view of the minister's expressed hope that the bill to amend the National Housing Act will be dealt with soon, may I ask him whether he will make representations to the government house leader that this be the next item of business before the house, after we have finished with the Criminal Code?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, I have been in consultation with the house leader. We are now working out the timetable, and I am sure he will be advising all hon. members about it shortly.



INCOMES REQUIRED TO PURCHASE HOMES

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** A supplementary question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. Will the minister undertake to make a statement reporting to the house the average market price of the 200,000 houses of which the Prime Minister is so proud, with a breakdown of the incomes required to buy houses in each of these brackets?

[*Translation*]

## EXTERNAL AID

RATE OF INTEREST ON LOAN TO INDIA

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

Could the minister tell the house, following the announcement that a loan of $30 million is to be granted to India, what will be the terms and conditions of such loan and, in particular, what interest rate will apply thereto?

[*English*]

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I do not have the information at hand. I would like to take the question as notice.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dumont:** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance.

With respect to the loan granted to Jamaica last week, could the minister tell us what arrangements were arrived at or what terms were agreed to?

**Mr. Speaker:** I suggest both the hon. member's original question and supplementary question call for technical and statistical data and should normally be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

## AIR TRANSPORT

PILOT FATIGUE CONSEQUENT UPON AIR CANADA STRIKE

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. I have not had an opportunity in the house to congratulate him on his appointment until now, so I should like to extend my congratulations and express the hope that he will live

up to the expectations which I believe all members of the house have for him.

Last Friday the hon. member for York South questioned the Acting Minister of Transport concerning the extension of flying hours permitted to pilots by the Department of Transport. At that time the acting minister undertook to answer the question. My question to the minister is whether pilots in Canada have been allowed extensions of monthly duty hours as a result of the Air Canada strike.

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, the answer is no, there have been no applications to the department for any change in the maximum hours which form part of the current regulations.

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Transport. Last Friday the Acting Minister of Transport in reply to my question suggested that it was the Canadian Transport Commission that dealt with this matter. Is this so, and if so can the minister tell us that the commission has not received any such applications?

**Mr. Jamieson:** To be honest, I am not quite certain myself whether it is the C.T.C. or a group within the Department of Transport. However, I am satisfied that no group that has the necessary authorization to extend hours has done so.

AIR CANADA STRIKE—EXTENSION OF CANADIAN PACIFIC AIRLINES FRANCHISE

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the length of the strike of Air Canada, in regard to which nothing is being done, is the government considering extending the franchise and giving more routes to Canadian Pacific Airlines at this time?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** I believe that the information on that has been given to the house on a number of occasions. Any air line is quite free to make application to the Canadian Transport Commission for an extension of routes during the period of the strike, and these applications will be entertained.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I would ask then whether the minister has received any applications from C.P.A. for a permanent extension. I am not merely referring to temporary extensions.



**Mr. Jamieson:** As an hon. member said, this is a different kettle of fish, and I will be glad to look into it.

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Transport. Will the minister cause to be re-examined the question of permitting a second coast to coast carrier to operate east of Montreal?

**Mr. Jamieson:** The answer is the same as the one I gave to the hon. member for Calgary North.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Failing this, would the minister and the government give consideration to issuing a D.F.C. to Canadians who have used third class carriers?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder whether hon. members do not think we might go on to another subject. I see many hon. members are anxious to ask questions. I hope that the next supplementary question is one that can be accepted by the Chair.

SUGGESTED HALIFAX LANDING TO ACCOMMODATE ATLANTIC AREA PASSENGERS

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** I did not extend congratulations in the house to the minister on his appointment, nor have I done so outside the house, so I will not say anything further on this matter at this time. I should like to direct a question to the minister not in regard to C.P.A. but in reference to a question which was directed to the Acting Minister of Transport last Tuesday. If the minister does not have an answer today perhaps he could take it as notice. My question relates to overseas carriers flying over Halifax. Has there been any effort made by C.T.C. or any applications made by these carriers for permission to land in Halifax, now that they are taking off from Montreal and by-passing the east?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand that invitations have been given to overseas carriers, or carriers other than Air Canada, that if they wish to apply for landing rights in eastern Canada the C.T.C. will give sympathetic consideration to such applications. Subsequently I asked today that representation be made to such carriers asking that they land not only in Halifax but also in Gander, Newfoundland.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

POSSIBLE STRIKE OF CANADIAN PACIFIC AIRLINES MACHINISTS

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, but first of all I should like to congratulate the minister on joining one of the two best departments in the government. My question is: In view of the fact that there is a distinct possibility of the machinists of Canadian Pacific Airlines also going on strike, has he been in touch with his colleague, the Minister of Labour, urging him to set up a conciliation board or a conciliator to avoid such a possible catastrophe?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** I do not think it should be my initiative to suggest what the Minister of Labour should do. He is perfectly capable of taking care of himself in these matters and I have no doubt he will do whatever is necessary.

**Mr. Hees:** He did not get on too well with the strike he is trying to handle now.

## HIGHWAY SAFETY

FEDERAL ACTION TO REDUCE FATALITIES

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** I should like to offer the Minister of Transport my supplementary compliments on his appointment, and direct a question to him in his capacity as the minister reporting on road and vehicle safety. Considering the very heavy casualties and the warlike toll taken every week on our highways, would the minister consider making an early statement on what federal action will be taken to curtail or reduce this heavy toll of life on the highways?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Yes, at the appropriate time. As my hon. friend probably knows, studies are going on within a special branch of the Department of Transport, as well as consultations with the provinces. Draft legislation is being prepared, and when all of these elements have been brought together I will be pleased to consider whether the appropriate procedure will be to bring it before the house in a statement made in the house, or whether it might not be preferable to refer it to a committee.

## INCOME TAX

APPLICATION TO OLD AGE PENSIONERS

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance based on the problem of the old age

[Mr. Jamieson.]

pensioner who has been granted supplemental benefits on a means test and who finds himself having to pay income tax on his meagre pittance, as a result of which he loses his free hospitalization and half of his OMSIP premium—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Would the hon. member ask his question.

**Mr. Rynard:** —would the minister consider the abolition of this iniquitous tax imposed on people who are on welfare?

[*Later:*]

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I consider this a very urgent problem and I would like to discuss it at ten o'clock.

[*Translation*]

## FITNESS AND AMATEUR SPORTS ACT

DELAY IN QUEBEC PARTICIPATION

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

I would like to know whether during the visit of the minister Mr. Loubier in the national capital, the representatives of both governments have concluded an agreement to promote amateur sport and recreational centres?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I understand, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Loubier had some discussions either with the minister or with the officials of his department today. I could not say if both ministers met, but I can add that some negotiations have been launched in this connection by the representatives of both governments.

[*English*]

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MAINLAND CHINA—CANADIAN RECOGNITION TO PROMOTE TRADE

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** I have a question for the Prime Minister. In order to improve the possibility of grain sales to China, will the government of Canada now press toward immediate recognition of mainland China and establish diplomatic relations?

## INDUSTRY

DEVCO—COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF MINERS

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister and ask him

whether he has received any urgent communications from the United Mine Workers with respect to the meeting held last week with the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** No, Mr. Speaker, I have received no communication from the mine workers beyond those on which I commented in the house a few days ago.

**Mr. MacInnis:** Has the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion received any urgent communications? I ask this question today primarily because the urgency of any question cannot be dictated by the presence or absence of any minister in the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. MacInnis:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have been trying to follow up this very urgent matter with the government and I have asked questions in respect of this matter only to receive off-the-cuff and snide answers from the Prime Minister.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. MacInnis:** I think the situation of the Cape Breton miners which has been imposed by a Crown Corporation deserves the attention of and some answers from this government. After all, it was the Prime Minister's idea to promote a just society.

## GRAIN

WHEAT—APPLICATION OF PENALTIES FOR SHIPMENTS OF IMPROPER GRADE

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** I wish to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. He may already have given an answer to it, and I might have misunderstood him. In his earlier answer the minister mentioned penalties whereby payments for storage of grain shipments of improper grade would not be made. Are these penalties now to apply to the shipments already made ,or are they to apply to any shipments that might be made in the future? Have farmers only been given a warning, or will the penalties be imposed on previous shipments? Secondly, can the minister advise the house whether he has any information on the number of carloads of No. 2 Northern now on track or en route to Vancouver?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** I do not have the specific information for which the hon. member asks but I shall be glad to obtain it for him.

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

MEXICO—APPLICATION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS CONVENTION ACT

**Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development related to the conference recently held with the Indian people in Ottawa. Has the minister taken part in an informal discussion with officials of the government of Mexico concerning the Migratory Birds Convention Act?

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder if this is not a question which might well be debated at the time of adjournment.

[*Translation*]

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

CONSULTATION WITH TEACHERS OVERSEAS BEFORE CONTRACT CHANGE

**Mr. Gaétan-J. Serré (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of National Defence.

[*English*]

In view of the telegram received this morning from the Ontario Teachers Federation requesting further consultation on terms of agreement covering overseas teachers, will the minister advise the house whether such consultation is under way and, if so, what progress has been made?

**Hon. Leo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** I think I should explain to the house that the contract for teachers for the year 1969-70 has already been approved by the Department of National Defence. However I have had a request from members for a consultation in connection with the next contract, and I undertake to have these consultations whenever the time is ripe.

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** I would ask the minister whether the changes in the contract were made without consultation with the Canadian Teachers Federation, which has been designated as the national organ for the teachers of Canada. If the answer is in the affirmative, why should the Government of Canada refuse to deal with the federation on questions concerning salary and other terms of teachers' contracts?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** First of all, I think we should get together as to the date of the contract. What Mr. Nason of the Teachers Federation was talking about at the press conference was the 1967 contract. That contract provided for no change in the 1968 contract and there was therefore no room for discussion.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I would join in the applause, but the answer does not cover the situation. The contract which the minister mentioned—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Would the right hon. gentleman ask his question?

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The question I ask the minister is: Why should the government of Canada refuse to deal with the Teachers Federation? Why was it not consulted?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** For the simple reason that there are two aspects involved in this situation— an agreement and a contract. The contract is one between the school boards who lend the teachers, the Department of National Defence and the teachers themselves. We agree that on general conditions of work, or general conditions of the contract, or questions concerning over-all agreements we should consult with the Teachers Federation, and this is what I have just undertaken to do.

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** A supplementary question. If teachers working for the department have a grievance, to whom do they look for redress?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** A teacher working for the department is assimilated in the rank of officer, and he has the same recourse as an officer. If he has a grievance he has the right to go before a board of inquiry, just as an officer has.

## SHIPPING

### SALVAGE OF TUG "EMERALD STRAITS"

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the privilege of addressing a question to the Minister of Transport about the sunken tug *Emerald Straits*. Today I received information that seamen on the Pacific coast may decline to man steel tugs of the same design as that of the *Emerald Straits*, which sunk recently, unless action is taken to rectify apparent construction defects. Can the minister tell us whether a decision will be made to salvage the tug in order to find out the reason for her sinking, and possibly to recover the bodies of the men who drowned?



**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Following the hon. member's question yesterday I asked for information on this matter and I hope I shall be able to provide it before the end of this week.

## AGRICULTURE

### POTATOES—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON ASSISTANCE TO P.E.I. GROWERS

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont):** I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, arising from disturbing reports over the last few days as to the number of farm auctions and disposals in Prince Edward Island. Has the minister initiated inquiries in Prince Edward Island as to the number of potato growers who, because of deplorable prices in the industry, will be prevented from planting this season, and would he tell us whether certain steps may be taken to alleviate this situation?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** We have not initiated a survey to gather the information in those precise terms but we are nevertheless aware of the economic and social problems associated with low potato prices.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** Since the industry is the backbone of the economy in Prince Edward Island, will the minister agree to make such inquiries, in order that the full extent of the problem might be appreciated, and possible action taken?

**Mr. Olson:** I am not sure I should agree at a moment's notice to undertake a survey such as the hon. member has outlined. However, the department and the government are deeply interested in this problem and we have held a number of meetings in an attempt to find some way of meeting this difficulty which recurs all too often in connection with the marketing of potatoes.

[*Translation*]

## INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

According to Mr. Nadeau, a Montreal newspaperman, who says he is well-informed, there has been a Trudeau-Caouette agreement to fight Quebec separatists. As I am not aware of the terms of such an agreement, is the Prime Minister in a position to tell us about it?

## AIRPORTS

STE. SCHOLASTIQUE—ANNOUNCEMENT OF FINAL CHOICE OF LOCATION

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question.

As some municipalities of the north shore of Quebec will be meeting tonight to discuss the famous location of the airport, and as some Quebecers are still hoping for a reversal of the original decision, would the Prime Minister, in the interest of all those who wish to take a constructive attitude towards this project, state clearly whether the choice of Ste. Scholastique is a final one.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker it has been stated several times by members of the cabinet, that the choice of this site was final and I need say only that the decision was the result of very long and numerous consultations with the authorities of the province and of the City of Montreal.

[*English*]

## TRANSPORT

ACTION ON MEASURE RESPECTING MARITIME FREIGHT RATES

**Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton):** My question is directed to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as leader of the house. Now that one of the few men opposite who understands maritime problems has been appointed Minister of Transport, will the hon. gentleman assure the house that this breakthrough will be followed by calling as the next order of business Bill C-182 to amend the Maritime Freight Rates Act?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** The hon. member will have observed that there is a certain difficulty in connection with that proposal, namely the fact that an extensive filibuster is going on in connection with the order of business presently under consideration. I understand that some hon. members have inquired earlier about the future of the National Housing Act proposals. We hope to pring these forward at an early date. In all probability the next order of business to be considered will be the official languages bill, followed by the bill to amend the National Housing Act.

## TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

MARITIME FREIGHT RATES—REQUEST FOR DEBATE ON COMMITTEE REPORT

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** When does the hon. gentleman propose to bring forward for consideration the committee report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications which is now before the house and which deals with this subject?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** We have heard enough filibustering on the Criminal Code bill, and I do not think we want to hear again from the hon. member.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame.

## AGRICULTURE

POTATOES—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON ASSISTANCE TO P.E.I. GROWERS

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. A moment or two ago, when the Minister of Agriculture was being questioned, I asked a second supplementary question to try to clear up a confusion which seemed to have been created between myself and the minister on this matter. I tried to ask the minister whether through his officials in Prince Edward Island there would be initiated the kind of inquiry—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. If the confusion is between the hon. member and the minister it can be cleared up after orders of the day have been called. Orders of the day.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Monday, May 5, consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 33, Mr. Laprise.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with respect to the amendment now before the house. I am sure the record will show that I am ready and prepared to defend the procedural right of private members to move amendments or motions even when I do not agree with those amendments or motions. I submit that it

is also appropriate for me to object to a motion even when it happens to contain ideas to which I take exception.

I believe that the amendment now before the house is leading us into a somewhat frivolous debate, is irregular and should be ruled out of order. We ought not to debate it any further. As to my right to raise this point of order at this time, I rely on citation 70(2) of Beauchesne's fourth edition. I will not take the time of the house to read that citation, as I doubt that there is any argument as to my right to raise this point of order at this stage.

The basis of my argument against the admissibility of the amendment is to be found in citation 203(1) of Beauchesne's fourth edition. The important sentence reads as follows:

> Every amendment proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the house the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

I contend that if the amendment of the hon. member for Abitibi were adopted we would have as a result an amended section of the Criminal Code which would not be intelligible or consistent with itself. That is the first of two main reasons I wish to put forward to support my argument that the amendment is not admissible.

My hon. friend from Abitibi seeks to move a motion to amend clause 18 of Bill C-150, which refers to abortions of female persons.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The laughter I hear demonstrates my point. We are having a frivolous debate and we ought not to consume the time of the house with it.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** May I say that I indicated to my hon. friends next to us that I would be raising this point of order this afternoon, so they would be ready to reply. The hon. member for Abitibi wishes to remove the word "female" wherever it appears in clause 18 of Bill C-150. He wishes the language of the amendment to refer only to a person, not to a female person.

I listened last night to the arguments that were advanced. My friends said that a person is a person, whether male or female, and that in the case of an abortion the reference would obviously be to a female person. Nevertheless, I suggest that if this amendment were passed there would be an inconsistency in the amended section and, second, the amended section would not be consistent within itself in that the amended part of the section would not be consistent with the original part of the Criminal Code. For example, if my hon. friend's amendment were carried the amended section in one place would contain the word "person" and then later would talk about "her intention" or "her own miscarriage." I do not wish to press the rules of English grammar too far but it is a rule of English grammar that when you talk about a person you must then say "his" this, or "his" that. If the language of the section is to refer to a person the obvious inference to be drawn would be the section should then refer to "his intention" or "his own miscarriage", which is ridiculous. That just shows the ridiculous situation we should find ourselves in if this amendment were passed. I submit that these inconsistencies in the amendment itself make the amendment one that should not be before the house.

Even more serious than that is the fact that if this amendment were passed it would become an amendment to section 237 of the Criminal Code. Section 237 of the Code already contains three subsections, two of which refer to a female person. If the amendment were passed it would apply to the new subclauses or subsections 4, 5 and 6, but no change would be made to the original, unamended part of the Code. As a result a state of confusion would arise. Section 237 would contain six subsections, some of which would refer to a female person and others to a person. Confusion would be inevitable.

Even worse than that, if the amendment were to carry someone would have to change the language in the original, unamended subsections of section 237. If we did not do it here it would have to be done by the officials who revise our statutes from time to time. The net result of passing this amendment, therefore, would be that we would effect an amendment in the original statute; we would alter section 237 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

May I remind Your Honour that on Friday, April 25, you ruled out of order three amendments that were proposed. I refer to amendments Nos. 17 and 18 proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway, and amendment No. 20 which was moved by the hon. member for Calgary North. Your Honour's argument in ruling out those three amendments was that the amendments went behind the bill and amended parts of the original act which were then not

before us. May I take a moment to read what Your Honour said, as found on page 7970 of *Hansard* for Friday, April 25. These were your words:

> If we look at section 237, with its three subsections, we find that they are not, as I understand it, before the house at the present time except in a very indirect way and I cannot see how, by an amendment, the hon. member can attempt to alter or amend them. This is why with much regret I have to reach that decision in connection with Nos. 17 and 18.

Later Your Honour used the same argument as the basis for ruling out of order amendment No. 20. Having read what Your Honour said, I confess I agree with your ruling even though I might have argued the opposite side of the case had I taken part in that debate. However, since Your Honour ruled that we cannot by an amendment at the report stage go behind the bill then before us and introduce language that would change the basic statute, I submit that the present amendment should not be allowed. If this amendment were to carry the wording of the original statute would be changed, and it could not be otherwise. A change would be made at least in subsections 1 and 2 of section 237 of the Criminal Code. If that were not done we should have a totally new section 237 which would be nonsensical, without meaning and without any clarity at all. Somebody would have to make the changes, and the result would be that my hon. friend from Abitibi would have been permitted to effect changes to the basic act, a right that was denied the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway and the hon. member for Calgary North.

• (3:00 p.m.)

I realize there has been some frivolity about the amendment, but not all of the arguments of my hon. friends in the Ralliement Créditiste are frivolous by any means. Even though I disagree with them, I respect what they are trying to do in regard to this proposition. If they are called to order when I believe they are in order, I will again rise to their defence. In this case, however, I think they not only do their own cause harm but they are taking parliament for a ride by presenting a frivolous motion, and this should not happen. I admit I cannot find among our procedural authorities anything that says we cannot spend the day in frivolity, but there is a citation that says that we cannot move an amendment so framed that it is not consistent in itself, an amendment so framed that the net result would be a proposition unintelligible and inconsistent.

For these two reasons, because of the inconsistency that would result and because of the fact that this amendment would, in effect, amend the basic statute, I believe Your Honour should find this amendment to be out of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** I listened with great interest, Mr. Speaker, to the comments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and I should like to say that I certainly do not agree with him when he says that our debate is frivolous, that we are constantly out of order and that our remarks are vain.

With all due deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's point of order might be procedurally valid in substance, when he says that the proposed amendment could give rise to problems in connection with the drafting of section 237 of the Criminal Code. But as to his point of order and his comments on the tremendous job done by the members of the Ralliement créditiste, I think that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who is very competent in procedural matters, is out of order himself.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the amendment moved by the member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) which tends to delete certain words in clause 18 of Bill C-150 is in order, as I said last night, since its purpose is to prevent inconsistencies, which is quite the opposite of what the member for Winnipeg North Centre was saying.

Even more—and I would like to emphasize this point in concluding—our ultimate and fundamental purpose is to avoid useless repetitions. Indeed, as I said last night, the word "female", for instance, in paragraph (a) of sub-section 4 of clause 18, which reads in part as follows:

> —for the purpose of carrying out his intention to procure the miscarriage of a female person—

is unnecessary, for it goes without saying that a male person cannot be aborted.

My remark applies also to paragraph (b), and I quote:

> —a female person who, being pregnant, permits a qualified medical practitioner—

It seems that the word "female" which appears almost every third line in clause 18, is absolutely useless.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to elaborate further on that amendment except to say that our fight is not a frivolous one. While carrying it on, we are not trying to obstruct the business of the house uselessly, but rather to improve this piece of legislation, so that it may serve the best interests of the Canadian people.

As for the minister, if he thinks that we are engaged in useless work and that the debate is dragging on, he need only withdraw the clause on abortion and we will vote in favour of the bill while voting against it, and then the house can proceed to a more serious piece of legislation, if any.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Unless other members with to contribute to the debate on the point of order that has been raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I am prepared to give a ruling at this time. I should like to assure the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that the point he has put to the house is one that worried me when the proposed amendments were considered, which is already some weeks ago. With my advisers, with the gentlemen at the table and with parliamentary counsel a very close look was taken at all of the amendments, including the one now before the house. I had some reservations about it but, as has been said before, the policy adopted in connection with these amendments was to be as lenient as possible so that there might be a full discussion of the amendments. I realize that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, along with his present seatmate, might feel—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** You had better identify her, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** —that if this policy is followed in this instance, all other hon. members might enjoy the same leniency. However, we did feel that, speaking generally, we should not allow an amendment that sought to go behind the amending legislation, an amendment which would directly amend the original legislation. This is why a number of these motions have not been put to the house.

The suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is that although the motion now before the house does not directly affect, amend or modify the original bill, it would do so indirectly. I would think that perhaps this is going just a little too far. I think there is a substantial difference between a proposed amendment that obviously seeks directly to amend the original legislation and one that, by way of consequence, might require amendments which, as in this case, are not of a substantive nature.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre contends that the adoption of this amendment would mean that the gender of some pronouns might have to be changed in consequence. I am not sure whether this would be sufficient reason for the Chair to refuse to put the amendment that is before the house.

I realize that in practice this particular amendment might result in a debate that perhaps is frivolous in its nature, not because of the hon. members who are taking part in this debate but because hon. members perforce have to be relevant in their remarks to the subject matter of the amendment to be discussed and decided on.

Having said that, and since the House has already spent some time considering an amendment which in my view, although perhaps borderline, was in fact accepted, I think it would hardly be in order at this stage to hold that this amendment is not acceptable, that it should not have been put to the house because it is out of order. I doubt that this is the decision that should be made at this late time. I should like to suggest that we allow the amendment to go forward, that hon. members who take part in the debate on and consideration of this motion take into account the fact that it is perhaps borderline, and that they limit their remarks on the amendment so we can move on as quickly as possible to the next one.

• (3:10 p.m.)

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to your ruling on the matter of the admissibility of the amendment and—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I believe that the hon. member for Lotbinière had the floor when the point of order was raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. The hon. member for Lotbinière participated in the debate on the point of order, and I would think that we should at this point go back to the hon. member for Lotbinière. Unless the hon. member has completed his remarks. If so, the Chair will recognize the Minister of Justice.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I tried to combine my answer to the point of order made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre with

the end of my speech, so as not to uselessly delay the debate, and also for the purpose of concluding at the same time.

We will be happy to hear the Minister of Justice.

[*English*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I gather in that event that the hon. member has concluded his speech, and I think the house will welcome your remark that because of the very narrow context of this amendment hon. members should confine their speeches to the very narrow point of whether it should be "person" or "female person" in the bill.

What the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) attempts to argue in his amendment is that since only a female can be aborted therefore the word "female" is superfluous and should be deleted. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that if we had put in only the word "person", members of the Creditiste party would have argued that only a female can be aborted and therefore it should read "female person". In fact their amendment would be drawn either way, depending on how the bill had been drawn.

I want to say briefly to hon. members opposite, grammarians that they are, with their subtle knowledge of the English and French languages, that "female person" is the broadest concept we know to cover the connotation woman, girl, female adolescent, and certainly in the part of the country from which my hon. friends come, lady. But the reason that the words "female person" are used is quite simple. Section 237(1) and (2) of the Criminal Code, to which clause 18 relates, use the words "female person" and section 238 also uses the words "female person". This is the section relating to the supply of noxious things, and I will read it:

> Every one who unlawfully supplies or procures a drug or other noxious thing or an instrument or thing, knowing that it is intended to be used or employed to procure the miscarriage of a female person, whether or not she is pregnant, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years.

Going through the Criminal Code I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to Section 135 relating to rape, which reads:

> A male person commits rape when he has sexual intercourse with a female person who is not his wife—

Section 138 reads:

> (1) Every male person who has sexual intercourse with a female person who
> (a) is not his wife, and
> (b) is under the age of fourteen years—

Section 140 reads:

> Every male person who, under circumstances that do not amount to rape, has sexual intercourse with a female person
> (a) who is not his wife, and
> (b) who is and who he knows or has good reason to believe is feeble-minded, insane, or is an idiot or imbecile,
> is guilty of an indictable offence—

Section 141 reads:

> (1) Every one who indecently assaults a female person is guilty of an indictable offence—

So there are plenty of precedents for the proper drafting that we believe was used in the bill.

**Mr. Caouette:** May I ask the minister a question?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Certainly.

**Mr. Caouette:** Is the minister trying to make it clear that a female is not a male?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I want to make it clear that the drafters of the Criminal Code knew the difference between a female and a male long before the Creditiste party was ever born, and I want to suggest to Your Honour that not even the fertility of imagination with which we have been faced for the past 20 days is sufficient to stray beyond the confines of this amendment. I hope we hear hon. members opposite talk about the amendment in that narrow context of person and female person in the hope that we can then get on to a more significant amendment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to dwell on these remarks, because I was the first, I think, in the committee on justice and legal affairs to ask the minister questions. At the time, the only answer he gave me concerning the inclusion in the bill on abortion of the words "of the female sex", was that experts would be called in to try and find an explanation.

Well, today in this house we will not take very long to discuss this amendment, because we realize that it has been prepared by the minister's experts who have not provided him with the reasons why they have included in

the text relating to abortion the words "of the female sex".

One understands the minister when he speaks, for instance, of the rape of a female person. One can explain the reasons why in the Criminal Code the distinction is made between the male sex and the female sex as far as other matters except abortion are concerned. But in connection with abortion itself we still do not know how it is possible that a person of a sex other than the female sex may get an abortion. Medically speaking, nobody has proved to us yet that a person of another sex may secure an abortion. And that is why we find that this legislative text is ridiculous, not serious, and we feel obliged to bring in amendments that are not serious to make comprehensible a text we would have liked the minister to change between the committee report and second reading of the bill.

So we seriously and sincerely regret that the minister should go on sponsoring a bill that the public and even his fellow lawyers find ridiculous and stupid and in which mention should only be made of abortion and not of abortion of a female person.

I believe that on this point at least the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) could accept to amend the Criminal Code. If up to now that text has been the laughing stock of the public, he should try not to be responsible for the continuance of a wording which is preposterous. Let us have at least legislation which is logical, shows common sense and corresponds to the views of doctors, who have asked us to remove from the Criminal Code the words "female person" in 12 or 13 different places when speaking of abortion.

We recognize that we must limit our remarks to the topic, the abortion of "a female person" and that we must express ourselves concisely. But when we speak of female persons, we speak of more than half the population. That is why we were pleased to support the remarks and the amendments of the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) aimed at removing from the Criminal Code such ridiculous, stupid and senseless words which show a lack of maturity on the part of the Liberal party. It claims to be a serious party; yet it introduced in this house a bill which was prepared by God knows whom. It was prepared not by hospitals, or doctors, or medical associations, but by civil servants who kept on repeating, in the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code or in the bill on abortion, the same stupidities we had before concerning the abortion of a female person. The expression existed way before the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) came to this house, way before the friends of his predecessor, who introduced the bill, thought of protecting themselves by asking the government to amend the Criminal Code with regard to abortion and homosexuality.

I support in all seriousness the amendment moved by the hon. member for Abitibi. It may not seem serious in the eyes of the minister but, otherwise, the matter will continue to be a joke in our society and especially for those who will have to plead before our courts, when they must speak of "the abortion, Your Honour, of a female person".

Again, this will prove that the Liberal party goes by what experts say in introducing amendments to the Criminal Code, in this omnibus bill, in introducing changes which basically are not serious.

• (3:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, just a few words about the expression of "the female sex", that my colleague from Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) would like to see eliminated because it is understood, according to the clear and precise explanations of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), that this expression should be used when speaking about abortion.

This is likely a result of Bill C-150 dealing with homosexuality. By speaking of female persons, it establishes clearly that homosexuals shall not have the right to get an abortion. These are undoubtedly the explanations the minister meant us to understand a while ago by referring to the Criminal Code, to the law that has always existed, so that it would be clearly established in everybody's mind that a man has no right to get an abortion even if he is in love with another man.

That is why the expression "of the female sex" is maintained. So in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, all explanations are unnecessary. Everybody knows that abortion is for women and not men, as far as the operation itself is concerned. So, the Minister of Justice probably knows the rules, the law, the Criminal Code and so on. By using this expression, he wanted to spare men difficulties that could happen some 20 years from now in Canada.

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I should like at the outset to set the record straight. Although I interject remarks

on each amendment, it is not to do any filibustering on this bill, for our party did not ask for such a discussion.

Not only we did not ask for it, we actually asked for the very opposite, and last Friday, we voted with the Progressive Conservative members on a motion to adjourn the debate on Bill C-150, in order to proceed with more serious matters. So if people pointed a finger at us because the debate drags on, they would be labouring under a tremendous misconception.

The amendment before the house is a very short one. I will try, therefore, as on similar occasions, to be very brief, and to limit my remarks to the regular 20-minute period.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer, and I would not like to get entangled or lost in the maze of legal terminology. Many people act as if they were paid so much per word, which often results in the fact that their language in a written form, in its attempts at precision, becomes gibberish or, as in the case in hand, simply ridiculous and stupid.

Simple souls and laymen like myself have to smile when they read the various paragraphs under section 18, and come across things like this:

—a qualified medical practitioner, other than a member of a therapeutic abortion committee for any hospital, who in good faith uses in an accredited or approved hospital any means for the purpose of carrying out his intention to procure the miscarriage of a female person—

When we find this kind of language in one paragraph after another, we cannot help but be amused. The repetition of this ridiculous specification gives us some doubts. Many stout, corpulent members of this house should feel their bellies, just in case.

Did a woman's ovum ever go into orbit and drive a permatozoon back into the body of a man? This is what this useless specification would lead us to believe. My remarks will be found very stupid and yet the wording of the subsections of clause 18 does imply such stupidities.

One would think that the authors of this clause in the omnibus bill were so concerned with the fate of these poor Canadian women that they wanted to show them that this provision legalizing abortion was a precious present being offered exclusively to the mothers and future mothers of families, those who are indeed responsible for one of our greatest national resources, that is, the generations which will succeed us in this country which is as big as a continent. Our motto "from sea to sea" could become "mother at sea".

These abusive specifications could also be construed as justifying the legislator who would have thus become a kind of Pontius Pilate who washes his hands so well that he dares determine, self-consciousness, without that he is quite in favour of abortion for persons of the female sex but, on the other hand, he certainly does not want the same authorization for persons of the male sex, like him.

All sorts of other interpretations could be put forth. May I be allowed to underline the most serious ones, those which would be likely to bring about confusion.

Let me take again paragraph (a) of section 18, which reads partly as follows:

—a qualified medical practitioner other than a member of a therapeutic abortion committee for any hospital, who in good faith uses in an accredited hospital any means for the purpose of carrying out his intention to procure the miscarriage of a female person.

Mr. Speaker, someone might give to the term "a female person" the following interpretation: a person still in embryo, that is a child in his mother's womb. If someone gave that interpretation, the legislation would mean that abortion is right provided the mother expects a girl. You see that that term may be confusing.

When the bill refers to:

—the miscarriage of a female person—

does that mean that if the unborn child were a male person, miscarriage could not be procured? You can see that that could be interpreted in such a way. I do not say that such is the purpose of the bill but it could be interpreted in that way by someone, and abortion would not be valid, then, if it were a boy.

And what would happen, Mr. Speaker, if some smart aleck came to see the doctor and requested an abortion for his girl-friend, basing his request on his own interpretation of section 18 (b) which reads as follows:

—a female person who, being pregnant, permits a qualified medical practitioner to use in an accredited hospital any means described in paragraph (a) for the purpose of carrying out her intention to procure her own miscarriage.

Mr. Speaker, it could be interpreted to mean that a female person cannot request the authorization, but a male person can. For an abortion to be authorized, the request would have to be made by a male person.

We might call this splitting hairs, Mr. Speaker but such an interpretation is possible.

Therefore, our "smart aleck" could say: "She, of the female sex, cannot, but I, I am not of the female sex, therefore, I can get the necessary authorization.

Often, we refuse to believe that people may be so stupid. It is the kind of objection that the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) could put forward, for instance. I would answer that if we see eggs, there must be a hen around. And we, in this house, since we are discussing idiocies, there must have been some idiots to lay such rotten eggs. If we bear in mind the consummate skill of the law artists—of those people who know how to evade legislation or to use it to their benefit—such a hypothesis might appear quite likely.

Mr. Speaker, it has been common knowledge since time immemorial that the greatest thieves are as free as a bird and that the law is unable to catch them. I would be tempted to add that, sometimes, having caught them, it lets them get away again. I am thinking at this very moment of Lucien Rivard's famous evasion.

• (3:30 p.m.)

All such interpretations, though they may seem crazy, are nevertheless plausible. We are puzzled by this heavy insistence on "female person". How many sexes are there? Was it the intention in this way to spare the pretty boys who, instead of being normally constituted, are cracked in the head?

Mr. Speaker, may I refer to a definition of the sexes to be found in the works of Plato. I quote:

> Formerly, our nature was not what it is today; it was quite different. First of all, there were three species of humans—

May be it is to that text that the author of the omnibus bill was referring.

> —and not two, as is the case today: the male, the female and, in addition, a third species made up of the first two. Only the name survives today, the species has disappeared. That was the androgynous species which combined the forms and the names of the two other species, male and female; it no longer exists today; only the name survives as an expression of scorn.
>
> Moreover every man as a whole was round-shaped, with a rounded back and rounded sides, four hands, as many legs, two faces quite similar on a round neck, and on top of those opposite faces, a single head, four ears, two generative organs and all the rest accordingly. He walked erectly, as we do now, in whatever direction he wanted, and when he started running fast, he did like showmen who turn in circles while throwing their legs up in the air; leaning on their eight members, they turned somersaults in rapid succession. And those three species were thus shaped because the male originated from the sun, the female from the earth, and the mixed species from the moon which has the characteristics of both.

[Mr. Matte.]

Mr. Speaker, it is true that I am young, but I have yet to meet such beings as those I have just described.

So, we only know two kinds, and we know only one sex that can transmit life, that can bear the foetus which will result in a normally shaped human being. There is only one sex.

That is why when the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) stresses the fact that this provision should be deleted, I think that he is quite right. It is altogether useless. However, the amendment might not cover all the clauses adequately, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) pointed out, because the same expression recurs in other clauses.

If the minister agreed, he would simply eliminate the expression every time is met and in all sections on abortion.

But the interpretations I just pointed out may exist. The main interpretation, at least according to the French version we have here, would be that the abortion of a person of the "female sex" might not be really that of the person because we understand the embryo, the foetus is a human being, a living being and consequently abortion could be interpreted as being that of the foetus itself of the female sex, which would create tremendous confusion.

Were we expected to understand that since the result of these masculine affairs, of the feminine gender, could not affect life or health, the fact of clearly specifying the "female sex" was meant to eliminate this kind of sex? This specification was useless as science is not advanced enough to know the nature of the young of this new race. Will they be aqueous or terrestrial creatures?

Finally, what will happen to these persons of both sexes physically? We have here all kinds of problems which, as ridiculous and stupid as they may seem at first sight, are nevertheless a very eloquent demonstration, in my opinion, of the uselessness of the present debate.

Before I conclude my remarks, I would like our motives to be understood and I want the government to consider the fact that we do not want to delay this debate in any way and that we would be very happy if the minister

were able to convince the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or the cabinet to put an end to this debate, to adjourn it indefinitely, so that we might pass to other much more important matters, in short, that we might discuss projects for which the people of this country have been waiting a long time and which they would rather hear about than what we are now discussing.

We are not and will not be blamed for it since we are still being urged to continue this gigantic struggle we have undertaken and which we will continue in order to prove that our attitude is supported by the majority of the people, at least those we are trying to represent with dignity in this house.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for having taken so much time in trying to explain a difference of a few inches only.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, for a number of days we have been debating a series of amendments to the government's proposals in respect of abortion as put forward in the bill. I have lost track of the number of days we have been discussing this matter.

Some of the amendments put forward oppose any provision for abortion within the Criminal Code. Other amendments placed before the house embody the stand that in the event this bill is passed by the house certain improvements should be made. I think it is perfectly proper that a confrontation of debates should take place on this particular matter, and that adequate provision should be made for such a debate.

During previous debates in the house I have made my own stand very clear. I am unable to see my way clear to support the government proposal as it is now before us. There are some amendments I feel I can support; yet there are others to which I cannot lend that support. In respect of this amendment I find it difficult to conceive—or possibly I should say I find it difficult to perceive its exact purpose.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I do not pretend to be enough of an authority on the French language to comment on particular problems that may exist with respect to the French version. However, in trying to arrive at a possible explanation of the English translation and the English version of this amendment, the only thought that came to my mind was that it might refer to the type of case that I read of a number of years ago, where a 14 year old boy developed pains in his chest and after a period of time, examinations and x-rays it was decided to operate. When the operation was carried out it was found that in fact there was a developing embryo in the boy's chest. Subsequently it was concluded that this was in fact a twin of the boy, the development of which had been arrested in the prenatal stage, that the foetus that was eventually born enveloped the retarded foetus and that with the physiological changes and developments at the stage of puberty the embryo had once again commenced its development.

I thought this might be an explanation of what the hon. member had in mind when he moved the amendment. However, after listening to some of the members who have presented their case in favour of the amendment I find that this is not their concern at all; they are not concerned about a male person ever developing a state of pregnancy. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I find that I cannot lend any support to this amendment, and I hope the house will proceed with the other more important aspects of the abortion issue now before us.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I should like first to thank the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), my colleague, who was kind enough to move this amendment yesterday on my behalf. I had to stay up North to attend the funeral of a very dear friend, and that is why I was absent when that amendment was moved in the house.

Mr. Speaker, it will not be necessary for me to speak at length in order to make the purpose of this amendment clear, for the hon. member for Lotbinière, as well as my colleagues who spoke in support of my amendment, have already done so fairly well.

However, I should like to add that I wanted to delete those words in clause 18, in order to avoid repetitions and also complications in our Canadian laws, as my colleague from Champlain (Mr. Matte) mentioned. We know that the legal officers who draft the laws always manage to complicate them to such an extent that the same pieces of legislation often mean two or three different things, and this gives rise at times to some quibbling between lawyers, but always at the expense of the client, of the little people.

Now, I would like to explain very clearly how I understand maternity. We know that

the feminine nature implies a possible maternity. That does not mean that all women must be mothers or must go through motherhood. I think a woman can be a mother without experimenting maternity and giving birth to a child. That is a happy and glorious experience which all women, I think, should hope for, but a woman can also be a mother through adoption.

I think that it is an altogether different thing that the man's body has in itself the possibility of being a father, but he cannot, I think, experiment maternity.

For those reasons, I think it is not necessary to complicate a legislation by giving so many details, when everyone knows that many of our Canadian statutes should be clearer to prevent complications. Maybe such details have been deliberately omitted from our legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that my amendment is well-founded and justifiable, and I cannot understand why the minister and the government would not agree to this amendment which could prevent complications and perhaps heavy expenses later.

Earlier, in his opposition statement, the minister led us back to the question of rape. He spoke about rape itself. I think that as far as rape is concerned, today we cannot consider it in the same light as we did in the past. Today a man can be raped just like a woman because, if I understand correctly, to rape someone is to force that person to perform a sexual act against his or her will.

It can happen to a man. One has only to read the proceedings of certain lawsuits in our largest cities to see that sometimes the charge of rape made against a male person is rejected and the latter, who was charged with rape, is freed. One therefore wonders whether the male person had not been driven to rape.

I think the minister's explanation does not make sense and I still think my amendment—the one we are supporting—is justified and acceptable.

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, following the amendment moved by the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) to the effect that the omnibus bill

—be amended by deleting in clause 18 the word "female" on lines 28 and 29 on page 42, and the word "female" on lines 3 and 23 on page 43, and the word "female" on line 39 on page 44,

We realize, Mr. Speaker, that the drafting of this bill was done too hastily. We have

[Mr. Laprise.]

been saying so since this debate started. Because of this, there are errors and almost inconceivable nonsense in the bill. Furthermore, that is exactly why 70,000 Catholic parents have asked for a royal commission in order to determine who is responsible for the drafting of this bill and for the gross errors it contains.

• (3:50 p.m.)

A while ago, I was listening to the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) and with him I recognize that, from time to time, some changes take place in the patterns of human life.

Last week, we were told of a human heart living outside the chest of a human body. That probably shows why some people with their heart not within their chest but without, are against an amendment to defend Christianity.

Therefore, in the face of such changes, we are not surprised either to discover in that bill, which was prepared and reproduced too hastily, enormous mistakes such as the use of the word "female" throughout.

I have discussed that famous omnibus bill at home with my own family, and my wife, seeing the word "female", asked me whether the Minister of Justice was afraid that women would change their sex, as some of them have. That happened last year, but it does not occur very often.

However, since it was deemed advisable to repeat the word "female", I believe that it would be more logical, as requested by those having a clear mind, to delete that word from the bill. Before we believe that women will change their sex, we have to await proof that such things will happen more quickly.

Besides, I discussed the matter with my daughters—they are students in a convent—who were wondering in what respect that bill was serious. They asked me the following question: "Is it true that men could imagine that other men would need to be aborted?"

Together with the Serena teams, which studied recently the amendments we have moved, the spokesmen for the University of Sherbrooke support us and state this: Your amendments could at least mitigate the omnibus bill, make it less ridiculous and allow this representative of justice to discuss it better.

Besides, these Serena teams have sent over 238 letters of protest, 7,378 signatures regarding all the amendments and also 49,175 signatures to the Senate in order to kill the bill once and for all.

In the face of such a general outcry, I will not let anyone say that we are not defending something serious here. On the contrary. When we find something ridiculous in a bill, we ask that it be changed. We must decry such absurdity in the house in cooperation with these teams, with Catholic parents, with all those who now want us to go on with the battle we started, because what is taking place in parliament reminds me too much of the time when we had a Prime Minister just as uncompromising as the present one. He would force his members and his ministers to vote like him, without any other obligation than to dictate to parliament. I say that this reminds me of the time of Sir John Macdonald who said about Riel "A man to hang".

Today, we can say that there are lives to be protected. When in this ridiculous bill we see such absurd words which are repeated at every turn, such as "female person", thus giving the impression that there could be others than female persons who could procure miscarriage for themselves, I say for the last time to my Liberal friends—who accept such intransigency, who vote unanimously as they did yesterday on sensible amendments which we introduce but who reject them all because of the dictatorship existing in this parliament—please do not repeat those mistakes for which the Canadian people have suffered because right now we are forging the destiny of Canada and we are going back a hundred years.

For a better and just Canada, for more explicit laws, I therefore beg you, as a brother-christian of all Canadians, to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Abitibi.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question? The question is on the motion by the hon. member for Abitibi amending clause 18 of Bill C-150. 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 view the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 75 (11), and a special order of the house made last Wednesday, April 30, the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred until after consideration of motion No. 19.

We will now proceed to the consideration of motion No. 34 in the name of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce.

**Mr. Cafik (for Mr. Allmand)** moved motion No. 34:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or would be likely to endanger her life or health" on lines 4 and 5 on page 43 and by inserting the following words: "endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) to Bill C-150, and I would like to explain the reasons for my position. First of all, I wish to make it clear that I realize that many members of the House of Commons, many people in Canada and many people in my riding are divided on the position they take with regard to the legalization of abortion. I hope they will try as hard to understand the position I am taking as I have tried to understand theirs.

When considering abortion I believe that the main question is whether the fœtus is in fact a human being and, if it is a human being, at what stage it becomes one. Obviously, if one were to conclude that the fœtus is not human, there would be no reason for not granting abortions on either request or demand. If, however, it is concluded that the fœtus is human, then people might be inclined to come to a different decision. I believe that this central question takes the problem of abortion out of the realm of religion and belief because I do not think it is solely a religious question but rather one on which legislators should decide on scientific grounds. In doing so we must ask ourselves the following question: If a fœtus is a human being, do we as members of the House of Commons have any responsibility to protect its human life? This is a serious question which affects all people, regardless of their religious, political or other beliefs.

A great deal of evidence was put forward to the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare in the 27th parliament by a number of witnesses who indicated that there is no question about whether or not a fœtus is

human. I should like to quote some of the evidence put forward at that time. One of the witnesses was Dr. L. L. de Veber, assistant professor of the Department of Pediatrics and Pathological Chemistry at the University of Western Ontario. In conjunction with two other doctors he submitted a brief to the committee, which is to be found at page 556 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the committee for January 30, 1968. I quote:

> The foetus is a unique and distinct individual from the first few weeks of life with its own circulation and its own blood group, separate tissues, and by 20 weeks or even earlier, capable of existing outside the mother. This is not to deny that the mother is the supremely important individual in the life of the foetus and that she is intimately connected with the foetus. However, to speak of the foetus as being part of her such as other organs is simply not logical or scientific.

Does the foetus become a human being at the moment of birth? In answer to this question the doctor said:

> This seems hardly logical since this may occur at 10 weeks, 20 weeks, or 40 weeks. There is nothing magical or mystical about the passage of birth process except for its independent circulation and breathing of air.

The doctor went on to ask:

> Is the foetus human when the mother can feel it kick and move? This is a very subjective assessment and would vary from mother to mother and we know scientifically that the foetus can move and react to pain long before the mother is aware of its presence.

The next question the doctor asked was:

> Is the foetus human at the period of viability? The problem here is that the period of viability is changing continually. At present it is usually assessed at about 20 weeks gestation. However, obviously as medical science advances, this period will become much earlier and it is also possible in the future that the foetus could be maintained outside of the mother from the very earliest weeks of gestation. Thus, again, we are on slippery ground in attempting to award the quality of being a human being at the period of viability.
>
> Does the fact that the foetus can cry after delivery, before viability, make it human? It is interesting to note the extreme reactions of people to the concept of the foetus crying after an abortion.

• (4:00 p.m.)

He is speaking here about abortions which take place prior to three months of pregnancy. Scientific evidence indicates that the foetus is living well before the time at which most abortions are carried out. Dr. de Veber continued:

> Very few doctors who perform therapeutic abortions find it a pleasant task. Many of them have stated they realize they are destroying a human life with the operation.

[Mr. Cafik.]

I go on to quote from evidence by Dr. Jack Walters who is a professor of obstetrics at the University of Western Ontario. He says:

> The definition of human life depends on the finding of certain factors characteristic of life as opposed to death. The factors are: 1. Heartbeat. 2. Blood pressure. 3. Maintenance of body temperature. 4. Production of carbon dioxide. 5. Utilization of oxygen. 6. Respiratory activity.

In Stockholm, Sweden, experiments were conducted on aborted children. I wish to quote the results of these experiments:

> The recording of the data concerning these aborted foetuses should demonstrate to anyone that life is present at this stage of development. The foetus has a heartbeat, produces an electrocardiographic pattern, utilizes oxygen, produces carbon dioxide and maintains body temperature.

Utilizing what is called the Doppler effect, heartbeats have been recorded in foetuses nine weeks of age.

This kind of evidence certainly leads me to believe that the foetus is in fact a human being. And if it is, what right have we to authorize some other person to take its life? I think there are situations in which this could be permitted. There is, I believe, a longstanding argument that a person has the right to protect his or her own life—the right of self-defence. This argument would justify an amendment to the Criminal Code allowing a mother to abort if her own life is, in fact, directly in danger. On the basis of this principle I believe most people would grant the right to an abortion in cases where life was endangered by the continuation of pregnancy.

In what other circumstances could we possibly permit an abortion? Bill C-150 as presently drafted says that, in the opinion of the committee set up to consider these things, an abortion could be carried out provided the continuation of the pregnancy would, or would likely, endanger life or health. The problem here lies in the definition of the word "health". Does it mean, as many would interpret it, merely a matter of convenience? Can abortions be allowed when the mother finds it discomforting to have an other child. Perhaps when she has four or five already, perhaps when the home is not large enough, or possibly when a girl is unmarried and social pressures are brought to bear upon her, producing mental attitudes which cause her to seek an abortion?

If we allow abortion for reasons of this sort, Mr. Speaker, we are surely not correcting the real problems. Suppose an unmarried girl is led to seek an abortion because of the pressure of society upon her. Is the fault that

of the innocent unborn child or is it the fault of the society which is so critical of her? Suppose a mother does not want her child because she is economically poor or inadequately housed. Do we solve this problem by allowing her to have an abortion or should we, as legislators, do something to provide conditions in which such a woman would want to bring her child into the world? I do not think we solve problems such as these by creating another. Many of those who submit to abortion find themselves in a much worse condition years or even months later. They find that the abortion weighs on their consciences. They regret what they have done. Anyone who is married and has children realizes that a wife is very often in a depressed state during some stage of her pregnancy. Are we to judge what should happen to an unborn child because of what may, after all, be only a temporary condition? I do not think so.

The amendment put forward by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce makes a significant change in the wording of the bill before us. The operative words are: "to endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health." In my opinion this may be a justifiable condition for abortion in line with the consideration of self-defence which I have mentioned. Simply to say that life or health could likely be endangered, or could be endangered, is putting the matter far too broadly. We have been told that from a legal point of view there is no difference between the original wording and the wording of the amendment. I submit there is one real difference, leaving aside the legal implications. The original wording would create a climate for abortion in Canada; people would believe that abortions were very easy to obtain. It may be we are doing many women a disservice by seeking to pass the legislation in its present form, because I do not think they will find abortion quite as easy to obtain as they thought it was going to be.

It would have a far better effect in Canada if we were to change this legislation in such a way as to avoid any impression that there is nothing wrong with taking the life of an unborn child or that it is permissible in any and all circumstances. I do not think it is, and I do not think this legislation should suggest that it is. If those who drew up this bill feel that the foetus is not a human being, then I believe they have drawn up bad legislation. If they say it is a human being, then we should be very careful about the conditions under which abortions are allowed to take place.

For these reasons I support the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. In no way do I feel that I have any responsibility to legislate morality, nor that the government has any responsibility to do so. That is not the question. I would certainly not subscribe to that view. But I strongly feel that we are under an obligation to protect the lives of our citizens, including the unborn child.

I should like to put on record one further quotation, this time from the Declaration of the Rights of the Child adopted in 1959 by the General Assembly of the United Nations. I presume Canada subscribes to this declaration. The preamble states in part:

> Whereas the child, by reason of its physical and mental maturity, needs special safeguards and care, including proper legal protection before as well as after birth—

• (4:10 p.m.)

It is interesting that here is a recognition by a world body in which we participate of the rights of the child both before and after birth. From that body emanates a declaration that there is need to protect the child both before and after birth. I feel that, without question, the foetus, at the stage of its development being considered here in connection with abortions, is a human being. I feel that abortions should only be permitted under very strict control for the purpose of protecting a woman's life or if her health will be seriously and directly impaired. Such an abortion would be, in my view, a case of self-defence.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise and talk about the amendment proposed by the previous speaker and I think it is quite important at this time to draw the hon. members' attention and to express my ideas on this amendment.

We should consider whether this amendment goes any further, goes far enough or goes too far in its attempt to make the bill more explicit. The amendment reads as follows:

> That Bill C-150 . . . be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or would be likely to endanger her life or health" on lines 4 and 5 on page 43 and by inserting the following words:
> "endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health".

I do not think there should be any uncertainties as to the reasons behind the position of the previous speaker who spoke in support of that clause or that amendment for allowing

therapeutic abortions. This is not a probable, a hypothetical or a future matter; it is an immediate question.

When you read this:

—would or would be likely to endanger her life or health—

I suggest that the clause should be more explicit and the amendment more realistic.

This may not seem very important, but just read the clause again in another way, and I quote:

—would or would be likely to endanger her health—

Most often this is how it will be construed and this will leave us open to all kinds of problems. Doctors will have to deal with women that will play on words, who will think up any reasons to get a therapeutic abortion.

Mr. Speaker, the present section of the Criminal Code is much too evasive and vague. I think the amendment, as worded, certainly supplements clause 18 to some extent, but fails to make it specific enough.

In my opinion, a matter of such importance should not provide a means of playing on words.

Physicians will face women who will play on words. This was confirmed in every country that adopted such legislation.

As it appears in the Criminal Code, the section now contains the following expressions "would or would be likely" and "her life or health".

I think too wide an interpretation is possible, and as I said, serious problems will crop up because of the way in which some expressions of the bill will be understood.

Those who wish to solve the problem of an unwanted pregnancy, are not consumed with scruples, but with an obsession: to get rid of the foetus they carry in their wombs. Those women or young girls have the impression that their problems will be solved by the death of the foetus and that, in this way, they will trifle with the conscience and good faith of physicians and gynaecologists. They will even threaten to commit suicide, but very few ever do it.

Physical health is easy to ascertain but hard to define in order to determine whether health is endangered or not, because it is closely connected with the morale of a person who claims to be sick because of a pregnancy.

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

It is more difficult to determine the moral or mental health, especially of unscrupulous persons who will resort to tricks or intrigues.

Mr. Speaker, the mistake made in section 18 of the Criminal Code has been noted and studied by Dr. Lavigne, president of the Quebec hospital medical boards, who referred to it, when he appeared before the committee on justice and legal affairs on March 20 last, in the following terms, and I quote:

We are against the present text of the bill and we wish to see it amended to limit the reasons for abortion to cases where there is a serious danger to the life of the mother. The problem is stated in the bill on page 43.

Mr. Speaker, I will not quote the wording, because I know that most hon. members know it by heart, especially those who took the trouble to study the bill and to come here to discuss its consequences clause by clause. I will go on:

Now, this leaves a door open to all social, psychiatric or other reasons that people will choose to give. There will always be a way of obtaining pseudo-psychiatric or pseudo-social reasons to obtain an abortion. Now, this is the equivalent of what the clause on abortion requests. At the present time, the bill reads as follows: Would or would be likely to endanger her life or health.

In my opinion, the proposed amendment does not go far enough, is not specific enough, and offers no guarantee, or nothing more than the provision of the bill when it was first introduced in the house.

Dr. Lavigne who is aware of the dangers of a wrong interpretation made the following suggestion, which I would like to quote:

We would prefer this to be limited to "to endanger her life" or at least "to endanger seriously her health."

The terms used leave the door open to problems, and discussions. The major problem regarding these therapeutic abortion committees is that psychiatrists, among whom some admit any kind of psychiatric reasons, would ask the gynaecologists and obstetricians to carry out abortions when those physicians have refused to perform them.

• (4:20 p.m.)

—This provision would also allow for a certain amount of bargaining as far as the patients are concerned because they will try to find a doctor who will agree to such an abortion. This will bring problems that will give rise to a double standard in certain cases.

In New York I know two hospitals that are located just a few streets from each other. Now one hospital carries out one abortion for every 20 deliveries and the other one carries out one abortion for every 6,000 deliveries. Therefore, I think that this situation would be creating a problem that is just as serious.

Mr. Speaker, these findings are very important, because the legislation itself on abortion already constitutes an evil, and the acceptance of such an indefinite clause, that changes almost nothing, such as the amendment under consideration,—that could be qualified as unfinished—constitutes a challenge to the interpretation of the terms of the law.

Such women who would ask for an abortion will thus be free to resort to all tactics, but they would be unaware of the actual psychological consequences which will result.

By trying to get out of an unpleasant situation for themselves, by playing upon words, they will get involved, that is, they would not know, and neither the psychiatrist nor the specialists would know exactly where they stand. Well-known doctors came to that conclusion, and one of them, Dr. Walsh, when he appeared before the committee on justice and legal affairs on March 20 last, added:

> It may impose tremendous strains on her health, it may impose tremendous economic and other strains, and in the case of the unmarried mother, which we must always keep in mind, it imposes the tremendous problem of giving up her baby.
>
> One of the problems that is not properly investigated yet is the following. In respect of a woman who has an abortion ... our experience is that a woman can tolerate giving up her baby much better than feeling that she has deprived it of its right to life.
>
> This is something that is very deep in a woman makeup. It is psycho-biological. We cannot prove it to anyone statistically. It is an intuitive observation. It is something that doctors who work with patients find all the time.

I think that for all those reasons we must be extremely careful before accepting all the amendments, especially the one now before us.

Some hon. members believe that the new legislation on abortion will only legalize abortion for serious reasons, for instance to preserve the life of the mother, even if it is seldom necessary.

It is generally recognized that abortion for such reasons is already legal. The changes proposed in the bill, on the whole, open the door a little more. That is why I submit that this amendment does not restrict enough the scope of the bill nor the meaning of its wording.

Bill C-150 proposes to legalize abortion to protect the mother's health. The decision here is left to the sole discretion of a small abortion committee.

In fact, this legislation will allow two doctors, a majority in a three-member committee, to authorize abortions for the purposes they decide upon.

In a television program on the CTV network on December 27 last, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) confirmed our apprehension concerning abortion committees. Let the abortion committees make the law, he said. He stated that the word "health" would not be interpreted by the courts of justice but by each therapeutic abortion committee. In other words, the decision of such committees is above and beyond the law.

We have noticed that in our hospitals abortions are now made for reasons of life or death, and not on psychological grounds. The immediate, rather than the future, physical health is more important. There is no gambling, no shillyshallying and consequently doctors are not blamed for such operations. If there is an emergency, an operation is performed but only with the mother's consent. Such cases are extremely rare, and are becoming more so, because of progress in the medical field, but when they happened, the mother more often than not chose to sacrifice herself in order to give birth to her child.

Why then should the government pester us with "probably" and "maybe" or with amendments like this one, which is incomplete and does not change much? What is taking place now is simple and gives rise to abuses. Why do this on purpose?

I believe first of all that a bill such as this one should never have been introduced. Now that the harm has been done, we, in the Ralliement Créditiste, are trying to limit the disastrous consequences by trying to induce the government to adopt a firm and clear-cut attitude, which will not let the moral health of pregnant women be adversely affected by an abortion.

Moral health is very difficult to define; even doctors have no definite views on this and find it difficult to explain this moral health, which cannot be endangered by a pregnancy, which is a normal process for women. Several physicians who appeared before medical boards have found it quite difficult to explain and establish the nature of moral health for a pregnant woman.

I hope that my intervention on this amendment will be more successful than those of the previous speakers, but as I do not expect any comprehension from the hon. members opposite, I ask them for once, since that amendment seems to be rather reasonable, to vote in favour of it and show for once at least that the bill can be improved.

It is therefore time for the government members to find a specialist who like the famous Dr. Barnard will graft on them what they need following the vote on the abortion legislation.

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in the debate once again, first to congratulate the mover of this amendment. He has proved that we are not fighting alone and that at least many people are beginning to wonder, as this amendment clearly shows.

I cannot say that I agree entirely with the motion. The fact remains that the hon. member deals with the real problems when he asks for a more precise definition and evaluation of the health factor, so as to leave no room for abuses.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Such are my first reactions to this amendment which clearly shows that many people are thinking things over and wondering how far it is permissible to go in order to save the life and especially the health of the mother by resorting to abortion?

That is why I congratulate and praise the hon. member who moved this amendment. I perceive here his desire to protect the people against the possible abuses which will certainly occur.

I say "certainly", for there is abundant proof in all the countries which as a first step, passed legislation similar to the one we are discussing. It started in a very low key: Merely a measure to legalize abortion when the mother's life is endangered.

It seems quite reasonable, at least in theory. But then applications are so numerous that the meaning has to be broadened to "life and health". And thus, scores of people resort to abortion, even when unjustified.

And so, down the slippery path, for soon new amendments are brought in to make abortion still easier to get. Today, in Japan, an abortion upon request costs $4.85, while British hospitals practise mass abortions and a British physician has procured up to 62 abortions in a single day, for $288 each.

Legislative measures on abortion passed in different countries irrevocably lead to fantastic abuses. It is on account of that, I believe, that the hon. member who moved this amendment was prompted to restrict the meaning of the word "health".

When we say "—endanger her life", if we stop there, what happens? I have said it again and again, and I am going to repeat it once more, for I think it is worth saying it again, since it is an extremely important detail: the mother's life may be endangered three times out of 10,000 deliveries, and yet they want to extend the permission to procure miscarriages to all the hospitals in the country. It is awful when you think of it seriously. Three times out of 10,000, and nobody denies those figures. They are official figures.



And even in those three cases out of 10,000, the physician cannot positively state that abortion will save the mother's life. When her life is really in danger, the mother is as likely to die from the abortion as she would be due to her normal pregnancy.

And very often nature can correct things far better than the best physician.

What do experience and facts prove? That there are fewer risks for a woman to die if her pregnancy is continued to the end.

Very definite cases have been explained. We took the trouble to consult serious and competent people; we were even shown slides, films, which prove beyond doubt that nowadays, with the tremendous progress made by the medical science, no doctor can be absolutely sure that abortion will save the mother's life. And that is only for the first part.

Being aware of such facts, how could we not object to abortion? How could we go against what is so natural, so logical? In the final analysis, we wonder why we are discussing such things when the facts are so obvious.

We, of the Ralliement Créditiste, have not undertaken this debate lightly, for it is only after spending week-ends with doctors, gynaecologists and psychiatrists that we have come to the conclusion that an alarm had to be sounded across the country so that people would realize that they were going to be fooled with a bill introduced quietly and without warning.

If the facts are not as we describe them, we would be pleased to stand corrected. We would like nothing better. Will all the acts be turned upside down to promote the pernicious consequences of the countless abuses which are possible? Will essential principles, that are not necessarily and basically moral principles, but simply human ones, be upset to that end?

And since we specialize, so to speak, in promoting the liberty of the human being, its

complete development and fulfilment, we take care of it from the first moments of its existence, which starts as soon as impregnation takes place or, in more precise terms, as soon as there is implantation of the impregnated ovum in the uterus.

Consequently, there are no cases where pregnancy endangers "her life".

A doctor told us of a quite frequent occurrence: cancer of the uterus. When a pregnant woman is struck by such a disease, what happens? She seeks the advice of her doctor who prescribes treatments against cancer and not against the life of the foetus. This is not regarded as an abortion. Besides, it is done even in Catholic hospitals. It happens in three cases per 10,000.

As for renal or cardiac deficiencies, there are as many chances, if not more, of the woman dying through abortion as there would be if she were allowed to reach the term of her pregnancy.

It is facts like those which prompt us to hold our own and we shall continue to do so. And that settles it for "her life".

So, with regard to life, it does not happen. This occurs only occasionally and then a pregnant woman will never be left to die because in giving her such and such care she can be saved. When a patient has a doctor and is in the hospital all attempts are made to cure her and save her life. If that person represents two persons, because she has a foetus in her, a baby, if you prefer, in her body, then what is the doctor's role? It is to save both lives. He must try to save them both.

• (4:40 p.m.)

If, when one tries to save both, the foetus dies, we shall not oppose this. And if abortion was practised in this case, we would agree entirely.

We do not agree about the consequences, and the consequences of abortion are especially shown in the second part of this amendment: "or seriously and directly impairs her health."

The wording is as follows: "or would endanger her life." Of course, I can understand the concern of the hon. member who brings us this amendment when he wants to specify "seriously and directly impairs her health."

At first glance, it seems fine, and I would be inclined to support him if I were formally assured that a serious and direct health impairment were determined beyond question.

Mr. Speaker, if abortion practically never helps to save the life of the mother nor her health, the consequence is even greater, that is to say that all discussions, all suppositions are possible.

It is for this reason that adding the expression "seriously and directly" does not change anything. There will always be a doctor, a gynecologist, a psychiatrist or a member of the committee authorized in the hospitals to suggest that a girl or a woman who absolutely wants an abortion will always find a way to say that her health is or can be "seriously impaired".

There will always be somebody that will find that her health is threatened "directly" while we know quite well, thanks to medical science, that it never happens.

There may be indirect consequences; a person could become insane, mentally ill, as a result of her pregnancy. Then, this person would have become insane for entirely different reasons, Mr. Speaker. Destroying the foetus will not solve her mental problem.

This again was demonstrated very clearly and decisively: a psychiatrist has indicated that the consequences of abortion, from the psychiatric and psychological points of view, were more serious than those of a normal pregnancy, even when it was not wished for. Although a person could be pleased momentarily with having been aborted, this was only temporary; sooner or later she would develop a guilt complex that would affect her mental health for years.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to vote for something that is so unscientific, so illogical? Are we going to vote for something that is going to increase the number of mentally unbalanced? For, Mr. Speaker, as the number increases of the institutions where abortions are performed, we will also have to enlarge our mental institutions. If anything affects a person mentally, abortion certainly does.

Are we to believe that a normal pregnancy, a most natural thing, related to one of the deepest instincts of the human being, the instinct of reproduction, could really affect the mother's health? We know of no such cases. There are all kinds of treatments, and new ones are discovered every day to help the pregnant woman.

Mr. Speaker, we even heard about a woman who had German measles in the first months of her pregnancy. The popular belief was that

in 90 percent of the cases a woman affected with German measles would necessarily bear malformed children. As a result, in many countries a woman who caught German measles in the first months of her pregnancy could get an abortion. This was 15 or 20 years ago.

Today, following experiments in laboratories, experiments in hospitals and the discovery of hard facts it was found, Mr. Speaker, that 10 to 15 per cent only of women with German measles gave birth to malformed children. It can thus be said that by authorizing abortion in all those cases, 80 to 85 per cent of the fœtuses killed could have become perfectly normal people.

The newest developments in medical science do not allow us to legislate today on things we do not know about with certainty. To postulate that health is seriously or directly impaired would encourage abuses, though this amendment was brought in with the best intentions.

There will always be some woman or other who considers that her health is seriously impaired or that her health is directly impaired. That is why it does not behoove us to determine this point, under the pretext of doing away with illegal abortions. This has been pointed out and doubtless others will mention it later. It has been pointed out that it does not solve the problem in any way. In every country where abortion has been legalized there has been a fairly marked increase in illegal abortions. It is quite understandable. Most of the female persons who are waiting for the passing of this bill, in order to resort to abortion, have some hope for they do not understand what reservations the act may stipulate. They hope that once the bill has been passed they can go and consult the therapeutic abortion committees and have their abortion authorized. That is what they are hoping, Mr. Speaker. And when the bill is passed, they will want that hope to be fulfilled. They will try to be aborted, even if their health is neither seriously nor directly impaired. What will they do? Resort to illegal abortion.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am afraid the hon. member's time has expired.

[Mr. Matte.]

# PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

## SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are the following: The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—Consumer Affairs—Lumber—Request for investigation of price increase; the hon. member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Alkenbrack)—Public Service—Undue extension of bilingual requirements; the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart)—Finance—Northern Ontario—Alleged investment discrimination.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## CRIMINAL CODE

### REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 34, Mr. Allmand.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Montmorency):** Mr. Speaker, I shall deal briefly with the amendment under study, the purpose of which is to qualify the word "health" in connection with permissible abortion, that is, abortion that will not be considered a criminal act in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I have already expressed some doubts about leaving the word "health" unqualified in the legislation. That could lead to abortion on request and could also lead to legal abortion for psychiatric reasons.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of qualifying the word "health", used in conjunction with other words as suggested

by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand), as follows:

"endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health."

is to avoid future abortions for psychiatric reasons which the act, as it now reads, might legalize.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is the crux of the matter with regard to this whole clause, because if the word "health" is not qualified, there will be, both medically and legally different interpretations of the legislation as between hospitals, and thus, all kinds of illnesses, even indirectly related ones, will make abortion possible, that is non-criminal.

Mr. Speaker, if I do not agree with the views expressed by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) concerning this matter, I respectfully submit to the house that we should qualify the word "health" as proposed in a similar formula, in order to prevent any intervention of psychiatry, and by leaving the general term "health", it might be inferred that, from the medical point of view, since the expression "or would be likely to" has already been added, a mental illness might be sufficient for a hospital therapeutic committee to deliver a certificate authorizing an abortion.

And in this field, Mr. Speaker, I feel that psychiatry has proved that the effect of abortion is absolutely contrary to the patient's purpose.

I think psychiatrists or psychiatry have never been able to determine one way or the other whether abortion had any remedial effects on the person seeking an abortion on psychiatric grounds. The amendment states, and I quote:

—seriously and directly impair—

It is my opinion that doctors who will eventually have to interpret those words could not conclude to the possibility of psychiatric abortions, if it is stated and if it has to be proved, by way of a certificate or through a diagnosis, that this would seriously and directly impair her health. An abortion will then have to be performed.

At that time, with respect to psychiatric abortions, we should think it over seriously so as to leave it to doctors, as suggested by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle), to interpret the word "health" which includes both physical and mental health. Various hospitals thoughout the country would give it various interpretations. I think what is good in one part of the country should also be good in another part.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Laflamme:** Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of looking into this matter. I personally talked about it to several gynaecologists even within hospital groups, and I sincerely think, as I have already said in my own constituency, that I would be not only agreeable to the bill but also satisfied with it, provided the word "health" is qualified, specified and defined.

And the clarifications brought in by the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) meet, in my opinion, the real objectives that the legislation should seek, namely to avoid considering in future as criminal acts the medical acts performed at present in a good number of hospitals in this country, and not open the door in such a way that it would be possible from now on to have abortion upon request, on the pretence of psychiatric diseases, even simulated ones, to which a patient could resort, at a given moment, in presence of her doctor, to show that her health would probably be impaired, when we know that this could also include mental health, for if mental health could be impaired, one must nevertheless take into account the life of the individual which must also be protected.

Given those circumstances, I will support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, and I agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) on that point for, in my opinion, it is essential that the word "health" be defined and described in a way similar or identical to the one proposed.

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme) for the opinion which he put forth about the amendment introduced by one of his colleagues, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand), removing from the clause the words "or probably" and adding:

"endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health."

The proposed amendment improves a little the meaning of the clause; only, in our opinion, it is not sufficient. We are going to accept the amendment which establishes that the health would be seriously impaired and, if it is seriously impaired, that the abortion be accepted.

Mr. Speaker, as was mentioned by my colleague from Champlain (Mr. Matte), it is proved beyond doubt that death or seriously impaired health were deplored in only three cases out of 10,000 pregnancies.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment stipulates that pregnancy would endanger the life of the mother or impair seriously or directly her health, and everybody agrees that the pregnant woman is from the beginning rather ill, although it is natural. This lasts as long as she is pregnant. I have among my relatives the mother of a family who, when pregnant for the first time, was practically condemned to death. She was told that she would not reach her term and so on. Today, this mother has seven children. She did not die. Her health is even better than ever.

And how many Canadian mothers of families with a delicate constitution, have we not seen bearing families of 10, 12 and 15 children. And yet, they were ill everytime they gave birth to a child. From the point of view of health, people said: She is ruining her health. However, nothing prevented those mothers of families from raising large families.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, if 50 years age a bill providing for the termination of pregnancy, when it engangered the life of the mother or seriously and directly affected her health, had been introduced, it is probable that we would not have those brilliant men in parliament at the present time.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Caouette:** The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) might not be here today, if such a legislation or regulation had been passed 50 years ago. That is what I think.

In the name of civilization, such bills are introduced while those who will vote in favour of them might not be members of parliament. They would have been rejected because their mothers' life was in danger or the birth of these particular birds would have seriously affected her health.

[Mr. Caouette.]

It is all absurd and confusing. The minister, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or any member are unable to cope with the matter. The bill is introduced even if it is a known fact that the majority of the people object to it and nobody says a word of what the people are expecting to hear.

If such a bill had been passed 50 years ago, the Chinese would perhaps have taken over our country. How many members would be here? We are told that we would help the Canadian people by passing such a legislation. This means that we are attacking and betraying future generations through that bill.

Mr. Speaker—I said it earlier and I repeat it now—they rely heavily on the concept of civilization to introduce in Parliament such a bill and such amendments as provide that abortion could be procured when the mother's life is "endangered or her health seriously and directly impaired".

Mr. Speaker, to hear such lines of argument is unbelievable. Particularly among Liberals, the services of psychiatrists are called upon. Before psychiatrists existed, there were women who gave birth to children. Psychiatrists have never helped anyone from losing his reason if he was meant to. Psychiatry has seldom cured the insane. We realize it when we look at the other side of the house.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** You should look at yourself in a mirror.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice tells me to look at myself in a mirror. He probably knows from experience, because he has seen his own reflection.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, the services of psychiatrists are requested. We have nothing against psychiatrists. No. But since Canada and the world exist, there have been all kinds of such people. For awhile there were "wise women", who were first replaced by psychiatrists, then by "wise ministers". Nonetheless, we cannot determine, exactly and completely, as the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme) said earlier, that such a person will die, or that her health will be affected or ruined by pregnancy, or bearing a child.

In my view, the amendment—and I repeat the words of the hon. member for Champlain—partially improves the legislation.

However, the fact that we reject the bill as it is does not mean that we accept abortion when the mother's life or health is endangered. We are against such a thing, we want nature to be respected.

Nature was not created by psychiatrists, nor by the Minister of Justice nor by the Prime Minister of Canada. Nature was created by a superior being, who is not the Minister of Justice. We must conform to that nature. Of course, there are ups and downs, tragedies, and death.

Mothers are not the only ones to die. I wonder if the minister will not eventually introduce another bill dealing with fatherhood, on behalf of *male* fathers of families.

And so it goes: we go off our rockers in the name of civilization. In the name of civilization, we no longer know what to do. In the name of civilization we allow all kinds of organizations to push us around, organizations which are absolutely unknown to the Canadian people, unknown to Parliament. A few people only understand what is going on; the others are all at sea.

We seldom see members speak up on the government side, as the hon. member for Montmorency did, and openly take a stand in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. The minister does not seem too pleased with his attitude, coming from a Liberal member, and does not seem pleased either with the support of the hon. member for Montmorency with regard to the amendment, because he does not want to change the law.

A bill is introduced and we are told: Follow the leader and vote in favour of the whole caboodle. This is a "package deal" as they say in English.

Mr. Speaker, the few Liberal members who get on their feet will be praised by the people more than those who remain stuck to their seat with Lepage glue. This is obvious. The people of Quebec will commend them too, because this is not a question of religion. We are Catholics, it goes without saying, but we have gathered evidence from people who, though they are not Catholics, are strongly opposed to this bill and against statements such as: "the life of the mother is in danger or her health will be directly or seriously affected".

Mr. Speaker, it is not just a question of religion, it is a question of Christian morality. There are Christians not only among Catholics, but all over Canada.



We sincerely believe that the government has no right to open doors which will give rise to abuses, to more or less justified abortions. The government is aware of this, and the minister also, and nevertheless he is good and patient. Sitting at his desk, he is listening, he is thinking and he calls us doctors from time to time. We do not speak on behalf of medecine at all, but on behalf of life that no man has a right to jeopardize. That life may be only embryonic, but it is a life there and thereafter. The nonsense of such a bill is that we are about to permit murder.

We are asked in the Criminal Code to spare from the rope those who have taken the life of others. But those who are about to be born, let us kill them under the pretext that the life of the mother is endangered or her health will be seriously impaired.

Now, neither the Minister of Justice, nor I know anything about the subject. As a matter of fact, even physicians do not agree. The hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle), who is a doctor, says something and another doctor who went to medical school with him, says the opposite.

When one speaks as a Liberal rather than as a physician, then one repudiates medicine.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** When you speak of credit, what do you repudiate? Credit?

**An hon. Member:** We serve the country.

**Mr. Caouette:** Even if we lose credit, we nevertheless work for our country, and if credit is lost, Mr. Speaker, it is not the fault of the Ralliement créditiste, but of the Liberals, because they are the ones who play with credit. The credit of the whole country. The credit of the whole nation good for the others.

Mr. Speaker, those are the remarks I wanted to make on that matter because I do not think that someone can prove beyond doubt that a mother will die in child-birth.

Mr. Speaker, nobody can be sure, not even the greatest scientist. So, how is it possible to be absolutely sure that the mother will die? Furthermore, neither the doctor nor anyone else can decide of the place or time of a person's death.

So I think the Minister of Justice who pilots this bill through the house should withdraw it, and stop saying all the time that we are filibustering, as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) said this afternoon. That is not the case. Let them introduce other pieces of legislation. Let them cast that one

aside; the minister should reintroduce it in 50 years, when he has more experience than he has now; during that time, our mothers will not rack their brains wondering whether they will die or not in giving birth to a child.

Therefore let us get down to work, let us improve health conditions for our mothers so that they can give Canada, our native land, sturdy, robust and intelligent children, so that we may be able, in a few years, to replace the present Minister of Justice.

• (5:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I must apologize to the house for not being here earlier this afternoon when my motion was called. I was obliged to be at a meeting of the Transport and Communications Committee at that time and did not know that the preceding amendment had been dealt with. In the meantime I believe the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) filled in for me and gave an excellent explanation of my amendment.

In any case I would like to put forward some of the reasons why I propose this amendment. Last year when the government stated its intention of amending the law on abortion and referred the matter to the Health and Welfare Committee I asked to become a member of that committee. I did so because I felt that this question was a very serious one and I wanted to listen to arguments on both sides and to all experts on the matter. I approached the subject, like most other people, with preconceived opinions. All of us form certain opinions about certain things and I, like others, had certain opinions about abortion. However, I had made up my mind, because I had been approached by many of my constituents, to try to look at this subject as objectively as possible and to consider all arguments as openly as possible.

I was made a member of the Health and Welfare Committee which sat for three and a half months during the period from October 1967, to March, 1968, studying the question of abortion. During that time we had 29 meetings, received 35 briefs, heard 93 witnesses, and prepared two reports. We prepared an interim report which was presented on December 19, 1967. I shall summarize briefly what the report said. It recommended that the Criminal Code be amended to allow therapeutic abortions under appropriate medical safeguards where a pregnancy will seriously endanger the life or the health of the mother. I agreed to that interim report which was prepared before we had heard all the evidence.

Later we prepared a final report which was presented on March 13, 1968, after we had heard all the witnesses. The report we made at that time was somewhat similar to the interim report. It said that the Criminal Code should be amended to read—and again I summarize—that when the continuation of the pregnancy of such a female person will endanger the life or seriously and directly impair the health of the mother an abortion may be performed. This was the opinion of the parliamentary committee which sat for three and a half months and seriously considered the evidence of all the experts in Canada on the subject. As a matter of fact, we heard not only experts but women's groups, theological groups, journalists and anybody who wanted to say something on the subject. We requested all those who we thought might have something worth while to say to come before the committee.

The wording that I propose in my amendment is the wording that was suggested by the Health and Welfare Committee. What it in fact does is to restrict the grounds where an abortion might be granted for reasons of health. We think that abortions should only be allowed when the continuation of the pregnancy will seriously and directly impair the health of the mother. As I said, I came to this conclusion after much soul-searching and after questioning and re-examining my initial position. It was my feeling that this question should not be decided on theological grounds but rather on scientific and social grounds, and I tried to reach a decision on those bases.

The arguments that led us to this conclusion were that the foetus is a human being in the process of development. There was discussion among the doctors as to the exact nature of the foetus. Some gave it more human characteristics and others gave it less, but finally I concluded that if there is doubt as to the humanity of the foetus, then surely that doubt should be resolved in favour of its humanity. If I had a gun in my hand and was trying to decide whether to fire it down a dark corridor without knowing whether or not somebody was there, I certainly would resolve the question in favour of the possibility that somebody might be there and I would not engage in foolish behaviour which might endanger someone's life.

As I say, there are arguments on both sides as to the humanity of the foetus, and this

disagreement is found among doctors. Some doctors firmly state that the foetus is fully human right from the moment of conception. Others state that whereas its humanity develops as the foetus develops it is uncertain whether or not it is fully human in the early stages. If there is this division of opinion, I state that we should resolve any doubt in favour of the human being. We should not take chances if there is any doubt whatsoever that a human life is involved.

For that reason we say that this life can only be terminated for extremely serious reasons. The only reasons that we feel are acceptable are when the life of the mother is in danger or when her health will be seriously and directly impaired. We take this position for humanitarian and social reasons. Those who object to it and would like to deny any protection at all for the foetus state that the foetus does not deserve any protection whatsoever. They state that it is just a part of the woman's body and therefore, if she wishes to have it removed, she should have the right to have this done. In other words, they say that it is no different from her appendix or her kidneys.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I must say that the vast and overwhelming majority of the informed witnesses who came before our committee denied that contention. To begin with, none of these other organs develops into a baby. The foetus definitely and necessarily does. That alone would lead one to believe that it is not like any organ in the human body. Second, doctors, and especially Dr. Jack Walters, professor of obstetrics at St. Joseph's Hospital and the University of Western Ontario, put forward six tests for human life. These tests are: 1. Is there a heartbeat? 2. Is there blood pressure? 3. Is there maintenance of body temperature? 4. Is there production of carbon dioxide? 5. Is there utilization of oxygen? 6. Is there respiratory activity? These are the tests used habitually to determine whether there is human life. The witness stated that scientific tests he and other obstetricians had carried out showed that as early as nine weeks the foetus gave evidence of satisfying all these criteria. In other words, the foetus has met these tests used to determine whether human life is present. Dr. Walters concluded as follows, as found on page 559 of the evidence before the committee on January 30, 1968:

> In discussion before this committee relative to changes in the abortion law for Canada, statements have been made that the foetus is a "potential human", "not living" or a "protoplasmic mass". The foetus, on the contrary, is living, is human and this must be taken into consideration in modifying the abortion laws of this country.

This doctor did not reach these conclusions on theological grounds or on grounds of prejudice. He arrived at them following the evidence of six scientific tests which he and others had carried out.

Another doctor who appeared before the committee on the same day, Dr. de Veber, a pediatrician, has carried out operations on foetuses as early as 14 weeks after conception. He referred to cases where the foetus had been taken out of the womb, operated upon and replaced in the womb where it developed normally until born as a child in due term. His comment was that if the foetus is not a human being and does not deserve human rights at this early stage, what are its rights after it has been taken out of the body to be operated on in one of these operations? Does it acquire human rights when it is outside the womb, only to lose them again when it is put back?

I confess I approach this subject with certain ideas about it. But the law itself, over many long years, has also recognized that the foetus has human rights. I could cite many examples of the way in which the law has recognized this. For example, in those dark days when we retained capital punishment a woman was never executed while she was pregnant. The reason was that the state recognized that although the woman might have committed murder there was living inside her another person who was innocent and who should not be executed for the crime. Thus, whenever a convicted person was pregnant the execution was stayed.

There are many countries in which pregnant women are exempt from imprisonment because it is recognized that they must care for the human being developing inside them. In addition, civil law has recognized that an unborn child has certain civil rights. Such children are given rights to succession and inheritance from the time of conception, and a curator can be appointed by the courts to protect their financial interest. In other words, if a woman is pregnant the child within her body is considered to be human for succession purposes should the father, or some other person, die leaving legacies to the woman's children.

Civil law has also recognized that the foetus has a right of action for damage caused to it. This was illustrated in cases involving what

have been called thalidomide babies. Action was taken on their behalf on account of damage done to them as foetuses because certain drug companies or doctors had acted or prescribed negligently. The courts upheld the right of action on the part of the foetus.

All this seems reasonable to me. These are principles which the law has recognized for many years. Now we are being asked by some people to dispense with these rights, to do away with this protection. I have a lot of respect for those who put forward arguments in favour of the proposals now before us. I have examined these arguments but after serious consideration, and, still with great respect, I cannot accept them inasmuch as I feel it is the duty of the state to protect innocent persons.

It is said by some that parents should be free to do whatever they want to do, that this is a question for them alone to decide, and the state should not intervene. Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not take this attitude with respect to cases of non-support by a father or in cases where a mother or a father batters a minor child. We do not take this attitude with respect to education. The state has decided that regardless of the wishes of the parents children should be educated to the age of 16; free and compulsory education is provided for them and we feel this is in the interest of the children no matter what the mother or the father might prefer. There are many other questions which the state decides because it wishes to protect children against the damage or intrusion upon their human rights which may be occasioned even by parents and those closest to them.

There are those who say, in support of arguments in favour of a wider amendment than the one I am now suggesting, that no one should be forced by law to have unwanted children. It is argued that families should have the right to limit the number of their children. Few of us would disagree with that proposition. I, myself, support the principle that families should have the right to limit the number of their children. I call attention to the fact that the government has put a bill through parliament, Bill S-15, legalizing contraception and the sale of means of contraception. I fully support that bill. But to say parents should have the right to decide the number of children they want to have does not conflict with the principle that we ought not to countenance abortion on any condition whatsoever.

[Mr. Allmand.]

• (5:30 p.m.)

I maintain that we must make up our minds whether we want the child before it comes into existence. Once it has come into existence we have forfeited any right to dispose of it for any reason whatsoever. Those who say we have a right to dispose of the child surprise me. Many hon. members have suggested that you must protect human life, and even animal life; yet, at the same time they suggest we can deprive a child of existence. This Criminal Code omnibus bill contains amendments which will make it more difficult for some to abuse animal life. Those are good amendments. On the other hand, I maintain that the grievances of a woman seeking an abortion can often be dealt with by means other than the performance of an abortion. Society can help to cure some of her grievances.

I could say many things on this matter but we are limited to speeches of 20 minutes. May I wind up by saying that I moved this motion to amend because I was a member of the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare which worked hard to bring out a report on this matter. I thought it was a good report. In no sense did I move this motion as a motion of non-confidence in the minister. I have full confidence in the minister. I think he is a good minister and in bringing forward this omnibus bill he has done good work. Only on this one point do I disagree with him.

My only regret is that the Creditistes may use my amendments as a pretext to continue their filibuster. Their behaviour here has been deplorable. This is the first time I have spoken in this debate. I did not speak on second reading or on any of the other motions to amend, thinking other members would wish to speak. I feel that the Creditistes, in carrying on a frivolous debate, have been undemocratic. I feel uneasy when they support me on this motion. I am uneasy about giving them an opportunity to talk more, because I completely disagree with their reasons for supporting my motion. I feel they are acting most undemocratically and they are paying lip service only to the principles of democracy. After I have spoken on my motion I will sit down, hoping to have the support of other members in this house. In any event, I wish to see the vote come as quickly as possible so that we can dispose of the matter. Hon. members here will determine whether they wish to support my

motion. After that, we can consider other things.

May I also say that certain reasons which cause a woman to seek an abortion—I am speaking of poverty, adverse social conditions and so on—should be cured by society. If a female wants an abortion, that is, wants to do away with the life of a child because of certain social reasons or because she cannot afford that child, then surely it is the duty of the state to give that family the necessary assistance to take care of the children. If bad social conditions, improper housing, or slum conditions cause a woman to seek an abortion, then I think it is the duty of the state to correct those underlying conditions. I say that many of the conditions put forward by persons as reasons for an abortion are conditions that may be and should be corrected by society. Of course, if the continuation of the pregnancy endangers the life of the mother, we cannot do anything; she must have an abortion to protect her own life. The same thing applies to her health. But if she wants an abortion because she is poor, because she is living in adverse social conditions or simply for personal convenience then, surely, we have civilized and humane methods of dealing with those problems.

I submit strongly that we should allow abortions under controlled conditions. At present the law is totally inadequate and confusing. There are conflicting sections in the Code, and the law must be changed. There ought to be reforms and I suggest the reforms should state clearly the conditions under which an abortion may be granted. Those conditions should be serious conditions. They should be related to serious threats to the life or health of the mother.

**Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak briefly on this motion. Having listened carefully to the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand), I rather feel that he has set up a lot of straw men which are not in issue at all in this motion to amend. He made a case against permitting what might be termed abortion on demand or request, but he did not say anything which persuaded me that the proposed wording of his amendment in any way improves upon the present wording of the bill.

I think all hon. members realize that it is necessary, in providing for therapeutic abortions, to deal with questions not only of life and death, but of health. This was made clear by the great case of Rex v. Bourne, decided before the war in Great Britain. In that case the medical evidence made it quite clear that it was impossible in many cases for doctors to decide whether life or health were involved. Indeed, they might never know that life itself was involved unless the mother died. So, I think all hon. members supporting the principle of therapeutic abortions realize that the distinction which is sometimes made between the life of the mother and the health of the mother is a false distinction. They realize that medical men, in the exercise of the awesome discretion which they now have and which we will confirm with the passage of this bill, require the protection of the law.

I invite the attention of hon. members to the wording of the present bill and to the wording of the amendment proposed by my colleague for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. The present wording is to the effect that a therapeutic abortion will be lawful if it is found that the continuation of the pregnancy would be likely to "endanger her life or health". I submit that the word "endanger" is a good, old Anglo-Saxon word. It is strong, forceful and carries great significance. That wording means that the medical men must find—

**An hon. Member:** Probably, you mean.

**Mr. Blair:** The medical men must find that the continuation of the pregnancy will endanger health, in the same way as it may endanger life.

Now, let us consider the proposal made by way of amendment. Instead of using one verb, it uses two. The test as to life will continue to be whether it endangers her life, but the test as to health becomes merely whether it will "impair her health". Actually, the full wording of the amendment is:

—endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I submit for the consideration of all members that, on a proper reading of these two texts, the test "endanger her life or health" is a much more serious test than "impair her health". I submit further that the addition of adverbs to the word "impair" does not improve its force or position. It is suggested that the test should become the endangering of life or seriously and directly impairing health. If this kind of section ever had to be construed by a court, I would say that the court would look at those two verbs—

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Adverbs.

**Mr. Blair:** Verbs and adverbs—and would say that the test as to life is endangering life, but the test as to health is merely the impairing of health, qualified by whether health is seriously or directly impaired. I suggest for the consideration of all hon. members that the original text of this bill imposes at least as strict a standard, and in my submission a more severe standard, than that proposed by this amendment.

I also make the submission, which I think will carry some weight with members of my profession in this house, that if we wish to have a law that is clear and incapable of undue confusion in interpretation and administration, the fewer words we use the better. I submit that by using the original text of the bill and retaining the phrase "endanger her life or health", we are going to have a more clear and understandable law than if we confuse the situation by suggesting that the test for life is whether it is endangered and the test for health is merely whether it is impaired.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on the amendment now under study, but after all that happened, I feel it is my duty to clear up certain points.

First, I shall like to congratulate the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) for his amendment.

As I was listening to him, he taught me a lesson, that we should never judge someone before having listened to him. In order to show that we are gentlemen, I would like to congratulate him, in spite of everything he said against us, for the reasoning he developed and for the arguments he put before the house.

He is accusing us of delaying the business of the house, but I think that we are getting our reward today. After two weeks of fighting, we feel that government members are beginning to move, are beginning to express themselves. If it were only for some amendments, as the ones we are studying presently, our struggle would not have been in vain. While endorsing the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce who is urging his colleagues to vote for this amendment, I must tell him that I cannot understand why he is the only one in his party to oppose those amendments.

I was listening earlier to one of his colleagues and I tell him frankly that he could at least have been honest when he was opposing the amendment. He has brought out arguments against this amendment, and he has not been honest about it, because he has not quoted all the words spelled out in the present legislation. He merely read paragraph (c):

(c) has by certificate in writing stated that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would ... endanger her life or health—

But, that is not the case, it is not the truth. Let us read the whole of this paragraph which says:

—that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely—

There lies all the difference, there is the heart of the matter. That is why we are fighting with all our might.

—would or would be likely to endanger her life and health—

And it is this word "likely" I am sure, that incited the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme) to say what he did say and for which I want to congratulate him. It is with this word "likely" that we will come to abortion on request. All the people, all the members who are thinking, who want to pass judgment on this clause, agree that tomorrow, in a few years, with this clause, we will have abortion on request.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair), to oppose his colleague, read this clause three times, and each time I said to myself: Since he is a lawyer, will he end up by reading the clause in full?

I am not a lawyer, and he read it in English, but then he did not say "likely". Hon. members shouted "likely". He would not say it, and it was intentionally. Hon. members shouted it twice at him—

**One hon. Member:** Dishonest.

**Mr. Gauthier:** —"likely". It is simply dishonest.

• (5:50 p.m.)

**An hon. Member:** In the English version, the word "probably" does not appear.

**Mr. Gauthier:** The French version that I have here says "probablement". I speak French. I cannot help it. If there are two bills, I am not to blame. Two flags, two bills, two Ministers of Justice.

Again, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, since be bothered to sit on the health, welfare and social aflairs committee; when he learned that

that subject would be discussed, he asked to be named on that committee and his report is simply marvellous, as well as the work he did to get information and pass an equitable judgment.

He says that in both reports he tabled in the house, it was clearly stated: "provided that the pregnancy worsens the mother's condition and seriously endangers her life or health".

That is what struck me. While he says that in both reports tabled in the house, he suggested to the minister of Justice not to forget to insert that word, no account has been taken of that suggestion in the text of the bill. The sentence: "probablement en danger la vie et la santé de la mère", has certainly not been written by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, not by the hon. member for Montmorency, nor by the hon. member for Gatineau.

I note that the amendments moved by those hon. members always aim at defining the word "health", and the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce has just provided us with striking evidence that the committee reports, since the beginning of this session, do not weigh much in the leaders' decisions.

We must remember that that bill was prepared long before—I am not talking about the present Minister of Justice—but the picture has not changed, because the chief said so. It cannot be changed. When I look at this task as a whole, I commend those members who were responsible, who worked seriously.

They are a little roused themselves since they are bringing us these amendments in order to try to correct the situation, to come back to the terms of the committees' reports.

Those who helped draft this bill, according to me, and to the evidence just given us, did not take into account the two committees' report regarding subsection (c). And this is why we see some members, despite the orders given to them, rise, protest and say: We have reached the limit; it does not make sense anymore.

And I understand that their social conception is rebelling. It looks as if their present leader compels them to destroy the Canadian nation. An infernal spirit which I am unable to describe is behind that.

That is why today, after the member for Gatineau who wants to delete the word "likely"—and it was quite clear in his amendment—the word "likely" must be taken off. Had such a word been left out, we could not have talked about it.

We missed that, we missed another amendment. I am wondering if we shall not miss the third, that of the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. And yet, these are three fine testimonies from the government side and not from just anybody.

The points made by the hon. member for Montmorency were not frivolous. I know personally the hon. member for Montmorency and usually, he knows what he is talking about. I am convinced that his reasoning today was based on the fundamental principles concerning the child's right to live, because if we deny here all rights to a child, we might as well shut up shop and go home, for this affects the future generation, our heirs of tomorrow. I will admit that the amendment is not quite perfect yet. But at least it might bring some comfort to people when they read the following words:

—endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health.

Those words, will in my opinion be of great help, though it is still far from perfection. It is not a hundred per cent in accordance with our idea yet, but we approve of a middle course. That is why we have been fighting for many days, in order to find a middle course.

Such a course is being indicated to us this afternoon, but some proclaim it to be futile. They forbid their colleagues to change the idea for the sake of which we are fighting. Yet they are not shallow-minded; let us tell them so, let us praise them. We are braver than people on the government side; say "thank you for a job well done" and this has nothing to do with politics. The future of the Canadian people is at stake.

As the hon. member for Montmorency pointed out a while ago, if we do not accept this amendment, with what is allowed by the law, we shall see in a few years from now abortions upon request, which is a very dangerous thing. And that is precisely what we do not want; we do not want to be like some other countries, like England and all the other countries mentioned since this fight began. We want to avoid the extremes to which other countries have gone.

Mr. Speaker, may I declare six o'clock?

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being six o'clock this sitting stands suspended until 8 p.m.

At 6 p.m. the house took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, before recess, I was making a few comments on amendment No. 34 moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) who wants to specify a certain detail in the act, of much concern to us, in clause 18 of the bill, by deleting the words:

"or would be likely to endanger her life or health" on lines 4 and 5, on page 43, and by inserting the following words: "endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health"

As I said earlier, we will vote for this amendment, even if it does not achieve our aims. It is a lesser evil. It specifies the case of an abortion, when the board of a committee appointed will have to make a decision, because the terms of the present act which the hon. member wants to delete make all the difference in the world.

When we write "would be likely to endanger her life or health", I am of opinion that the words "would be likely to" will allow some doctors to go very far, and even, as the hon. member for Montmorency suggested, to allow abortion on request. This is exactly what we are trying to avoid through our amendments. I believe that amendment No. 34 does not go as far as those we have moved, but at least it sets some limits for the committee which will have to make the decision.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton as well as the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce were sincere this afternoon in their discussion. The latter seemed somewhat sorry to have moved the amendment, though he told us frankly that he did so because he thought some of his constituents wanted him to define more clearly the limits of the legislation. He blamed us for extending this debate on the bill now under consideration.

This extension, Mr. Speaker, if it is an extension, has a purpose. We want to achieve an aim. We wish to draw the attention of the government and stir it up. We probably have not quite succeeded today, by moving that amendment, but the intervention of the hon. member for Gatineau and of the hon. member for Montmorency, whom I would like to congratulate once again, have helped us.

I think that our comments were not entirely lost and if we could carry on, in a few days most of the government members would support us, in order to respect the wishes of the people.

Mr. Speaker, as I have little time left, I am going to bring my speech to a close. I would like to appeal to the conscience of all government members—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order!

• (8:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I have not previously taken part in the debate on the abortion clause of this bill or the amendments, but this particular amendment seems to be the one which gives an opportunity to make some brief comments. The various stands which have been taken in respect of this amendment indicate how much this whole subject, and the amendment relating to abortion, have been misunderstood.

As a piece of social legislation, I would agree with those who have suggested that this particular part represents a fraud. Current practices in most hospitals go much further and are much more reasonable than this particular amendment would allow. Rather than being a progressive piece of social legislation, this really is a step backwards.

The impersonal hospital committee which is to be set up, busy as it will be, will not meet the situation. The hospital committee which will have to make the decision will not have personal knowledge of the patient, her family background, mental or physical problems. This amendment is intended to permit that committee to give serious consideration to more than just the danger to the life of the patient. For that reason I would support it.

I am advised that at the present time hospital practices in most, if not all, of the provinces take into account many more conditions than those set forth in the bill we are now considering, and many more than those incorporated in the amendment we are now discussing. I should like to outline these considerations by reading from an article which appeared in the April, 1969 edition of *Canadian Doctor*. Those of us who are not medical people must rely upon the opinions of those who are in practice, particularly in respect of what is currently being done in hospitals regarding abortion. Let me read from this article which is entitled "Forum":

If an abortion law has to specify indications for abortion, rather than leave the decision to the woman and her physician as is done with nearly all other decisions to operate, then the indications must include all conditions for which termination

of pregnancy is required. These should encompass all physical diseases in the mother that would jeopardize her health, or that of the baby, should she continue with the pregnancy. They should also include obstetrical indications, if carrying the pregnancy to full term would be hazardous to either mother or baby.

Furthermore, the law should include psychiatric indications where continuation may result in a psychotic episode or depression severe enough to engender suicidal thoughts or affect the woman's personality. It should be made possible for the woman to be relieved of responsibility for continuing with a pregnancy that would result in an unwanted child and the adverse effects such an event may have on the emotional health of the mother, the child, or on pre-existing children in the family. Similarly, there should be no question when abortion is requested in the case of known rape or incest, or in the case of a high risk pregnant child under the age of 16. It would also be reasonable to expect that abortion be permitted, in case of a gestation which may result in a physically or mentally incapacitated offspring. Bill 150, when looked upon in this way, is inadequate.

That outlines briefly what the people in the medical profession seem to feel is an absolute minimum. In fact, these are the conditions under which abortions are presently performed in hospitals. If you consider all the conditions set out in the article I have just read, you will find that the proposed definition we are being asked to consider is completely inadequate.

Many others during the debate have spoken about these inadequacies, particularly in respect of rape and other incidents which are not covered by the bill. For that reason, I think the amendment now proposed moves in the right direction, or at least in a more reasonable direction, toward making abortion a medical matter rather than a legal matter.

The legislation we are now asked to consider, even as it would be if the amendment before us were adopted, is much too narrow to be workable. As I see it the result would be that the hospital committees, when they have been established, would have to rule against many abortions which are now being performed in our hospitals. In other words, rather than enlarging the grounds or making them more reasonable, this bill will narrow those conditions and make it more difficult for the committee to rule in favour of abortion. This is another case of defining by narrowing the meaning and making the law less reasonable than was intended.

These committees must follow the definitions in this bill. If there were nothing said at all I think these committees would be in a better position than they will be with the present narrow definitions. In other words, if the hospital committee were set up, and if it were given general directions that abortions might be performed in accordance with the practices heretofore prevailing in that hospital, or any hospital in the province generally, it would be a better bill. I say this because here we will have the situation of the committee having to apply the law which has been laid down and refusing cases which are perfectly legitimate and logical. After it has refused one or two of these cases, patients will stop going to the committee and instead will turn to illegal abortions, which this bill is trying to avoid.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I found it necessary last night to vote against the amendment of a colleague. I shall not comment upon the vote because that is not permitted. However, I found it necessary to vote against that amendment because it would have tended to increase the number of persons on the hospital committee, which I think would be a bad practice. In my view, the more people that are placed upon a hospital committee the more difficult it will be to get the committee together in order to make decisions, and the more difficult it will be to consider the act and its application to a particular person.

I think the present practice, amended slightly, of permitting the family physician and the surgeon involved to perform the abortion, with perhaps advice from another surgeon, would have been much more preferable. However, we are confined to the narrow amendment before us. Therefore, I rise to indicate that I will support the amendment because it moves a little further toward the situation where the committee can make a broad and reasonable decision upon the facts. I hope the government will give consideration to some of these amendments and will allow them. We have here an amendment moved by a member of the government party. It goes a little way toward improving the bill, and I hope the government will accept it.

**Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River):** Mr. Speaker, because I spoke briefly on the question of abortion during second reading of this bill I shall be very brief tonight. I was impressed by the speeches of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) and the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand). It is very seldom that I have been able to say I have been impressed by a speech I have heard in the House of Commons, but as a result of those speeches I am

prepared to change the position I took on February 25 with regard to the question of abortion.

I am now able to vote for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. I reserved an open mind on this question until I had read the deliberations of the justice committee, which might indicate that I should change my mind. I was not sure that I should vote against the government on this issue. Since that time I have not seen, read or heard anything that would lead me to change my position. However, the speech of the hon. member from Notre-Dame-de-Grâce and that of the hon. member for Ontario have moved me to change my position somewhat, and I shall support this motion.

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this amendment. I think it will make what is not a very good piece of legislation somewhat better. It will allow the medical profession and those dealing with this question a little more leeway in their interpretation of danger to the life or impairment to the health of a pregnant woman. The problem with this legislation is that it is too restrictive; it devolves upon the abortion committee alone to decide whether an abortion shall be carried out. The question is whether a woman should be admitted to hospital and have this procedure carried out before the eighth week of pregnancy.

In these days of tight hospital beds and the fact that the pregnant woman rarely sees the physician before the sixth week of pregnancy, it makes it difficult to do the operation before the 8th week which is the optimum time.

I support this amendment because it will slightly broaden the terms under which abortions may be carried out. The amendment provides that an abortion may be carried out if continuing the pregnancy would endanger a woman's life or seriously and directly impair her health. If such a provision were not made, I think the abortion committee would degenerate into a largely routine and poorly functioning type of body, in that you would have on it three physicians none of whom might have anything in common with the patient, who might not know the family, and the family would not be very familiar with what was going on. This would be a very poor way of proceeding, and there would not be the necessary consultation between doctor and patient.

It seems foolish to have an abortion committee just to guard the rules and practices of a hospital when there is a general medical committee in every hospital that inquires into the standards according to which abortions are carried out and which studies the indications in respect thereof. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment. It makes a small improvement to what is a very poor piece of legislation in respect of establishing a cumbersome abortion committee.



[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, we are considering the amendment of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) which seeks to replace the followings words:

—or would be likely to endanger her life or health—

by those:

"endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health"

I feel nonplussed. On the one hand, I would like to support the amendment without reservations. But on the other hand, the bill proposed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) reads as follows:

—would or would be likely to endanger her life or health—

By that expression, the Minister of Justice opens all the doors to every pretense and to every case without exception and would allow abortion under any circumstances and without any limits.

Since I formally object to that proposal, to this shabby piece of legislation proposed by the Minister of Justice, dealing with abortion, I would be inclined to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, which is a little more specific and which gives a little more security to the patient and to the legislators, to the doctors and to the therapeutic committees, when it is said:

—would endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health.

But when I consider the abortion problem in its true context, I wonder why we should permit abortion? Is it really necessary? Are we compelled, because of the great number of cases, to pass a law on this matter? Is the problem so big that we should allow abortion? Will the fact that we adopt a measure and that we permit abortion do away with clandestine abortions?

After considering both the bill and the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, I remain puzzled. The reason is that I am not at all sure that the

amendment I have just mentioned or the bill can solve the problem of secret abortions, or of therapeutic ones, in short, that they can bring any long-term solution to the problem of the rejection of motherhood and of the meaning of motherhood.

Secret abortions constitute a very serious problem, not only in Canada but in a large number of countries. Its consequences are disastrous, because more than half of all secret abortions give rise to serious complications, to permanent sterility in 25 per cent of all cases.

Even in those countries where abortion is legal, the number of secret abortions—and this should really give us food for thought—does not appear to have been substantially reduced.

As a matter of fact, in France, 88 per cent of all abortions are secret, although abortions are authorized by law, and in 80 per cent of such cases, married women are involved.

In various countries, the reasons put forward to justify abortion pertain to physical health: health of the mother, to mental health: depression, psychoneurosis, overwork, etc. These reasons are closely related to socio-economic factors, financial troubles, especially poverty, alcoholism of the husband, housing problems, lack of information on birth control methods, etc.

When we know these things, when we stop to think in a sensible manner, and with common sense—it is not necessary to have as much education as the hon. Minister of Justice—we then begin to wonder about the advisability of the legislation of the omnibus bill, and in particular, of clause 18 designed to legalize abortion, and we wonder even more about the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce which is only another way to flounder in a system that a strong-minded majority government wants to force on the Canadian people.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that this legislation will not really solve the problem of illegal abortions, nor will it help the woman who asks for an abortion.

We are worried more than puzzled when we read in the bill terms as vague as "would be likely", "would," "to endanger her life" or "health", especially when no definition is given of the word "health".

I have here a book entitled "*Famille et réalités contemporaines*" published by the Foyers Notre-Dame editions and an article written by Mrs. Fernand Ouellette, entitled:

—"*Réflexions sur l'avortement*".

She says on page 77, and I quote:

Therapeutic abortion in hospital seems to involve less pernicious consequences. On the other hand, there is no evidence that pregnancy aggravates psychic and other disorders, nor that it eliminates them.

Therefore, on what are we legislating, Mr. Speaker? In allowing abortion, will we solve the problems or aggravate them?

That is what I want to know. And I continue the quotation:

It would be preferable, it seems—

This is an extremely interesting and positive factor that I am duty-bound to mention in this house and that hon. members have forgotten since the beginning of this debate.

Mrs. Ouellette says and I quote:

—it would be preferable, it seems, to provide the pregnant woman with psychological, technical, financial assistance—

I hope the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cantin) understands me.

—to enable her to accept her womanliness as a whole, including her fecundity.

This government would like us to pass retrograde legislation. It wants to legalize the rejection of maternity, to have the public accept the legalized rejection of motherhood. It wants us to admit and to recognize that such is the way of progress and humanism, that in such a way the respect of the human being and of life may find expression.

I say that this is a retrograde legislation, which makes no sense at all and which is unbearable in a society such as ours.

Mrs. Ouellette goes on—and this is very interesting indeed:

—This might be the crux of the matter: the serene acceptation by woman of her real mission, which is maternity taken in its broader, more human sense. Several thorough studies on the nature and behavior of woman have led us to the conclusion that maternity gives woman her greatest sense of achievement and allows her to actualize her fullest virtualities on all levels.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we are dealing here with an extremely important aspect of the question and the discussion of such stupid matters as the omnibus bill, legalizing abortion, caused us to displace the problem. When our basic values: maternity, fecundity, love, relationship between husband and wife within the family, are already deteriorating, this

government is making himself an accomplice of an entirely socialist ideology, which does not respect the human being and contributes to degrading women, to degrading men and to eliminate values which are the basis of our society.

The hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) and the hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Pilon) or some others, are unable to see—

**Mr. Mongrain:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Fortin:** —that this legislation—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. Is the hon. member for Trois-Rivières rising on a question of privilege?

**Mr. Mongrain:** No, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Trois-Rivières on a point of order.

**Mr. Mongrain:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Our friend from Lotbinière is speaking for the fifth time on general abortion, while we are considering an amendment that proposes to change certain words in the bill, and I quote:

—"endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health".

Therefore, I would like to ask the hon. member for Lotbinière to keep to the rules. We have heard that sermon 50 times.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I thank the hon. member for Trois-Rivières. I noticed that the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) was more in order than usual. The hon. member for Lotbinière.

**Mr. Fortin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing that I was more in order than usual. But with all due respect, I do not like your way of implying that generally I am out of order.

It seems to me that the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, instead of remaining glued to his seat, should rise from time to time and participate in the debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order please. I would ask the hon. member for Lotbinière to speak only to the amendment now before us.

**Mr. Fortin:** If I must speak exclusively to the amendment, I would ask the hon. member for Trois-Rivières to play his part as a parliamentarian and to give us his views on the matter. If he has the courage of his convictions, Mr. Speaker, let him rise.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order please. The hon. member for Lotbinière has the floor and I would ask him to stick to the amendment before us.

**Mr. Fortin:** I know, Mr. Speaker, but, with your permission, first I would like to make the following remark: I wish the hon. member for Trois-Rivières would stop interrupting me with his nonsense because it puts me off the track.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, maternity is the road to a woman's greatest development and to her full potential in every way.

However, the amendment now before us is avoiding the issue, going around in circles, a foolish and a mad system into which the Minister of Justice wants to drag us. He sets the problem in an utterly different way and proposes minor values just to upset our basic principles.

Mr. Speaker, our responsibilities are far more serious. This amendment would be valid if there were many problems, many cases originating from the fact that a woman is pregnant or that it is a matter of maternity.

But could the hon. member for Trois-Rivières, or another one, tell us the number of cases, among all abortion applications, in which the life of a person is really endangered and how, for a woman, the fact of having a child can endanger her life?

Would the hon. member, or another one, have the courage to tell us the proportion? He does not ask himself the question because if he did, he would agree with the Ralliement créditiste and say that we are meeting a need that does not exist, a problem that does not exist.

How many cases occur in which a woman is pregnant and dies in childbirth? How many?

I do not know how many hundreds—perhaps even thousands—of cases, because of the progress of medicine have incited doctors Légaré and Jutras from Victoriaville to testify before the committee.

The minister is always saying, when he rises in the house, that he is in favour of adopting the report of the committee. I wonder whether he has read what went on in the committee, what Dr. Jutras and other specialists said.

We are not the ones to say so. Specialists say that when termination of the pregnancy is requested, it is not always a matter of the pregnancy endangering the life or the health of the mother, because with modern progress of medicine and technical developments, those cases are very few, they are practically non-existent.

Dr. Jutras even said in this regard, and I quote:

> The progress of medicine is such that tomorrow we will have the following problem; we will have legalized abortion, we will have allowed abortion. Doctors will procure an abortion under the pretext that the pregnancy probably or certainly endangers the health or the life of the mother. The foetus will be expulsed from the uterus but, Mr. Chairman, thanks to medical progress, the foetus will continue to live.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Is that strong enough, to speak like the Canadian people, to be understood by the hon. member for Trois-Rivières? Is that strong enough?

The foetus will live just the same. Those words are not from me but from specialists. This goes to show you the stupidity of this amendment, and of the section for all that, that wants to make us believe that the fact of being pregnant, for a woman, necessarily means that it impairs her health or her life. It is ridiculous, it cannot be.

Therefore, not only can I not accept the clause of this bill, for it is a lame measure, but what is more, we are floundering in a system which deflects us completely from the subject, namely the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce.

I would like to congratulate him just the same, for having the courage of his own convictions and for having expressed them. That may be a lesson to other members. I hope like him that he will not be taken to task by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), his leader, and should he need help, we can offer him our services. We are free on this side.

Mr. Speaker, when we say, for instance, that we must not wonder from the subject, namely the fundamental values, I do not believe the objections the minister could raise could be valid. In fact, the therapeutic committee of each hospital—and there I should like to set again the problem—will make a decision depending upon the possible danger in which such or such a woman could find herself from being pregnant and not upon the social, family, civic or other circumstances in which that same woman could find herself.

The therapeutic committee takes into account only the fact that the woman requesting an abortion wants it actually. The committee does not have to judge the intentions of the patient or the social or family consequences of such an abortion. We are entitled to consider the following case, to compare and examine the possible consequence of the amendment of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce.

Let us take the case of an unmarried mother. The therapeutic abortion committee will not consider the fact that this pregnant woman is married or not. But the committee will consider the fact that she is pregnant, that the law tells her that, for this reason, her life or her health is or likely to be in danger. Consequently, the committee will take its decision, which will be favourable.

Therefore, there are here two things to consider, not to say, at least, two important things. The first one is the fact that this woman is pregnant. It is quite obvious. Therefore, the committee does not have to judge the circumstances that have made this woman pregnant. One does not have, therefore, to judge the unmarried mother. But one must judge the consequences. As in the case of a mother, does the fact of being pregnant impair her health? No, because when she asks for an abortion, in 99 per cent of the cases, it is a refusal of motherhood, as I said in the beginning.

Secondly, the fact of being pregnant would or would likely endanger her life or her health, and this is what the bill says. If this was to be adopted, the committee would be entitled to decide whether an abortion is advisable in relation to the broadening of the legislation. But here again, there is so much latitude left by the words "would" or "would be likely to" and by the words "life" or "health", which have not yet been defined, that here again, the committee would create a bad impression if it was to refuse a doctor permission to perform an abortion.

This is why I said in the beginning of this very short speech that, from certain points of view, I was in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. He said that it was at least necessary, for the committee, to authorize an abortion, that the fact of being pregnant would impair seriously and directly the health of the woman involved, which is a little more precise—but

still insufficient—than what the bill itself says.

Indeed, the therapeutic committee under the law will always be able to contend that the abortion will be done by a recognized qualified doctor and that consequently the danger of sequelae from such abortion are limited and practically nil.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

[*English*]

**Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville):** I rise to say a few words in support of the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grace (Mr. Allmand). It is the same as the amendment I proposed on March 27 in the committee when the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs had this important bill before it. At that time I referred to it as the "two adverbs amendment" because by using two adverbs, "seriously" and "directly", a change would be made in the bill without changing its substance which would be important in limiting the terms of the legislation and determining its interpretation before the courts in years to come.

I am sure I need not give this honourable house a lecture on jurisprudence, or talk about extended judicial interpretation which sometimes takes place over the years despite the best intentions of the legislature. As a matter of fact, I do not disapprove of this idea of judicial interpretation. The fact remains, however, that in a bill as important as this, one which in the opinions of many people involves life and death, it is important we should state clearly what we mean, and use words whose meaning is unlikely to be extended by the courts in years to come.

I believe the insertion of those two adverbs in the bill would not limit the effect which the government intends the bill to have. On the other hand, they would constitute a safeguard against the extension of the provisions of this bill in years to come into areas which are not now contemplated. It would not be wise for us to attempt to define the word "health". Health is a medical concept which it ill behooves lawyers to attempt to express in words. Although we cannot express directly any satisfactory definition of health, I believe we can achieve satisfactory results by the use of these adverbs.

[Mr. Fortin.]

• (8:50 p.m.)

I know some hon. members feel that because the bill in its present form was, so to speak, approved by the electors of the country, we are therefore committed to it. May I remind hon. members that during the election campaign two forms of this proposed legislation were before the people of this country. One of those forms was the bill introduced in the previous parliament in December of 1967, the other being the recommendation of the Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare which had advocated use of the two adverbs. It is that version I support. I am speaking of the version of the bill recommended in the second and final report of that Standing Committee on Health and Welfare. May I point out that that report was made subsequent to the introduction of the bill in the House of Commons by the then minister of justice. Actually, it was made after opportunity had been given to that committee to consider the import of the words used by the government in the bill. The committee considered that it would be useful to have the two adverbs included. I am of the same mind as the committee was last year, and I urge the house to adopt the motion now before it.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dumont:** Mr. Speaker, will we be allowed to speak after the Minister of Justice?

[*English*]

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the debate this afternoon and to the very able way the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) explained his reasons for presenting this particular motion. Of course, the motion reflects the wording of the report of the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare of the last parliament of Canada. That committee studied this matter for some time.

The hon. member is supported by certain members of the Creditiste Party who oppose certain parts of the clause absolutely. I assume they are willing to accept any limitation of that clause if their acceptance means they will obtain the support of the house.

I was impressed by the speeches of hon. members on this side of the house, and particularly so by the speeches of the hon. members for Ontario (Mr. Cafik), Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme), Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) and the hon. member who has just

spoken, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan).

**Mr. Aiken:** There were a couple of other good speeches, too, while the minister was out of the chamber.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I heard speeches from all sides of the house, but I was particularly impressed by the speeches of the hon. members I have mentioned. Not only was the eloquence of the hon. members attested to but, as I said previously, the remarks of the hon. members underline our position that while this is a government bill, neither the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) nor I intend to trespass on the conscience of any member of the party we represent.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Every member of our party is free to look at this issue and free to consider his own private conscience. I think the speeches made from this side of the house bear ample testimony to the correctness of what I have said.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I think the house should analyse with care what the motion proposed by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce really means.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I entirely agree.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** What the motion suggests is that clause 18 should be amended and that the test presently proposed relating to therapeutic abortion should be taken out and the test contained in the report of the last Parliamentary standing Committee substituted. The hon. member suggests that we should adopt the test recommended by the previous standing committee on health and welfare.

Let us analyse the two tests, the test in current Bill C-150 and the same test called for in the predecessor Bill C-195, introduced in the house on December 21, 1967, during the previous parliament. That bill has been under the scrutiny of the people of Canada for over one year and a half.

The test under this bill is this: Can the continuation of the pregnancy endanger the life or health of the mother? The test proposed by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce in his motion is this: Would the continuation of the pregnancy endanger the health of the mother or seriously and directly impair the health of the mother? Despite the philosophical under-pinnings for his argument, the only difference in the two tests relates to the health of the mother.

For both the motion proposed by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce and the bill, the test is whether the pregnancy will endanger the life of the mother. But, whereas the bill says "endanger her ...health", the hon. member's motion says merely "seriously and directly impair her health". In point of fact, we are comparing the significance of "endanger" with the significance of the words "seriously and directly impair" as they relate to the mother's health. That is the substance of the proposed change. So, any discussions relating to the life of the foetus, to morality of abortion itself or to some of the issues which have been rejected in the bill, namely, whether abortion should be permitted for eugenic reasons because of the possible deformation of the child, whether abortion should be permitted for sociological reasons because of possible dislocation of the family, whether abortion should be permitted if the pregnancy results as a consequence of the criminal sexual offences of incest or rape are irrelevant. All these issues are irrelevant. The bill has rejected the eugenic, sociological or criminal offence reasons. The bill limits the possibility of therapeutic abortion to these circumstances: It is to be performed by a medical practitioner who is supported by a therapeutic abortion committee of medical practitioners in a certified or approved hospital, and the abortion is to be performed only where the health or life of the mother is in danger.

The only departure of the amendment from the wording of the bill is this. The hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce proposes to substitute for the word "endanger" as that word relates to the health of the mother, the words "seriously and directly impair". So, with respect, I suggest to the hon. member and to all those who supported him that the philosophical under-pinnings to the motion were probably irrelevant in this debate. What the debate really ought to concentrate on in considering this specific motion to amend is the difference between the effect of the word "endanger" and the effect of the word "impair", when that word is preceded by the words "seriously and directly". It was to that latter question that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) addressed himself earlier this afternoon.

The word "endanger" as used in the bill imports or connotes the elements of hazard,

peril or risk. In the opinion of the law officers of the Crown the meaning of the word "endanger" is every bit as clear and significant as is the meaning of the words "seriously and directly impair". It appears to us that the elements of seriousness, directness and impairment are all present when a person's health is said to be in danger. The word "danger" in itself implies the existence of direct peril or risk.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I submit to the house that everything sought by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce in this amendment is covered by the words in the bill. As the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton put it, the more adverbs we put in to qualify the verb, the more confused becomes the language of the bill. The more confused the language of the bill, the more difficult it is for members of the medical profession to assess the situation within which they are to discharge their responsibility.

It is our submission that it is far more difficult for a doctor or a medical committee to attempt to evaluate the significance of the words "directly and seriously impaired" than it is for them to evaluate in medical terms what the word "endanger" means.

I suggest to the house that the sense of immediacy sought by the hon. member is there, that the sense of peril is there and that the sense of risk is there. If we compare the words "endanger" and "impair" the word "endanger" does far more to further the intent of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce than does the word "impair". It casts into far sharper relief the directness of the risk that is meant within the terms of the bill. To introduce qualifying adverbs makes it far more difficult for members of the medical profession to discharge the responsibility that is cast upon it within the terms of the bill.

I have the greatest respect for the work the members of an earlier parliament did in the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare. I know the number of meetings that were held. I know the number of witnesses that were interviewed and I know the turmoil in terms of private conscience that the members went through. But I also know that the words that finally evolved from that committee's deliberations were a—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** They were a compromise.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** —were an intensive compromise. The words "seriously and directly impair" did not represent the unanimous view of that committee in the parliament which preceded this parliament.

The votes were not recorded, but from my own private research and conversations with members who sat on that committee I know that the vote was either 10 to 8, or 9 to 6, or 10 to 6, depending on with whom one talked. So that the value of that committee report in terms of its weight and influence upon this parliament should be limited by the controversy and division among the members of that particular committee.

On the other hand, the words that are found in clause 18 of the bill are the original words that were contained in Bill C-195, tabled in this House of Commons on December 21, 1967 by the then Minister of Justice, the present Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau). They were available to the scrutiny of that former parliament and to the people of Canada. They were debated in public across this country for over a year and a half. Their meaning is quite clear, and it is embedded in the understanding of the people of Canada.

Weighing those words, which contain the very clear verb "endanger", against the words proposed by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, which are qualified by two adverbs and supported by a divided committee of the earlier House of Commons, the conclusion of the government can only favour the present wording of the bill, especially in view of the fact that the former bill and this bill have survived public scrutiny. In this regard, representations have been made to me as Minister of Justice from every quarter of the country. My door has been open to these representations and so has my telephone. Petitions on both sides of this delicate issue have been received. The words in the bill to which I refer are clear to the people of Canada and they deserve the support of this house.

In addition, I believe that what the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce seeks to achieve in terms of imprinting upon the minds of the people of the country—upon the women of the country, if you will—and upon the medical profession in the country, that there ought to be a direct or serious risk or peril to the life or health of the mother, is adequately and more precisely met by the word "endanger" than it is by the word "impair", qualified as it is in the amendment by the adverbs "seriously" and "directly".

An amendment in the same terms as the one moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce was proposed in the standing committee on justice and legal affairs of this parliament on March 27 last. It was proposed by my good friend the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan). The standing committee considered that amendment and rejected it. So that in supporting the bill as it stands I am supporting the committee report as it stands, that standing committee of this House of Commons having rejected an identical amendment.

As minister responsible for this bill I want to say that there were parts of the bill that did not survive that committee. I have accepted those parts of the committee report that went against the original bill.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** It is because I believe that members of parliament on both sides of the house should have their day, that they should have an opportunity to scrutinize the legislation, to cross-examine the minister and his officials, to question the witnesses and to make it a collective decision in their own good judgment, that I submit that the committee decision of this parliament, as opposed to the decision of the committee of an earlier parliament which was hopelessly divided on the issue, ought to govern the will and wishes of this House of Commons.

**Mr. Aiken:** Would the minister permit a question?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I will in a minute. It is for that reason, despite the obvious sincerity and the wealth of argument introduced by hon. members who support this amendment, that I urge them to support the justice committee report and to support the bill as it stands. I suggest to the members who are supporting this amendment that the words in the bill itself more adequately and conclusively convey the meaning that they themselves wish to convey than do the words that they are offering to the house.

**Mr. Aiken:** Would the minister now permit the question that I was going to ask him. Does he feel as strongly about the report of the committee on transport as he does about this one?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad I did not take that question in the course of my speech.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to inform the house that we are not the ones who delayed the debates of the house since, as soon as this bill was introduced, we asked that the clauses on abortion and homosexuality be withdrawn. Everything else would have been passed in three days. As the government refused to listen to the voice of truth, we have to acquaint the people with that truth.

That is why I begin my remarks by answering to the minister who just made remarks on the difference between the clause in this bill and the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) which, in my opinion, is but a drop in the ocean.

He would have the whole Canadian people believe that by changing the word and adding "seriously her health", that could bring about some changes. We still say that we object to abortion as it is advocated by the bill, as well as to the clauses concerning homosexuality. Let these two clauses be deleted from the bill, and then you can go on discussing wheat, housing, etc.

Therefore, with regard to the bill before us, we must define what is meant by the word "health". I think that this bill was meant to clarify the Criminal Code. Would this purpose be achieved by a legislation allowing abortion on "health" grounds? I think that is the main question we should ask ourselves.

A study of the 880 pages of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the standing committee on health, welfare and social affairs, enables us to make various interpretations of the word "health"; interpretations given by witnesses who were defending one position as well as the other.

You will not mind, Mr. Speaker, if I do not quote all of them, because I know I have only 20 minutes, but I shall take the liberty, at least, to point out a few statements made by authorities on the matter.

That is why I am wondering why the minister and the members who pretend to be justified in voting in favour of a bill that would promote abortion, have not travelled across Canada and repudiated the amendments we are moving. Why are there so many protests to the effect that these amendments should be deleted from the omnibus bill? Once and for all, why not establish a royal

commission of inquiry so that the truth may be made known to the public.

I have in hand a statement printed on page 601 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the standing committee on health and welfare. Dr. Patricia Whyte stated, and I quote:

Yes, I believe it should include psychiatric conditions.

Speaking of health matters—

—I realize this is a very difficult area to define and those who have had to work with this definition have had a problem.

• (9:10 p.m.)

In some people's minds it can even include social health. It can be a complete disruption, for instance, of their way of life.

At page 695, Dr. Whyte also states:

That is a very hard word to define, I agree; you can define it as meaning happiness if you like.

Before such statements, where can we find the word health and how can that word provide information in a bill which in our opinion, Mr. Speaker, should not even be agreed to?

Then, at page 716, we have evidence from Dr. Mongeau and I quote:

Because when you qualify it by saying: "seriously", you are at the mercy of the definition given to "serious".

That is why here, yesterday, I stated that I am not an expert. I am not a doctor, nor a lawyer; however, I am a legislator, and our purpose in parliament is to make legislation clearer, so that the public is not mystified that the great Christian world that we have always defended is not destroyed but, on the contrary, strengthened and at last gets the last word, Canadians having joined forces towards that goal.

And Dr. Mongeau adds:

This is where I say there is a danger of interpretation. There will always be a psychiatrist who can say that from a psychological point of view the health of the mother will be affected.

Then we can continue with the evidence of Dr. Beirne. He said:

To define help, if you will allow me that expression, we refer to two definitions: the conservative one and the liberal one. The conservative or negative one is the absence of illness; the positive or liberal one includes well-being, absence of tension and goes as far as nutrition, housing, education and so forth. There lies the danger. What interpretation shall we give?

[Mr. Dumont.]

We could go on to quote a statement from the representatives of the Hôtel-Dieu du Sacré-Cœur de Jésus of Dolbeau:

—We believe that the mother's health is a flexible criterion that might lend itself to a rather broad interpretation of the law especially when psychiatric reasons are taken into account—

Dr. Quigley replied and I quote:

—We maintain that your committee and the government have proposed an amendment to the act so as to include health grounds without being well-informed on this vital question and without having defined the word "health".

For that reason, we cannot accept the amendment because we would then have an abortion bill which the Canadian people do not want.

I was listening to the minister telling us that neither him nor the Prime Minister were gagging anybody. I must say that many Liberal members tell us in the lobbies: You must go on with the battle because we are prevented from speaking the truth.

And that truth is still being expressed on page 487. The public must be told, must be informed, and then the people will rise in protest and we shall know exactly where the truth lies. On page 487, it is stated and I quote:

I am not being entirely facetious when I state that somebody could say: "I am—

—"I am so upset; I am so nervous about this pregnancy that you have to abort me." Now her health at this particular moment is interfered with. She is a nervous, upset, anxious, possibly depressed woman. Is this going to be sufficient justification for terminating that pregnancy?—

The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) said and I quote:

—I gather that you are not happy about the inclusion of the words "and health", the health of the pregnant woman, as proposed in the Criminal Code.

Dr. Quigley replied and I quote:

I am very unhappy because I do not know what is meant;—

Now if such authorities ignore what it means, how can we believe that we can impose our views to medical authorities as competent as Drs. Jutras and Légaré who testified before the committee and put forward such sound arguments.

On page 540, Dr. Walters stated and I quote:

—How you are going to change this law is something that disturbs many of us.

I think the omnibus Bill, which has already been submitted, extends it into a field which is going to be very difficult to interpret, and I would

submit that we are getting out of a frying pan into a fire. "Health" as defined by the World Health Organization or by a final year medical student on an examination paper, entails a tremendous area—economic, social and emotional... Again, it is going to come down to interpretation of what you mean, what we in London mean, or what somebody in Ottawa means by "health"... This is going to be the problem in including "health" as well as "life".

In this definition, have we not the true way of thinking of an expert who wants the bill on abortion and homosexuality to be withdrawn, so that a Royal Commission of Inquiry can define, first of all, what is "health"?

Dr. Walters added further:

—There is difference of opinion in the medical profession. When you have a group discussing this in a specialty, or a multi-specialty—the general practitioner group—you have differences of opinion on a purely medical basis. If it could be established only on the life of the mother being endangered there would be much firmer solidarity. As soon as you get into health you are into a very grey area again.

And in order to make myself quite clear, since in this house, on the government side, some hon. members are physicians I shall quote a statement published in the March 20 1963 issue of *Le Soleil* and made by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) before the Richelieu Club—and I am thinking of the government members who are muzzled and cannot cast a free vote in the house, because it was explained by the hon. member for Hull—and I quote:

If in the past the province of Quebec has protested against the federal regime, it was because the Quebec members in Ottawa have not sufficiently emphasized the Quebecers' stand—

If the hon. member for Hull, who doubles as a doctor, is able to make such a statement and can say that the "deputation" who, most of the time, was a liberal "deputation", did not achieve its purpose, we should not be surprised that even today not one member from the province of Quebec dares to express the slightest opinion.

That is why I feel some sympathy for the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce who spoke a very good English but delivered a very good speech a short while ago because he has at least the courage of its convictions and he told the house what he had in mind. The same cannot be said of the one we refer to as the whip of the Liberal party. The members of the house have experienced—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Dumont:** —Caouette's whip.

• (9:20 p.m.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I believe the hon. member for Frontenac is wandering away from the amendment now under study and I would ask him to come back to it and to stay with it as he did at the start.

**Mr. Dumont:** Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to say that the Liberal party whip, who has felt Caouette's whip, is unable to obtain from all government members a precise definition of the word "health". I have received a six-page letter from one of his electors in which he expressed his opposition to the omnibus bill and stated that there were strong supporters of proposals that would at least have watered down the omnibus bill which, in my opinion, should not be accepted. I shall read a few lines from it:

The party whip received my communication on April 2, during the long session and the holidays and as he is a cipher in Ottawa, I wonder if he suffers from locked jaws—at first I had read blocked—whether he is deaf and dumb or whether he is stuck to his seat.

So, in the six pages, this elector defines accurately a government member who prevents the house and the whole country from knowing what is meant by the word "health". We know that the hon. member for Chambly is very efficient, that he fully understands the problem. So, we simply ask him to have the courage to give an answer to his electors and to speak up in the house and define, as we are doing, the word "health".

At page 548 of the standing committee on this bill, we find this and I quote:

I know what life is, but I am not sure what health is..."health" is a very ambiguous term, I think it is fine for the legislature to use it, but somebody else is going to have to interpret it. This is the problem with many laws. I think "life" is clearly defined. We all know what we are talking about and we can, as a profession, say that this woman's life is going to be lost.

We deal with housing, with food, with education, we deal with so many things we know very little about. We know it affects the life of the mother, but it is a very difficult problem to decide that you are going to snuff out one life for a nebulous thing called "health", which we all would like to have so that we do not lose our life.

And on page 553, we find this:

I think the doctor could give medical evidence concerning the life of the patient under such and such circumstances, but I would submit it is leaving too much to the medical profession to interpret the word "health".

Considering all those objections, all those things that the Canadian people need to

know, again I ask this house, by means of a free vote that should take place tomorrow, to refer all those amendments, to refer this bill on abortion and on homosexuality—as at the present time only 1 per cent of the people are in favour of the amendment—to a royal commission of inquiry, so that the Canadian people may know the truth.

[*English*]

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MOTION TO EXTEND HOURS OF SITTING

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, in order to give hon. members a full opportunity to express their views on this matter, I should like to recommend to the house that it might be a useful idea to extend the sitting another couple of hours. Therefore, pursuant to section (5) (a) of Standing Order 6 I move:

That this sitting be continued until midnight this day for the purpose of considering all aspects of the "Report Stage" of Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, including any or all proposed amendments and the motion to concur in the said bill, as amended.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Speaker:** It is the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Carried.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those who object please rise.

*And more than ten members having risen:*

**Mr. Speaker:** As more than ten members have risen to oppose the motion, it may not be put before the house.

• (9:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 33 (Mr. Laprise).



[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the amendment of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce because I do not agree fully with it.

For once I agree, partly, with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). But as one of my colleagues has an amendment with which I am in total agreement, and which will be discussed later on, probably tomorrow, I cannot accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, because I feel it does not go far enough.

It would still leave room for doubt in the bill, which might lead to far more complications. Therefore, if we are to amend clause 18, I feel it should be amended properly to avoir any ambiguity.

Having said this, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention again that although if I speak at this stage it is not to say that I am for or against the bill. In principle I am against the liberalization of the legislation on abortion and I shall have the opportunity during the debate on third reading to object once more to this bill.

At this time, I do not want to stretch the debate too much; I think that it might be possible to have done with the amendment of the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce tonight.

But before I resume my seat, I want to emphasize the objection I have against the term it is proposed to add to Bill C-150 in section 18, and which would allow abortion not only when the life of the mother would be endangered but also when her health would be likely to be endangered they are not quite sure about it, but they are ready to accept it, even in doubt.

As the minister said in his statement, he is ready to accept doubts in regard of the health of the woman. So the minister, as a lawyer, might not have as much sensitivity and knowledge as the doctors or specialists in this field.

And, tonight, I want to emphasize the evidence given by Dr. Marcel Boisvert, a Montreal psychiatrist who spoke readily and very clearly, on February 6, 1968, before a seminar

organized and prepared by the Foyers Notre-Dame which had then invited people such as members of the bar, of the medical profession, of the clergy and of family organizations.

So here is what Dr. Marcel Boisvert had to say on the subject, and I quote:

As a psychiatrist, I believe that this bill on abortion would not be likely to promote health but, on the contrary, it might have a detrimental effect on the health of both individuals and society.

Clause 18 of Bill C-150 is intended to make the legislation stipulate that physicians will be able, if they think that the woman's life may be endangered, to perform an abortion.

According to the wording of the clause proposed by the minister, it is intimated that a certain proportion of medical cases could give the right to procure miscarriages.

And now psychiatrists, gynaecologists, highly qualified physicians, are saying the contrary, and the statement by Dr. Boisvert that I have just stated is further evidence of it. I go on:

He carried on, appealing to psychological arguments: "Biology, as it progresses, is more and more positive as far as the human character of a fecundated ovum, as early as its origin, is concerned. Thus, it is clearer and clearer that to procure a miscarriage means for everybody: to destroy a human being.

And this is the beginning of the psychological problem. To improve the physical or mental health of the mother can we destroy this human ovum? I answer that from the psychological point of view, every abortion is unhealthy in itself;

It is a psychiatrist who is speaking.

—to want and to perform an abortion is a neurotic symptom and cannot be considered as therapeutics."

To back his argument, the psychiatrist asserts that every action is accompanied with and followed by psychological reactions: it is the principle of the equation action-reaction with a proportional value. "Thus, he says, the value of abortion includes the suppression of the existence of a human being—a very important value—which must bring about a reaction of an equivalent value. The fact of destroying a human life brings about a reaction which originates from the instinctive depths of every individual. So, to facilitate abortion, is to facilitate repression, deviation of feelings towards a pathological evolution."

According to Dr. Boisvert, by permitting an abortion for doubtful health reasons much more evil will be created than cured. I continue:

After having also put forward psycho-sociological, professional and practical arguments, Dr. Boisvert concluded: "During my 18 years of medical and psychiatric practice, I have never heard anybody speak highly of abortion as a therapy. Neither our fellow-members nor our colleagues, nor even my patients have ever reported any kind of improvement as a result of abortion. But I could observe regularly deep and serious complications of all kinds resulting from abortion.

That is the testimony of a very famous psychiatrist who is against adding in the legislation on abortion, that abortion may be allowed for health reasons, especially if they are doubtful reasons, as stipulated in clause 18 of bill C-150.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are right in opposing the principle of this bill.

As for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, I had the pleasure, a few minutes ago, to notice that other members had finally decided to express their views, but some are upbraided by the Minister of Justice who defends his argument and his bill.

When he said in his statement that the members of his party are free to study the bill, we never doubted it, but he did not say that they were free to vote according to their convictions.

He said the opposite when he presented the bill on second reading. I said so at the beginning of the debate and, if need be, we will mention it again on third reading. The indications then given by the minister left no room for doubt.

Mr. Speaker, I for one am not completely satisfied with the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. I would prefer that the word "health" be completely deleted from clause 18.

For that reason, when another amendment on the subject will be moved, and at the first opportunity, I will speak again.

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I know that some people are quite anxious and would like us to proceed with the vote on these amendments. Let them not worry, we will come to that, and even if the government does not want to change its mind, we must say everything we have to say on each amendment.

I do not blame the minister for being impatient, because we are also.

Mr. Speaker, we want to take advantage of the procedure which allows us, not to filibuster but to put on record our objections, because history will prove that this debate was ridiculous and should never have taken place here.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** I draw to the attention of the hon. member for Shefford that what we are discussing now is not a debate, but an amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce.

• (9:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Rondeau:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I said that we were getting hot under the collar because it seems the hon. minister and his government do not want to admit that anyone of our amendments is logical. We want the arguments we have been putting forward to remain in the records of this Parliament so that we shall be able to say that we have foreseen the odious effects of this bill, and that we, at least, have not let the bill pass without saying a word in protest.

Mr. Speaker, some members do not seem to be able to determine when life begins. What is a human being?

I would like to base my remarks on a book which was published by the federal government and made available to Canadian mothers—I did not say "mayors" but "mothers". The title is "The Canadian mother and her child". At page 24, we read, and I quote:

When one of the spermatozoa and the ovum meet and unite, a new life begins.

On the government side of the house, they tell us that life begins when the child is born or when it is 4 months old. However, doctors have proved during the hearings of the committee that there is no doubt—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I wish to remind again the hon. member that he must address himself to the amendment before us. The hon. member says that it is important to air his views and those of his colleagues on the subject. Under the present circumstances, we are only studying an amendment proposed by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce.

It seems to me the argument submitted by the hon. member for Shefford goes somewhat beyond the narrow limits of the discussion and therefore I am asking him after he has completed his introductory remarks, to address himself to the question before us.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you once again for your usual kindness, and because of it, I shall try to restrict myself to the amendment before us, dealing with the health of the mother when it is endangered.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) wondered when life began.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

In support of my argument, I referred to the above-mentioned to prove that today, there is no doubt about it, even in the house, or in the books that the federal government makes available our Canadian women.

It is strange to find that on the opposite side they do not seem to want to put forward the arguments of our scientists or medical associations who, regarding the proposed amendments have given us very good suggestions.

As far as I am concerned, I shall not be able to vote for the amendment moved this afternoon by the hon. member for Ontario, because that would mean we are in favour of abortion.

Since the beginning of the fight we are putting up in the house, we cannot accept the arguments concerning the threat to the life of the mother, because Quebec or Canadian doctors are not quite sure that if the abortion is not carried out, the life of the mother will be endangered.

Now, we cannot accept the argument of life against health, that is to say that to protect the mother's health, we have to kill the foetus. Such arguments do not weigh enough in the balance and are not sufficient to convince us of the worth of that amendment.

That is the reason why I shall abstain from voting for or against that amendment, because from now on we will recognize that abortion should be procured in Canada, in some cases, to protect the life or health of the mother.

Mr. Speaker, in this house, some hon. members have quoted various authorities, but the major part of their evidence has been put aside by the Association of the medical practitioners of the Hôpital Laval in Quebec, whose representative told us the following, and I quote:

Any abortion is homicidal, for the foetus is a human being.

Here, in the amending bill, that fact does not seem to be acknowledged. And I continue the quotation:

Some allege that the foetus is not a human being as long as it is not viable. Now, the notion of viability of the foetus outside the mother's womb is dependent upon medical knowledge. At the present time, we consider that the foetus is viable outside the mother's womb, in practice, only from the twenty-eighth week of gestation (that is to say when its weight reaches 1000 grams); however, that period might be reduced through acquisition of new knowledge and the elaboration of proper techniques. The viability outside the mother's womb actually depends on

the maturity of the foetus. However, can we define a being as human according to a more or less obvious degree of maturity especially when that maturity requires years for achievement?

On the other hand, the fact that the foetus is totally dependent upon its mother—

And here we get closer to the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, when he spoke of the mother's life which could be endangered. I go on:

On the other hand, does the fact that the foetus is totally dependent upon its mother give her or those who look after her health the right of life or death over it? The dependency of a living being on its surroundings is a general biological phenomenon. The child developed to term is as dependent as the foetus, but in a different way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the child is a foetus, it needs its mother to live.

But furthermore, when the child has become, according to the Criminal Code, a human being, that is after its exit from the uterus, it is still dependent upon its mother's care. Outside the uterus or inside, the foetus depends upon its mother's care, and that is why we cannot impair its life either outside or inside of it.

I go on.

In fact, it is only a difference of surroundings and birth is but the passage from one to the other, without any appreciable modification in the degree of dependency. Would it be the respiratory assistance and the special type of nutrition needed which would render the foetus unfit to become a human being?

The human being's dependency decreases in time—

We know that a six-month old infant is more independant than one of three months. We know that a three-month old infant is more independent than one of three months. And, we also know that a foetus needs its mother to survive. I shall go on:

The dependence of the human being diminishes with time and is in inverse ratio to the degree of maturity.

We cannot accept, considering all the medical and scientific information we have been given, the killing of the foetus, when the latter would "endanger the life of the mother or seriously and directly impair her health".

As my hon. colleagues and as some government members have admitted this afternoon, we cannot accept such health grounds to justify abortion.

On the other hand, this amendment states that abortion is acceptable if the pregnancy endangers the life of the mother and, for that reason, I could not vote either in favour or against it. The reason is that subsequent amendments will enable us to prove once again that we are against abortion not only on moral grounds but also on scientific grounds.

I proceed with the quotation:

Legally, the foetus is considered as a human being as its rights to inherit are recognized.

As the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce said this afternoon.

And I go on:

An abortion for the purpose of improving the health or the welfare of the mother or of preventing the birth of a deformed infant is euthanasia. If it is permitted to kill a deformed infant while it is in the mother's womb, why should it not be permitted to do so after its birth?

Among the various forms of murder, abortion appears to be the one against which the State should intervene most strongly. The role of the State is to protect the rights of every citizen, all the more so when the aggrieved citizen is less able to defend himself and to see that his rights are respected. If the law is written for the protection of the weak, the child still in the mother's womb is entitled to the protection of the State, which should be in proportion to its weakness.

Mr. Speaker, the minister is wondering who is the author of those words. It is the medical board of Laval Hospital, which the minister does not want to hear, nor to listen to, giving scientific arguments.

**An hon. Member:** An established hospital?

**Mr. Rondeau:** Yes, an established hospital which can certainly treat the sick. There would be a large number of patients to be found across from me.

I continue:

• (9:50 p.m.)

If abortion is performed when the life of the mother is endangered by pregnancy, it can then be considered not as euthanasia but as a case of self-defence. To warrant self-defence, however, the act of defence and the act of aggression, should be comparable and the defensive act must be the only possible method of protecting oneself. But cases when, in order to save the mother's life, it is obviously necessary to kill the foetus—

And here we think of the amendment under consideration.

—are extremely rare according to experts.

But not according to the minister. And not according to Liberal experts, but to medical experts.

Dr. René Simard, Director of the Obstetrical Department at Laval University, stated he has never

met any such cases. On the other hand, Roy J. Hefferman, a famous American obstetrician, says that to perform a therapeutic abortion is to disregard the new methods of treating troubles inherent to pregnancy or to begrudge the patient the time such methods require.

These amendments are setting back the medical clock; they imply that today's medicine is not advanced enough to save the foetus while protecting the life or health of the mother.

The Minister of Justice is showing his contempt for physicians by defending his bill so stubbornly and by turning down the advice of experts. This is to laugh at the physicians who during the past 25 years have made fantastic progress and have cured illnesses which 50 years ago were incurable and to suggest that since medicine is now advancing, we want to hold it back.

The government members are unable to accept the scientific arguments which are put to us and which we receive in the mail every day. Moreover, the inefficiency of the therapeutic abortion is proven by an American study which indicates that on 1,600,000 deliveries, the death rate is 0.98 per cent on 1,000 in the hospitals where abortions are performed and .087 on 1,000 in the hospitals where they are prohibited.

Considering the scarcity of the cases where the therapeutic abortion is necessary to save the life of the mother, we can ask ourselves if legislation to allow it is justified. Thus, if the legislator wants, through legislation, rule on those extremely uncommon cases, he should include in that legislation some very strict guide lines similar to those advocated by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists.

Mr. Speaker, we have moved in the house some amendments similar to the provisions included in the abortion legislation by the American College of Obstetricians. No amendment accepted in the United States and included in the American legislation has been accepted by the minister.

Why? They are experienced and have been performing the so-called therapeutic abortion for years and today in the light of experience, they say to us, with figures to support their claim, that this legislation is inoperative, that it was not supposed to save the life of the mother or to take care of her health, but rather to protect the thousands of physicians who want to perform abortions openly and do not want to be affected by the legislation.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

It is mainly for that purpose that the Minister of Justice fights for his bill with such stubbornness, because some physicians will benefit from this legislation. They will no longer be indictable.

But no attention is paid to medical experts, hospitals, health officials in Canada. The intent is to protect those business or medical swindlers.

Mr. Speaker, I have here the newsletter of the Catholic Nurses of Canada, for March-April, and at page 56, it says:

Cases when pregnancy—

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The Minister of Justice on a point of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Perhaps instead of reading this document, the hon. member could be encouraged to table it to save the time of the house.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I shall table those papers, and I accept the minister's suggestion with pleasure. But, at the same time, I would ask him to table in the house, all the letters of protest that he has received from physicians. If that is agreeable to him, I am willing to produce those papers and letters of protest. Is he prepared to do so? I am waiting for his answer.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call it ten o'clock.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member has called it ten o'clock. I would like to point out to him that there are only a few seconds left before his times expires. The house might perhaps allow the hon. member to use up the thirty seconds he has left to finish his speech.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Rondeau:** I am extremely touched by the kindness of the minister.

On page 56, one reads, and I quote:

There are so few, if any, cases where the pregnancy really endangers the life of the mother, that legalizing abortion in those cases would not constitute, quantitatively, a serious menace to the common good.

Mr. Speaker, I have here many more documents. I shall use them another time.

[*English*]

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### SUGGESTED VOTING PROCEDURE FOR CRIMINAL CODE BILL

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there is already one deferred vote and there may well be at least one more, it might be to the benefit of hon. members if Your Honour, acting on the discretion which is granted to you under the appropriate Standing Order, asks the house to agree to an order that all deferred votes up to the time of orders of the day on Thursday might be taken at that time. It seems that Thursday is a propitious time for such a vote since a larger number of members will then be present for the ritual of the vote. The added advantage will, of course, also be that hon. members will know when the vote will be taken.

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** We would be agreeable to that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is so ordered.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Let us hope there will be some to take.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### CONSUMER AFFAIRS—LUMBER—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF PRICE INCREASE

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, about two weeks ago I asked a question about housing. The then minister of transport, who was in charge of housing and was on the roster, was out of the house. On the advice of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), I directed my question to the Minister Without Portfolio from Manitoba who did not attempt to answer me. Then you, Mr. Speaker, advised me I could assume that my question had been noted.



• (10:00 p.m.)

After notice of this length, I still want a reply. The question was one which, in my opinion, simply required "yes" or "no" for an answer. It was this:

> In view of the sharp rise in the first quarter of this year in the profits of Canadian lumber producers in British Columbia, coupled with a sharp increase over the past year in the price of lumber and other building supplies, will the minister urge upon the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs the need for action to roll back the price of such building materials needed to meet the housing shortage?

Since I did not get an answer, I followed up with a supplementary question:

> Will he himself undertake to discuss with these British Columbia lumber firms the need for restraint in the matter of the prices of their product, to keep down inflation?

Again, I got no answer. I suppose this was because—though I had not heard so at that time—there is no housing crisis. But I still want an answer and I would appreciate one, now.

My question arose from the following facts. On April 17, shares of MacMillan-Bloedel Limited of Vancouver, Canada's largest lumber producer, rose 50 cents to a four-year peak of $36.50 on the Toronto Stock Exchange reflecting expectations that the company would report a sharp rise in first quarter profits. The stock has gained 30 per cent this year, from a low of $28 in January. Two other Vancouver based forest producers had already reported big gains in first quarter profits. One was Crown Zellerbach (Canada) Limited with a rise from $1.9 million a year ago to $3.1 million, a 63 per cent gain. The other was British Columbia Forest Products Limited, which reported a rise from $1,545,000 a year ago to $2,609,000, a gain of about 70 per cent.

Meanwhile lumber and plywood prices had risen to record highs by the beginning of 1969. One large Vancouver producer, Weldwood of Canada Limited, reported that average lumber sales in the first quarter of this year were at prices $25 per thousand board feet higher than a year earlier. After a period during which prices dropped somewhat they are now on the way up once more.

On April 30, David Satok, President of the Toronto Home Builders Association, declared that the January and February price increases added about $500 to the cost of a small house. No wonder the rate of housing starts dropped from 307,200 in February to

266,100 in March. In the face of such a situation, it seemed to me logical to ask that the minister in charge of housing should urge on the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) the need for a roll back in the price of materials used for housing. Will he do so now? I address these representations, of course, to the new minister in charge of housing. Will he discuss the need for restraint with these British Columbia firms which have made such profits?

The government appears to be on the edge of setting up a prices and incomes commission whose main function, in the words of the white paper called "Policies for Price Stability" will be to rally a sense of public responsibility leading to voluntary restraint. Its first job might be to urge price restraint on the lumber kings of the British Columbia forest empire. Will the Minister without Portfolio, the minister now in charge of housing (Mr. Andras) urge this labour of Hercules on the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** In reply I should like to say that I share the hon. lady's concern about the high cost of building materials such as lumber. We are also concerned about the high cost of other things such as money, land, services and labour. Hon. members know that the government is well aware of recent developments in the lumber market and that appropriate action has been taken by federal cabinet ministers to ameliorate the situation. The government's position was clearly outlined a month ago in this chamber by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin). After having consulted his colleagues in cabinet he announced the steps that were being taken, namely, that the former minister of transport had made representations to the railways urging that enough box cars be made available for the movement of wood products. He announced also that the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) had launched discussions with the provincial governments concerned on the matter of additional supplies of timber to be made available to industry until such time as a more stable supply-demand balance is achieved. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) has assured us that the officials of the Combines Investigation Branch are vigilantly watching any threat of anti-competitive developments in the present special market circumstances.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce himself made an appeal to the lumber industry to safeguard the requirements of traditional customers, both domestic and foreign, and to resist any tendency to neglect Canadian demands in favour of speculative, short term exports.

[Mrs. MacInnis.]

## PUBLIC SERVICE—UNDUE EXTENSION OF BILINGUAL REQUIREMENTS

**Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington):** Mr. Speaker, I bring forward this matter because of the ludicrous, self-admitted political posture of this government on questions of bilingualism in the public service. My remarks pertain to the question I asked of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on April 24 which arose from some statements made extramurally by his parliamentary secretary at the time he was speaking at the Grenville-Carleton Liberal Associations annual meeting on the Saturday previous.

With regard to his remarks, may I now quote from the Ottawa *Citizen* on Monday, April 21. They carry a report of the remarks of the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Walker). The article is headlined, "Bilingualism situation critical" The main text of the article is as follows:

> Departmental directives have pushed Civil Service bilingual requirements beyond the intent of Parliament's legislation, says James Walker, parliamentary secretary to Prime Minister Trudeau.
>
> "As a result, we are getting legislation by regulation and something must be done about it."
>
> Elected representatives should have veto power over these regulations which are issued by senior public servants to interpret the law, Mr. Walker said.—
>
> The intent of the legislation, he indicated, was set out in a speech by former Prime Minister Lester Pearson which, among other things, assured the job opportunities of unilingual public servants would not be adversely affected.
>
> "I believe it is time we took a look at the situation again. I think the regulations have had a stronger effect on people than the legislation intended.
>
> "Some people may believe their judgment is better than that of the politicians, but I believe in the democratic system and that means rule by the elected representatives, be they good or bad."
>
> Leslie Barnes, executive director of the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada, warned that the bilingual question ranked with superannuation as the most critical in government-employee relations.
>
> The difficulty arose out of administrative application of the policy, he said.

The ruling in favour of bilingualism for all positions in the national capital area reduced job advancement opportunities for many from outside areas, he said.

The government, if it had the will, could ensure that its intent was carried through in application, he said.

"The cabinet cannot duck responsibility for the situation".

I agree with the parliamentary secretary. Something is wrong and unfair in our bilingual and bicultural regulations as they apply to the salaries and job opportunities of our public servants. That is why I asked the following question on April 24, as reported at page 7900 of *Hansard*:

Was the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister stating the view of the government when he said that departmental directives have pushed civil servant bilingual requirements beyond the intent of the legislation by parliament?

I also had a supplementary ready to ask. I did not ask it on April 24, but it would have been as follows: "Arising from the statement made by the parliamentary secretary that elected representatives should have veto power over regulations which interpret the law issued by senior public servants, will the Prime Minister indicate whether the government has any specific measure in mind to provide for the exercise of such veto power?"

What a strange anomaly now exists as a result of Mr. Pearson's legislation applying to bonuses for bilingual and bicultural public servants. Since the Prime Minister is the sponsor of the next big jump this country may take into more legislation respecting the status of the official languages of Canada—I refer to Bill C-120—why do not the opinions and remarks voiced by the parliamentary secretary come from the Prime Minister himself? This would be far better, since it is now agreed and stated by his able parliamentary secretary that mistakes have been made. This legislation does not make for a just society; it does not even amount to participatory democracy, both so-called unique and vaunted ideals of the Prime Minister. Why cannot this country now have some leadership from the Prime Minister?

• (10:10 p.m.)

We need a reconsideration of the legislation put forward by the previous government. We need a reconsideration of the 7 per cent bonus to bilingual public servants because of its trouble making and divisive results in our public service. No one can deny this, Mr. Speaker; ask any member of this house, any member of the Senate, any member of the public service.

I have spoken out against this measure several times. In this connection I cite *Hansard* for November 18, 1966, November 22, 1966, November 23, 1966 and particularly November 24, 1966, where will be found opinions regarding public service regulations respecting bonuses for bilingual employees. This government has had ample warning about this, warnings that they would not heed. Now, the parliamentary secretary makes a strong protest and agrees with me as well as with all others who have argued against this measure. The parliamentary secretary recommends the typical Liberal dictatorial method of dealing with it, saying that elected representatives should have veto power over the very regulations that a Liberal government has created. Mr. Speaker, none other than parliament should straighten out this mess and amend this error.

While I am on my feet I want to warn the Prime Minister that he be very careful in his advancement of Bill C-120, especially regarding the provision pertaining to linguistic minorities of 10 per cent having lingual parity with the remaining 90 per cent of a district. What about the other ethnic minorities in this country which I mentioned in my remarks in 1966?

Yes, we are thankful for men who will fearlessly state their opinions, as the parliamentary secretary has done in this regard. I want the Prime Minister to know that the people of Canada will not swallow his hodgepodge of bilingual legislation in Bill C-120 with regard to the public service, such as the people of Canada were forced to swallow by the former Prime Minister and which they have now regurgitated.

**Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I am very flattered that the hon. member agrees with what he thinks I said. In all friendliness, I must tell him that I do not agree with many of the things he has just said. Frankly, I prefer to quote myself and to make comments, rather than refer to the Ottawa *Citizen*, however good that paper may be.

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to reply to the hon. member. I simply say that because of my deep interest in parliament and in the vital role of the elected member in our system of parliamentary democracy, I recently expressed the view that the time might well be at hand when

parliament itself should periodically or regularly review various departmental regulations and directives to see if there were any cases where such regulations or directives went beyond the scope and intent of the actual legislation upon which they were based.

It is quite conceivable to me that prior approval by a group or committee of knowledgeable members of parliament of the effect of these regulations might be desirable. As a former municipal councillor, I can attest to the fact that this problem occurs at that level of government. I believe the provincial area would not be immune to this problem either. The view I expressed did not deal with any one particular government department or piece of legislation, but if there were cases that anyone wished to bring to my attention, including regulations or directives relative to the administration of government policy on bilingualism in the public service, I said I would be interested in hearing about them.

In answer to the first part of the hon. member's question on page 7900 of *Hansard,* may I just say that I doubt that the Prime Minister has attached any conditions to my particular job as his Parliamentary Secretary that would make it mandatory for him to agree with everything I think or say.

My concern in respect of government policy regarding bilingualism in the public service is that the laudatory aim of the government in making federal services available in the two official languages to all Canadians be administered in such a way and these services provided in such a manner that there is no bar or hindrance to any public servant who wishes to perform such services.

## FINANCE—NORTHERN ONTARIO—ALLEGED INVESTMENT DISCRIMINATION

**Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane):** Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and his Parliamentary Secretary have to be away, but I believe someone else is here in the minister's stead and I am sure the Minister will take cognizance of my remarks when he returns.

Last Wednesday, as recorded at page 8173 of *Hansard,* I asked this question of the Minister of Finance.

Since the minister has announced that there will be new regulations governing the trust companies can he assure the house that there will no longer be a double standard on the part of lending institutions, which discriminates against capital investment in Northern Ontario?

[Mr. Walker.]

When I speak about this discrimination on the part of the lending institutions, I do not necessarily speak about willful discrimination against Northern Ontario. Rather it is something that is unconscious. It is because of a lack of knowledge of the north and of the great wealth and the future that we have in that area. However, the net result is a double standard because a loan for a project in the industrialized southern cities is relatively easy to obtain, but a similar loan in Cochrane, Kapuskasing or Hearst would be impossible to obtain.

I know that most hon. members of this house who are not familiar with Northern Ontario are not aware that this is actually the case. There is no one who will admit that this kind of double standard exists, but nevertheless it is there.

I do not suggest for a moment that the Minister of Finance can advise the trust companies and other lending institutions to whom they must make loans, but I wonder if it is not possible for a certain percentage of the funds of trust companies to be placed aside for the development of such areas as Northern Ontario. A certain percentage could be put aside and not used in the large cities of the industrialized south.

Perhaps the minister could use persuasion, if not legislation, in this regard. As I say, I believe this is an unconscious thing because people do not know about Northern Ontario. For this very reason, Mr. Speaker, I intend to have an economic conference in Northern Ontario which may perhaps partly solve this problem. At least it will bring businessmen from the industrialized south to the north so that they will become more familiar with our problems.

I have organized a two day conference which will bring forward the top executives from the financial community in general, from large industry and from government, who will come to Northern Ontario and spend those two days discussing these problems. There will be present the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, (Mr. Marchand) who will make a major speech in Cochrane, putting forward his ideas on the regional development of Northern Ontario. There will also be present the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) to speak about matters of transportation and freight rates which are so vital to our area.

But there is nothing we can do in the North without proper capital investment. This is why I have invited a number of these people to come and look at our problems, to see

what vast wealth there is in the north, to see what the potential is, and perhaps change their methods of lending. It is not only one group that can look at this problem. For example, if it is tourism that we want to promote, tourism in the area of Moosonee, it is not possible to do that without capital investment.

• (10:20 p.m.)

So it goes in respect of a number of things. If we want secondary industry in northern Ontario we must be able to ensure that the product will be brought to market at a reasonable rate. Therefore, the transportation commission should be concerned about freight rates. All these problems are interlocked. This is the reason these various people must get together to hold a meeting of this type. Perhaps this would serve to make the companies more aware of the problems of northern Ontario.

**Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) should be commended for making all hon. members of this house aware of the lack of capital investment which at present is the reason for the slow growth and development of northern Ontario. I should like to assure the hon. member that all of us in this house share his concern and that I personally will bring his recommendations and suggestions to the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson).

**Mr. Speaker:** It being after ten o'clock this house stands adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

## 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-112, an Act to amend the Farm Machinery Syndicates Credit Act, without any amendment.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

CONCURRENCE IN EIGHTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Bruce S. Beer (Peel-Dufferin-Simcoe)** presented the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, and moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

MISCELLANEOUS ESTIMATES

Eighth report of Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, in French and in English—Mr. Fernand-E. Leblanc (Laurier).

[*Editor's Note: Text of foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

### TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF AIR CANADA REPORT, AND REPORTS OF AIR CANADA AND C.N.R. AUDITORS

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the house will recall that last week we made comment on the reference to the Standing Committee on Transport of the report of the Canadian National Railways for 1968. It has been suggested that it might also be useful to have the report to parliament of the auditors on the accounts for the C.N.R. for the year ended December 31, 1968, tabled on April 30, 1969, and the report of Air Canada for the year ended December 31, 1968, and the report to parliament of the auditors on the accounts of Air Canada for the year ended December 31, 1968, both tabled on April 1, 1969, referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. If the house is agreeable perhaps that could be made an order of the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it so ordered?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CAPTAIN FELIX HATCHER, NORTH SYDNEY, NOVA SCOTIA

Question No. 1,789—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. Was an application for one year's extension of service received by the Department of Fisheries from Captain Felix Hatcher of North Sydney, Nova Scotia, and, if so, on what date?

2. Was a similar application received by the Department from Chief Officer Herbert Lukeman and, if so, on what date?

3. If such applications were received, what was the final disposition in each case and what was the justification for the decision in each case?

4. Were these two applications dealt with by departmental officials at departmental headquarters in Ottawa and, if not, at what departmental level were they disposed of?

5. Is bilingualism a consideration in deciding whether or not to grant an extension of service on ships operated by the Department of Fisheries in the Atlantic region and is it a consideration in filling positions on such ships?

**Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** 1. Yes. On August 8, 1968.

2. Yes. On September 12, 1968.

3. Captain Hatcher's case was reviewed in the region and a decision made that a recommendation to continue his services could not be justified, since qualified persons were available to succeed him.

In Mr. Lukenan's case, it was considered to be in the Department's best interests to continue his services for one further year since the First Officer on the vessel on which

he serves was not in good health and Mr. Lukenan had been temporarily replacing him. The one year period would also permit the third Officer to up-grade his certificate of competency so that he would be qualified to replace Mr. Lukenan.

4. Captain Hatcher's case was dealt with regionally, although there had been one consultation with headquarters officials. Mr. Lukenan's case was approved by the Deputy Minister.

5. Where bilingualism is considered desirable, it is taken into account when filling positions on ships or in considering reasons for extension of service.

DISCIPLINARY ACTION FOLLOWING INSURANCE OVERPAYMENTS

Question No. 1,806—**Mr. MacEwan:**

1. Is it intended that any disciplinary action will be taken against officials of the Unemployment Insurance Commission or other public servants in consequence of the discovery that overpayments in unemployment insurance during the 1968-69 fiscal year amounted to some 3 million dollars?

2. Has any disciplinary action been taken so far and, if so, what is the nature of the disciplinary action?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** The Unemployment Insurance Commission advises: 1. No, since this is not a matter which can be entirely controlled by the Commission and its staff. From its inception, the Commission has always exercised enforcement and control measures to ensure that the payment of benefits is made to people who are entitled under the law. In programs of this type, however, a degree of loss through overpayments is inevitable because of false or erroneous declarations on the part of claimants which are initially accepted at face value in order to make payments as quickly as possible and with a minimum of formality. The Commission attempts to keep the loss within one or two per cent of the amount of benefits paid, which is a rough guide used by agencies in this type of operation in other countries. The Commission's efforts have been particularly evident since the end of last year when a major campaign of public education and benefit control was launched to reduce the loss to the Unemployment Insurance Fund to a minimum. Although this new program has been in operation for only a few months, substantial improvements have already been achieved.

2. Not applicable.

[Mr. Whelan.]

J. WALTER MILLER—FRENCH LANGUAGE COURSE APPLICATION

Question No. 1,843—**Mr. Paproski:**

1. Did J. Walter Miller, supervisor, Laboratory of Hygiene sub-registry, Registry Services Branch, Department of National Health and Welfare, make application for a French language course given by the Public Service, and, if so (a) was his application accepted (b) if not, by whom was this application rejected and on what grounds?

2. What is the policy of the Public Service Language Bureau with regard to enrolment of public servants in French language courses?

3. Is the administrative support category of public servants, of which Mr. Miller is a member, listed outside of the preferred categories for French language training?

4. Is bilingualism currently a required qualification for appointment in Public Service administrative support categories?

5. When is it estimated by the Public Service Language Bureau that administrative support categories will be permitted to enroll in French language courses in order to qualify for promotion within that category?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. The Department of National Health and Welfare submitted an application for Language Training for Mr. John Walter Miller on December 18, 1967. The type of training course requested was for either two hours three times a week or one hour daily. (a) The application was accepted and Mr. Miller's instructional level was the beginning of the first level; (b) Mr. Miller could not be put on course at that time because the courses he requested had started in September 1967, and students were already 40 per cent of the way through the year's work. Beginning in September 1968 one-hour daily and two-hours three times a week courses were mostly replaced by intensive courses. Only those students participating in slow-paced courses as at July 25, 1968 who could not be integrated in the intensive courses were permitted to continue training in this type of course.

2. The policy of the Public Service Language Bureau with regard to enrolment of public servants in French language courses is: (1) First order priority for language training is given to members of the Executive and Administrative and Foreign Service categories (or the equivalent in agencies not subject to the Public Service classification system).

Next in order of priority are first (lowest) level supervisors in the Professional and Scientific and Technical Categories who

supervise both unilingual English and unilingual French employees. (2) If training capacity is not taken up by the two above groups, members of other groups will be taken, in order, from the following categories: (a) Professional and Scientific; (b) Administrative Support; (c) Technical; (d) Operational.

(3) However, if circumstances arise which, in the view of departmental officials, merit special consideration of a higher priority for a particular employee, departments are free to submit nominations with supporting explanations. The number of special cases that can be accepted is small.

(4) Within the priority groups described above, four levels of selection criteria must be applied by the nominating agency to determine the order of priority; (a) Those who have immediate need to use second language skills and who have partially developed skills; (b) Those who have immediate need to use second language skills and who have little or no proficiency in the second language; (c) Those who have no immediate need to use second language skills and who have partially developed skills; (d) Those who have no immediate need to use second language skills and who have little or no proficiency in the second language.

(5) While those participating as at July 25, 1968, at Levels 1, 2 and 3, in slow-paced courses are permitted to continue training, no further nominations are accepted for these courses. To ensure the attainment of the Government's objectives in language training, all nominations from the Executive and the Administrative and Foreign Service categories and from the first (lowest) level of supervisors in the Professional and Scientific and the Technical categories are assigned to: (a) Complete immersion courses; (b) partial immersion courses.

(6) Employees from other occupational groups and levels are assigned, as space is available.

3. See answer to Question 2.

4. The selection standards approved by the Public Service Commission pursuant to Section 12 of the Public Service Employment Act provide that proficiency in both official languages may be either an essential or a desirable qualification. The determination of whether proficiency in both official languages is a desirable qualification, an essential qualification, or neither in the case of a particular position, is made in accordance with Section 20 of the Public Service Employment Act and Sections 4 and 5 of the Public Service Employment Regulations.

5. Employees in the Administrative Support category are permitted to enroll in French language courses at the present time as indicated and under the conditions stipulated by answers (2), (3) and (6) to Question 2.



LICENSING OF LOBSTER FISHERMEN

Question No. 1,884—**Mr. Comeau:**

1. Were new regulations regarding licensing of Maritime lobster fishermen and boats recently promulgated and, if so (a) what is the main objective of such regulations (b) what were they designed to achieve (c) what motivated such regulations?

2. Were these regulations made solely on the basis of departmental ideas and experience or was there prior consultation with individuals or groups within the lobster fishing industry as to economic and other conditions and the possible results such regulations might have upon the lobster fishing industry in the Atlantic Region?

3. What steps are planned to control marketing (buying and selling) of government lobster licenses?

4. Is it government policy to encourage centralized operation in the Maritime lobster fishing industry and, if not, what steps are planned to ensure economic justice and equality of opportunity to individual lobster fishermen?

5. Is an early re-assessment of the new regulations provided for and has provision been made to revise the regulations to protect individual fishermen and the principle of free enterprise should experience indicate such revision is necessary?

**Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** 1. Yes. A licence control program in the lobster fisheries of the Maritime Provinces was announced on January 20, 1969: (a) To place an upper limit on the size of the fleet harvesting the lobster crop. Eventual elimination of casual or part-time fishermen will result. (b) To strengthen the earnings of the lobster fishermen; (c) The lobster fishery is fully exploited at the present time and growth is limited by biological factors. It is evident that there are too many participants in the fishery, and that their capital and operating costs are high. This has resulted in generally low incomes.

2. There has been a demand for several years by the bona fide lobster fishermen in the Maritimes that there be restriction of entry to the lobster fishery, and the subject has been discussed many times with fishermen's organizations and individuals.

3. In 1969, no one, be he an individual or a company, can license more lobster fishing

vessels than he had registered with the Department of Fisheries last year. The Department will keep record of all changes of ownership and a new owner must register his purchase of a lobster fishing boat with the Department within 30 days or face loss of the valuable lobster fishing privilege.

4. The steps outlined in the answer to question number three will prevent centralization of lobster fishing operations.

5. The new licensing policy will be reviewed in 1970 and such revisions made as deemed necessary. The principle of free enterprise is protected in that anyone who can purchase an existing licensed lobster vessel can enter the fishery provided there is no increase in the number of vessels.

COOK DECKHAND ON FISHERIES PATROL VESSEL

Question No. 1,886—**Mr. Crossman:**

1. Has an appointment been made recently to fill a position of Cook Deckhand on the Department of Fisheries patrol vessel 11A 5831?

2. If so, what is the name and the address of the appointee?

3. Were the services of the Department of Manpower and Immigration used?

4. What are the names and addresses of the applicants?

5. Was priority given to applicants residing in the area served by the vessel?

6. If not, for what reason?

**Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** 1. Yes.

2. Robert R. Cameron, R. R. #1, Pugwash, Nova Scotia.

3. No.

4. Not applicable.

5. No.

6. Priority was given to Mr. R. R. Cameron because of previous employment with the Department in another capacity, and because a commitment had been made to find him alternative employment.

PETROLEUM IMPORTS WEST OF OTTAWA VALLEY

Question No. 1,895—**Mr. Mahoney:**

What quantity of refined petroleum products was imported or transferred into that portion of Canada, west of the Ottawa Valley, for each month during the most recent 24 month period for which figures are now available?

[Mr. Whelan.]

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** National Energy Board reports as follows: According to reports made to the National Energy Board, the following net quantities of refined petroleum products were moved into Regions 3, 4, 5 and 6 by way of transfers within Canada or through importations in the period shown:

| | 1967 | 1968 |
|---|---|---|
| | (barrels) | |
| January | 983,603 | 1,087,796 |
| February | 589,956 | 1,714,044 |
| March | 508,710 | 1,371,334 |
| April | 1,949,728 | 2,131,354 |
| May | 2,652,455 | 2,814,153 |
| June | 3,063,393 | 2,173,181 |
| July | 2,896,561 | 1,834,079 |
| August | 2,753,951 | 3,839,635 |
| September | 1,532,897 | 2,869,541 |
| October | 3,712,325 | 3,657,412 |
| November | 3,006,786 | 2,911,501 |
| December | 2,116,451 | 1,972,606 |
| Total | 25,766,816 | 28,376,636 |

Regions 3, 4, 5 and 6 comprise the whole of Canada with the exception of Region 1—the Atlantic Provinces—and Region 2—the Province of Quebec and that part of Ontario lying east of the "Ottawa Valley line".

PETROLEUM IMPORTS EAST OF OTTAWA VALLEY

Question No. 1,896—**Mr. Mahoney:**

What was the average daily consumption of refined petroleum products in that portion of Canada, east of the Ottawa Valley during 1968?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** National Energy Board reports as follows: The estimated daily consumption of refined petroleum products in Regions 1 and 2 in 1968 was 619,700 barrels.

Region 1 is comprised of the Atlantic Provinces and Region 2 is comprised of the Province of Quebec and that part of Ontario lying east of the "Ottawa Valley line".

CORPORATION PRE-TAX PROFITS

Question No. 1,906—**Mr. Skoberg:**

What are the total and percentage increase of pre-tax profits reported by Canadian corporations for the years 1967 and 1968?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** The Dominion Bureau

of Statistics reports that: The pre-tax profits of corporations in Canada, less the losses of companies incurring losses, in 1967 and 1968 are estimated to be $5,020 million and $5,877 million in the two years, respectively—a year-to-year increase of 17.1 per cent. This information is based upon a sample of corporations, and may be revised when more complete data become available at a later date. This measure of profits is a component in the measurement of gross national production and excludes dividends received from other Canadian companies to avoid the overstatement of profits on a national basis that would result.

AURELE DE FOY SUZOR-COTE STAMP

Question No. 1,914—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

For what reason did the Post Office issue the Aurele de Foy Suzor-Cote commemorative stamp in a fifty cent denomination rather than in one of the lower and more frequently used denominations of six to ten cents?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: Canada Post Office has been issuing commemorative postage stamps in various denominations periodically since the Diamond Jubilee issues in 1897. In 1967 following the release of the current definitive eight cents to $1 stamps illustrating the works of such renowned Canadian artists as A. Y. Jackson and Tom Thomson, criticism was directed at the monochrome reproduction of these paintings, which was a manufacturing limitation at that time. The Aurèle de Foy Suzor-Côté commemorative stamp was produced by a new printing process which enabled the reproduction of his painting in its natural colours. It is considered that this stamp is one of the most colourful and attractive postage stamps issued by the Post Office and it was felt that a 50 cents denomination would be much more appropriate than one of the lower denominations.

*GREECE—CONCERN OF CANADA AND OTHER NATO COUNTRIES FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

Question No. 1,964—**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):**

1. At the NATO Ministerial meeting held in Washington last week, did the Canadian Government make strong representations denouncing the military Greek Government for violating the European human rights convention through oppression and torture and, if not, for what reason?

2. Did any other member countries of NATO express their concern regarding activities of the military Government of Greece?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs):** No. In the view of the Government, the Washington meeting was not a suitable occasion on which to comment on such matters.

There was no specific reference to Greece or its government in the statements of any of the representatives at the Washington meeting.

[*English*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Question No. 1,967—**Mr. Lundrigan:**

1. Has the Department of National Health and Welfare moved field officers in the Programme Administration category to the Head Office of the Canada Pension Plan Administration in Ottawa?

2. If so (a) are these transfers of a temporary nature (b) for what reason were they made (c) are these officers filling the terms of reference for which they were hired, and (d) what was the total cost of these re-assignments in travelling expenses and other related costs?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** 1. The Department of National Health and Welfare did not move field officers in the Program Administration category to the Head Office of the Canada Pension Plan Administration in Ottawa on a permanent basis.

2. (a) For about a year, however, it was necessary to utilize the services of some field officers in Ottawa for short periods of time. These assignments usually lasted for three weeks and usually involved eight to ten officers at a time. (b) This temporary assignment of field officers was authorized so that they might assist in processing the large backlogs of applications which occurred after survivor benefits first became payable in February 1968 and when the eligible age for retirement pensions was reduced to age 67 in January 1968, and to age 66 in January 1969. If this had not been done substantial delays would have occurred before payments could have been made to applicants. This was also the only way in which these temporary backlogs could be cleared quickly without hiring additional permanent staff. A secondary reason for bringing these field officers to Ottawa was to expose them to the detailed procedures involved in the processing of claims and to give them some insight into other operations at Headquarters. (c) It is

not considered that these temporary assignments at Head Office were in conflict with the terms of reference under which the field officers were hired. Rather they were beneficial in the sense that the field officers increased their knowledge of the legislation and claims processing and thereby improved their abilities in dealing with the public on Canada Pension Plan matters. The Plan is quite new and there is still much to learn. (d) The fiscal year which ended on March 31 1969, is the only significant period during which field officers were assigned to Head Office operations. For that year there were a total of 77 field officers so assigned for temporary duty and the cost involved is allocated as follows: Transportation, $11,005.12; Meals and Accommodation, $36,201.65; Total, $47,206.77.

ELLERSLIE, P.E.I., FISHERIES STATION

Question No. 1,974—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Were two mobile homes or trailers, approximate sizes 60 x 12 and 50 x 10 purchased recently for the Department of Fisheries station in Ellerslie, Prince Edward Island?

2. From whom were they purchased and at what price?

3. Are they new and, if not, how old and what is their approximate worth?

4. What did it cost to transport these trailers to Prince Edward Island and was that cost included in the selling price?

5. Was any attempt made to purchase them on Prince Edward Island and were tenders circulated to prospective contractors in this regard?

6. Are these trailers of American or Canadian construction?

7. Are they considered to be constructed and insulated for all weather Canadian use?

8. What is the expected life of service of these two trailers?

9. Have any repairs been made to these trailers since purchase or is it expected that any repairs will be made in the immediate future?

**Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** 1. Yes.

2. Woodlawn Mobile Homes & Parks Ltd., Ottawa; total price $13,350 F.O.B. Ellerslie, Prince Edward Island.

3. No. One unit was a 1968 model used as a demonstrator; the original price was $9,450 F.O.B. Ottawa. The other unit was used approximately six years and was refurnished; the original price of this unit was $7,650 F.O.B. Ottawa.

4. Haulage from Ottawa to Ellerslie, listed at $500 per unit, was included in the selling price.

[Mr. Munro.]

5. Tenders were not called, but prices were checked in the Halifax area and, after a review of available units and prices in the Ottawa, Montreal, and Cornwall areas, it was considered that the two second-hand units purchased provided an economic purchase arrangement.

6. One unit was of Canadian manufacture; the other, American.

7. They are considered to be of adequate construction for the area in which they are to be used.

8. As these two units were purchased to house summer students, it is extremely difficult to estimate their life expectancy.

9. Minor damage which occurred during transportation from Ottawa to Ellerslie will be repaired and paid for by Woodlawn Mobile Homes Ltd.

INDIAN AFFAIRS—TECHNICAL SERVICES BRANCH

Question No. 1,984—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Is there now, or will there be soon, a Branch or Directorate of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development known as Technical Services Branch and, if so (a) has the Branch any personnel officers (b) if any of them are not Canadian citizens, who are they in terms of name, age, birth-place, degrees and diplomas held, present and former classifications and salaries within the federal service?

2. (a) Within the Technical Services Branch, is there a "Physical Planning" section or sub-section and, if so, who heads it, what was his birth-place, what is his citizenship, what degrees and diplomas does he hold from what institutions (b) has the Physical Planning Section any sub-sections and, if so, what are they, who heads them, what is their citizenship, degrees, diplomas, present and former classifications, salaries, etc. (c) how many professional personnel as distinct from technical and clerical personnel is there in the Physical Planning Section, how many are not Canadian citizens and how many are American citizens and of these, what are the degrees, diplomas, classifications, etc.?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. There is now a Technical Services Branch of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. (a) The Branch has no personnel officer; personnel service is supplied to the Branch by the Departmental Personnel Adviser; (b) N/A.

2. (a) There is a "Physical Planning Division" headed by Mr. E. W. Wallace in the capacity of Acting Division Chief. Mr. Wallace was born in America and is an American citizen with a status of "landed immigrant"

in Canada. Mr. Wallace studied Architecture at Syracuse University and Landscape Architecture at New York State College of Forestry. He is a registered landscape architect, has been a member of the American Society of Landscape Architects for 20 years, is presently being sponsored as a candidate for membership in the Canadian Society of Landscape Architects; (b) The Division has two sub-divisions—(1) Mapping and Community Planning, and (2) Development, Area and Site Planning.

| Unit Name | Head |
|---|---|
| Mapping and Community Planning | H. Toogood |
| Development—Area and Site Planning | Vacant |

Statistics

| Name | Citizen | Diplomas & Degrees | Classification Former | Present | Salary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H. Toogood | Can. | Bristol Univ.—Public Admin.<br>London Univ.—Bach. Law<br>U. of Toronto—Masters Planning | TO11 | AR5 | $13,790 |

(c) There are eleven professional people in the Physical Planning Division. Six are American. All are landscape architects. There are three B.A.'s, two M.A.'s, four Arch. 4's, and one each of Arch. 5 and 6.

WEST MAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Question No. 2,051—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Has West Man Regional Development Corporation submitted a brief to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development outlining a project for an Indian Handicraft Industry that will employ Indians on seventeen Reserves in Manitoba?

2. Has the Indian Affairs and Northern Development Department accepted the project and, if so, on what terms?

3. When will the project be formally launched?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. Yes.

2. The Department has arranged with West Man to explore more fully the proposal with Indian people. Meanwhile, the Department has agreed to continue financing for the sales outlet at Brandon and employment of an Indian manager to supervise the outlet.

3. The Department, in consultation with Indian people, in the Brandon area, will review the West Man proposal and until such a review is completed the Department is not in a position to state whether the program will be launched or in what form the program will be launched.

REPLACEMENT FOR ARGUS AIRCRAFT

Question No. 2,052—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Further to written question No. 1,629 in which the Minister of National Defence affirmatively indicated that active consideration is being given to a replacement aircraft for the Argus, presently in use by Maritime Command, what specific aircraft are being looked at and to-date, have any evaluations been made and, if so, with what results?

2. When will a firm decision be reached?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence):** 1. As indicated in *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence No. 36* of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, both the ORION and the NIMROD are being looked at as possible replacements for the Argus aircraft. Evaluation has not yet been completed as studies are also being conducted on the development of advance maritime patrol aircraft which would embody in both the vehicle and its systems the latest technological advances.

2. No decision will be made until phase II of the defence review has been completed.

INCOME OF RESERVATION INDIANS

Question No. 2,058—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What is the average income of gainfully employed Indians on reservations for each of the years 1960-1968 inclusive?

2. What is the average income of gainfully employed Indians off reservations for each of the years 1960-1968 inclusive?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1 and 2. Information is not available.

*Questions*

AMHERST, N.S., POST OFFICE

Question No. 2,065—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What firm was awarded the contract for renovations to the doors of the Post Office at Amherst, Nova Scotia?

2. What was the amount of the contract awarded to the firm, were other bids received and, if so, what were the names of the firms submitting bids and the amount of their tenders?

3. Were the doors that were formerly on the Post Office designated as the property of the contractor and, if so, for what reason?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** 1. E. J. Mills Ltd., Amherst, N.S.

2. $4,974. This was the only bid received from invited tenders for replacement of doors, repairs to the floor and the construction of lobby partitions.

3. Yes. This is the normal practice for such projects.

LEBRET, SASK., POST OFFICE

Question No. 2,068—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Is it the intention of the government to build a new post office in Lebret, Saskatchewan and, if so, when is it intended to proceed with such plans?

2. Has it been decided where the new post office will be located and, if so (a) what is the location in Lebret, and (b) has land been obtained or purchased for this building?

3. Was the Council of the Village of Lebret consulted regarding the location of the post office?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** 1. Yes. Build lease tenders will be opened on May 12.

2. No.

3. Yes.

LISTED MISSING

Question No. 2,075—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. By provinces, how many persons were listed as missing in Canada in 1968?

2. Of these, in each province, how many were (a) under 21 (b) under 18 and over 14 and, in the case of (a) and (b) what was the breakdown between male and female?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** 1. and 2. Information on number of missing persons for 1968 and the number located, by province, is not yet available. Missing persons data for adults and for juveniles for 1967 reported by the police in accordance with the requirements of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program are provided in the attached table.

The following definitions given in the Uniform Crime Reporting Manual are used by police in compiling these data: Adult: An adult is any person of 16 years or over, or such other age as may be directed in any province. Juvenile: Is any girl or boy under the age of 16 years or such other age as may be directed in any province. Reported: Adults or juveniles, who are residents of or persons temporarily residing in your area of jurisdiction, who are reported missing during the year—regardless of the period of time—excluding children who are temporarily lost at public gatherings, exhibitions, etc. Located: Adults or juveniles missing from your area who have been located by your force or by some other police force during the year. Located does not necessarily mean returned to your area.

No information is available on sex of missing persons.

PERSONS MISSING AND LOCATED, BY PROVINCE, CANADA, 1967

| Province | Adults | | | Juveniles | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Missing | Located | Per cent Located | Missing | Located | Per cent Located |
| Canada | 21,746 | 20,893 | 96.1 | 33,412 | 32,941 | 98.6 |
| Newfoundland | 370 | 367 | 99.2 | 273 | 273 | 100.0 |
| Prince Edward Island | 46 | 44 | 95.7 | 20 | 20 | 100.0 |
| Nova Scotia | 691 | 648 | 93.8 | 710 | 695 | 97.9 |
| New Brunswick | 511 | 502 | 98.2 | 793 | 790 | 99.6 |
| Quebec | 3,972 | 3,797 | 95.6 | 5,594 | 5,477 | 97.9 |
| Ontario | 10,754 | 10,291 | 95.7 | 14,641 | 14,441 | 98.6 |
| Manitoba | 2,063 | 1,987 | 96.3 | 1,367 | 1,327 | 97.1 |
| Saskatchewan | 491 | 482 | 98.2 | 1,250 | 1,246 | 99.7 |
| Alberta | 568 | 515 | 90.7 | 3,894 | 3,851 | 98.9 |
| British Columbia | 2,191 | 2,177 | 99.4 | 4,828 | 4,779 | 99.0 |
| Yukon | 80 | 77 | 96.3 | 36 | 36 | 100.0 |
| Northwest Territories | 9 | 6 | 66.6 | 6 | 6 | 100.0 |

SOURCE: Dominion Bureau of Statistics publication "Crime Statistics—Police"—catalogue number 85-205.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEED GROWERS AND DEPARTMENT

Question No. 2,079—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. What is the working relation between the Canadian Seed Growers Association and the Canada Department of Agriculture?

2. On what basis is a $44,000 annual grant made to the CSGA and is the CSGA accountable for this grant?

3. Are any parts of this grant distributed to lesser member associations or members and, if so, who are they and what amount of the grant does each receive?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** 1. The Canadian Seed Growers' Association is the seed pedigreeing agency as authorized by regulations of the Seeds Act. The Association prescribes the crop standards while the Department sets the grade standards for seed of the various pedigreed classes. The Department inspects the growing crop and reports its findings to the Association. Acceptable crops are granted pedigreed status and recorded by the Association. The Department controls the labelling and sealing of pedigreed seed.

2. To help defray the costs associated with the granting and recording of pedigreed seed crops. The CSGA is not accountable for this grant.

3. No.

IMPORTS OF LIVING INSECTS

Question No. 2,081—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. How many import permits of living insects and disease organisms for research and educational purposes were granted in 1966, 1967, 1968 by the Department of Agriculture?

2. What was the country of origin of these insects and disease organisms?

3. Who were the recipients of these insects and disease organisms?

4. What were these insects and organisms?

5. Under what specific conditions were these permits issued?

6. Have there been instances, in the past ten years, of voluntary or accidental liberations of any of these insects or disease organisms?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** 1. 1966, 301 import permits; 1967, 291 import permits; 1968, 334 import permits.

2. The majority of importations were from the United States of America. Other importations were from Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, Australia and New Zealand.

3. Research Institutions, colleges and universities, high schools and individuals.

4. (a) Numerous genera and species within the class Insecta, mostly of non-quarantine significance; (b) Numerous species of fungi and bacteria, mostly of non-quarantine significance; (c) A limited number of virus cultures.

5. (a) That the insect or disease organism would be maintained by qualified personnel in such a manner as to prevent escape from the laboratory in question, or (b) That the specimen did not present a risk to Canadian agriculture, or; (c) That the specimen was useful or beneficial as a biological control agent.

6. Voluntary—There have been intended liberations of insect specimens for biological control purposes. Accidental—There have been no reports of accidental liberation or of injury to Canadian agricultural crops which could be attributed to pests granted entry for the purposes indicated.

BON ACCORD POTATO SEED FARM

Question No. 2,082—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. Did the Department of Agriculture participate with the Province of New Brunswick in setting up the Bon Accord Potato Seed Farm and, if so, in what way?

2. Is the Department presently participating in the project and, if so, in what way?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** 1. Department of Agriculture participation in the setting up of the Bon Accord Potato Seed Farm was confined to providing technical advice in the field of seed potato production.

2. Seed potatoes produced on this farm are inspected by Department of Agriculture staff.

GRANT TO HORSE IMPROVEMENT SOCIETY

Question No. 2,083—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. Is an annual grant still given by the Canada Department of Agriculture to the Canadian Hunter, Saddle and Light Horse Improvement Society?

2. Who are the president, vice-president, the secretary and the treasurer of this Society and what are their addresses?

3. For what specific purposes is this grant given?

4. What are the activities of the Society?

5. What is their membership?

6. How many foundation mares were inspected and registered under the Society's programme in 1966, 1967 and 1968?

7. How much money has this Society received since the start of these grants from the federal government?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** 1. Yes. An annual grant of $5,000 is provided by the Canada Department of Agriculture to

the Canadian Hunter, Saddle and Light Horse Improvement Society.

2. Officers of the Society are: Mrs. J. G. Holbrook, President, R.R. 3, Dundas, Ontario. L. J. McGuinness, 1st Vice-President, Algoma Street, Mimico, Ontario. Mr. Thomas Gayford, 2nd Vice-President, R.R. 2, Gormley, Ontario. Mr. & Mrs. John Wilson, Secy. Managers (also carries out duties of Treasurer), R.R. 5, Orangeville, Ontario.

3. For the purpose of assisting in the development and improvement of the light horse industry in Canada.

4. The Society has three main activities: Conducts an inspection system whereby animals meeting the required standards are enrolled in the Society. Encourages members to exhibit their animals in competitive classes at fairs and exhibitions. Purchases and makes available the services of high class stallions in suitable locations, for improvement of light horses. At present they own a total of nine stallions.

5. At present there are slightly more than 500 active members in the Society.

6. Foundation mares inspected and registered with the Society: 1966, 304; 1967, 427; 1968, 340.

7. Since 1927, the Department has provided an annual grant of $5,000 to the Society.

*ALLEGED DIVERSION OF NATO AID TO SOUTH AFRICA

Question No. 2,109—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Does the Government of Canada obtain assurances that the materiel offered as military aid to NATO countries is not later supplied to Rhodesia and the Union of South Africa?

2. Is the Government of Canada aware of a statement by the Secretary General of O.A.U. at the meeting of that organization, February 17-22, 1969, that stated (a) the Government of West Germany and the Government of The Netherlands are supplying military and financial aid to Rhodesia and the Union of South Africa and (b) that West Germany is aiding the Government of Rhodesia to build a missile system?

3. If the answer to part 2 is yes, has the Government of Canada taken steps to confirm or deny these assertions?

4. If the assertions have been confirmed, has the Canadian Government communicated with the West German Government or The Netherlands' Government on these matters and what have been the results, if any?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1. The only NATO countries receiving Canadian military aid are Greece and Turkey which receive small amounts of spare parts for aircraft previously donated by Canada. I have no reason to suppose that this equipment is not used exclusively within the NATO area by Greece and Turkey.

2 and 3. It is understood that the report of the Administrative Secretary General of the O.A.U. made in February, 1969 contained assertions that Western countries, including West Germany and The Netherlands, have increased the volume of their exports to Rhodesia and that West German scientists were assisting South Africa to establish a missile system. There is no indication that the Administrative Secretary-General referred to (a) the supply of military and financial aid to Rhodesia and South Africa by the West German or Netherlands governments or (b) West German aid to Rhodesia to build a missile system.

4. It was not considered necessary to communicate with any government regarding the assertions actually made in the report of the Administrative Secretary General of the O.A.U. A report (dated December 30, 1968) of the United Nations Committee on Sanctions against Rhodesia established by Security Council resolution 253(1968) of May 29, 1968 indicated that, while West German exports to Rhodesia had increased, those of The Netherlands had decreased, not increased, over a period under review. This report is a public document, circulated to all member governments by the United Nations.

SASKATCHEWAN ASSISTANCE PLAN APPLICATIONS

Question No. 2,123—**Mr. Gleave:**

1. Has the Government of Saskatchewan made any application under the Canada Assistance Plan since its inception?

2. What amounts of money have been paid to the Saskatchewan Government in respect of each of these programmes?

3. What were the financial claims submitted by the Government of Saskatchewan in respect of each of these programmes?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** 1. Yes. The Government of Saskatchewan signed an agreement under Part I (Welfare Assistance and Services) on March 22, 1967, and under Part III (Work Activity Projects) on September 24, 1968. Claims for federal sharing in respect to expenditures incurred under these agreements have subsequently been submitted for payment.

2. Part I (Welfare Assistance and Services): 1966-67, $3,115,664; 1967-68, $13,403,925; 1968-69, $14,102,529. Part III (Work Activity Projects): 1968-69, $27,071.

3. See (2) above.

INVESTIGATION OF MISLEADING ADVERTISING

Question No. 2,166—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

Is the Combines Investigation Branch of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs investigating misleading advertising practices of car and appliance leasing companies?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** In reply to questions asking whether inquiries have been instituted under the Combines Investigation Act, the general practice is that no information is given out as to whether a particular inquiry has been or is being pursued with respect to a particular group or company unless or until a report is published or some legal proceeding of a public nature is taken. If the Honourable Member has any information or evidence which indicates to her that there may have been a violation of the Combines Investigation Act, this information should be sent to the Director of Investigation and Research.

*QUEEN'S PRINTER—POSITION OF ROGER DUHAMEL

Question No. 2,169—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. Was Roger Duhamel the Queen's Printer as of May 1, 1969?

2. If not, when did he cease to occupy that position?

3. Did he resign from said office and, if not, what were the circumstances under which he ceased to be such?

4. Is there any person as of said date holding the position of Queen's Printer and, if so, what is his name and since what date?

**Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services):** 1. No.

2. March 31, 1969.

3. No. Mr. Duhamel was appointed by the Governor-in-Council as Queen's Printer under the provisions of the Public Printing and Stationery Act, Revised Statutes Chapter 226, Section 5. This Act was repealed on the coming into force of the Government Organization Act, 1969 (Bill C-173) on April 1, 1969.

4. Yes. Mr. C. B. Watt, Director General of Printing and Publishing in the Department of Supply and Services, has been appointed Acting Queen's Printer effective April 1, 1969.

29130—534½

*Motions for Papers*

## QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—CONSOLIDATION OF FISHING HARBOURS

Question No. 1,600—**Mr. MacLean:**

1. Is there in operation at the present time or in contemplation, a programme of consolidation of small fishing harbours in Prince Edward Island built and maintained by the federal Department of Public Works into a small number of facilities?

2. If so, was this decision taken unilaterally by the federal Department of Public Works, without consultation with the provincial government?

3. (a) Was advice sought from fishermen's organizations or from any other organizations or persons regarding such a policy (b) if so, from whom was advice sought?

4. What are the locations into which fishing facilities are to be concentrated?

5. For how long, and under what conditions are the remaining wharf and other fishing facilities in other locations in Prince Edward Island to be maintained by the federal Department of Public Works?

Return tabled.

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 115 is acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations as to privileged documents and the consent of the government authorities concerned.

[*English*]

CONTRIBUTIONS TO COST OF LANDS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Motion No. 115—**Mr. Kaplan:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of certifications issued by a representative of the Government of Canada pursuant to section 9(1) of the Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Province of Ontario, dated June 14, 1961, approving claims for contributions to the cost of acquisition and development of certain lands for water conservation and flood control purposes in the Toronto area.

**Mr. Speaker:** Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house

that notice of motion No. 115 be deemed to have been adopted?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Forest:** Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call notices of motion Nos. 86, 96, 106, 111, 112, 116 and 125?

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

[*English*]

RESEARCH STUDIES ON LABOUR RELATIONS

Motion No. 86—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of each of the research studies commissioned and completed by and for the Labour Relations Task Force.

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, these documents fall into two categories. As was previously announced the government has decided in due course to publish approximately 20 of these studies. These are to be published by the Queen's Printer. The government would be quite agreeable to these being tabled at once, subject only to the understanding that the reports when ultimately published may contain the normal prepublication editorial changes with regard to grammar, references and reorganization of material.

The second category of studies includes those which the government has itself decided not to publish, but under the arrangement the authors were entitled to make their own private arrangements for publication. Leaving aside the question of copyright, the motion would be acceptable subject only to obtaining the consent of the authors in question to have them published. If the hon. member is in a position to accept those two bases we would be in a position to honour his notice of motion.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** It is agreeable.

**Mr. Speaker:** Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the minister, is it the pleasure of the house that notice of motion No. 86 be deemed to have been adopted?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Speaker.]

NATIONAL BALLET OF CANADA

Motion No. 96—**Mr. Osler:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of Annual Reports and Annual Financial Statements of the National Ballet of Canada for the years 1964-68 inclusive.

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to information provided to the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) to the effect that there is no such corporation known as the National Ballet of Canada, he has agreed to withdraw this notice of motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed that the notice of motion be dropped?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

REPORTS TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE POLICY—PAGES 4385 TO 4387

Motion No. 106—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of each report referred to in the submission of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy on February 26, 1969, listed on pages 4385 to 4387, No. 31 of the proceedings of the Senate Committee.

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) I wish to report the following: Because the surveys mentioned in this motion resulted in the publications the hon. member has requested in his motion for the production of papers No. 105, I wonder whether the hon. member would consent to withdrawing the notice of motion.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, if the government previously agreed to tabling the information requested in motion No. 105, I am agreeable.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed that this motion shall be transferred for debate?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Transferred for debate.

NATIONAL BALLET GUILD

Motion No. 111—**Mr. Osler:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of Annual Reports and Annual Financial Statements of the National Ballet Guild of Canada for the years 1964-68 inclusive.

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 111 asking to issue a copy of annual reports of the National Ballet Guild of Canada for the years 1964 through 1968 inclusive is acceptable. However, corporations such as this one, incorporated under Part II of the Canada Corporations Act, are not required to file or deposit any annual financial statements with my department. With this reservation the motion is acceptable.

**Mr. Speaker:** Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the minister is motion No. 111 acceptable?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC RELATIONS CONTRACTORS MEETING

Motion No. 112—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all papers, information or other documents presented at the public relations Contractors meeting held in the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Headquarters in Ottawa from November 27 to 29, 1968 inclusive and a copy of all notes made at the said meeting.

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development I wish to report as follows: As the papers the hon. member for Skeena is requesting in this motion for the production of papers were included in motion for production of papers No. 77, which was tabled on March 19, 1969, I wonder whether the hon. member would consent to withdrawing this motion?

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** I think I would, Mr. Speaker, subject to the caveat that I may put it back on the order paper. I have read the particular document to which the hon. member has referred and there are no such papers included.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed that the motion shall be dropped?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

INDIANS—WORKING GROUP TO RECOMMEND STRATEGY AND POLICY

Motion No. 116—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the document entitled "Report of Working Group I—Indians to the Executive Committee" which Working Group had its terms of reference set out in February, 1968 and which was formed to examine and outline the problems relating to Indians and to make recommendations concerning strategy, policy and programming.

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development I wish to report as follows: The hon. member for Skeena requested this same information in his motion for the production of papers No. 82. The hon. member was informed then that the document he requested in the motion for the production of papers No. 82 could not be identified. On April 23 the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, on behalf of the hon. member for Skeena, agreed that this motion be withdrawn. As the motion for the production of papers No. 116 is identical to the motion for production of papers No. 82, and the document still cannot be identified, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was misled by the reply given on an earlier occasion. Perhaps I could assist the efficiency of the government by tabling the particular document in question now. This might help them find it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Is it agreed that the motion be transferred for debate?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Transferred for debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining notices of motion stand?

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to pose what has become almost a weekly question. Has the President of the Privy Council had any success in getting permission from the provinces in respect of documents relating to the Northumberland Strait Crossing?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to apologize to the hon. member because I am afraid I do not have the report today. I will make an inquiry.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining notices of motion stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

*Business of the House*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTED RE-ARRANGEMENT OF SCHEDULE

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement attributed to the President of the Privy Council that there are only 18 sitting days left to deal with government business and that some legislation may have to be put over, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he will agree to putting the Criminal Code amendments over until the end of the session, and immediately bringing forward legislation on housing and other urgent matters? Will he, in any event, undertake that the house will not adjourn for a summer recess until the housing and other legislation has been dealt with by the house?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Thank you very much.

**An hon. Member:** More?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Why not? Mr. Speaker, I can give neither of those undertakings. On the first point, I do not see how the question would be solved or how the motion would be adopted any more quickly by putting it later in the session. I think we all realize that the Criminal Code omnibus bill has been dealt with sufficiently and that it would be a mistake now to risk postponing its adoption to some other session. On the second point, the government intends to introduce concepts of planning into the use of legislative time, and as much as possible we will stick to our goal of adjourning before the summer is too advanced. I think it is up to the house to take its responsibility; when there is a filibuster such as we are now seeing, I hope that all responsible parties will unite in conceiving some way of allocating time for bills, when that time is obviously being wasted by some members of the house.

**Mr. McCleave:** What about the Liberal members who spoke yesterday?

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, without being in any way provocative, will the government not accept responsibility for having introduced the Criminal Code legislation in the manner in which it was introduced, and will the government not accept responsibility for getting important legislation before the house before we adjourn for the summer recess?

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. If it is the government's intention to stay with the Criminal Code bill until it is finished, will the Prime Minister give the government house leader freedom to discuss with other house leaders which of the other items of legislation we shall deal with after the Criminal Code bill is finished?

**Mr. Trudeau:** I believe it is up to the government to decide the priority with which it wants to introduce bills which are on the order paper, or which should be dealt with at this session. Of course once this priority has been established by the government, it should be discussed and tested with the opposition to see if we have cause to change that priority.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUGGESTION THAT A.B.M. SYSTEM BE UNDER NORAD CONTROL

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Burnaby—I mean, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas).

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**An hon. Member:** I am glad we have that fellow identified.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I can understand your having difficulty knowing who is the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour. I understand the Prime Minister had the same difficulty.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** The voters knew the difference.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** May I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Having in mind the statement made by the deputy commander of NORAD, General F. R. Sharp, to the effect that on a purely military basis the anti-ballistic missile system should be brought under NORAD, will the Prime Minister assure the house that no commitment will be made by the Canadian government to bring the anti-ballistic missile system under NORAD without the matter first being referred to parliament?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the most I can say on that is that General Sharp obviously implied that it was a matter for political decision and not to be decided only by military considerations. It is of course the intention of the government to take its political responsibilities in such matters. But it may be that the government will not want to discuss this question in front of the house, if it does not feel it has to come up with a decision.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Prime Minister whether parliament will have an opportunity to discuss this matter before the government takes the political decision which is now under review.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I do not understand the question very well, Mr. Speaker. The matter is before the committee, and General Sharp is testifying before it. Members of the house can express their opinion before that committee, and we hope they will.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** May I ask the Prime Minister if, in the government's review of the anti-ballistic missile system, he will undertake to see that the comprehensive report commissioned by Senator Edward Kennedy which is now completed is included in the study, and when does the government expect to complete that study?

**Mr. Trudeau:** We have been pressed by the house to make some announcements as soon as possible on phase 2 of Canada's defence system, and I believe we will give that top priority before deciding on the defence systems of other countries.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Having failed a moment ago to get an assurance from the Prime Minister, I wonder if he would give the house an assurance that he will not make an announcement regarding the NORAD policy the day after the house adjourns.

## NORAD—POSSIBLE EXTENSION OF NORTH BAY INSTALLATION

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister in connection with NORAD and the statement made by Lieutenant General Sharp, deputy commander of NORAD. Is the Prime Minister in a position to inform the house on the correctness of the statement that the government is now considering an extension of the NORAD headquarters at Colorado Springs to a supplementary command post at North Bay?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, this sounds like a rather complicated question. I will have to refer it to the minister to see whether we can give the hon. member an uncomplicated answer.

**Mr. Winch:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I will take with pleasure the advice of the right hon. Prime Minister and direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. I should like to ask the minister if his department is now considering the extension and expansion of North Bay as a supplementary headquarters to the NORAD headquarters in Colorado Springs as was announced by General Sharp.

**Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** First of all, the question does not involve an extension of the facilities. As conceived and as operating now the installation at North Bay could be used as an alternative base to Colorado Springs. The only thing that would be new in this particular case would be for the government to accept the proposition and formalize an arrangement with the United States government to use the North Bay base as an alternate base in case Colorado Springs is knocked out.

**Mr. Winch:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it now being considered by the government as outlined by the minister?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** No, Mr. Speaker.

## A.B.M. SYSTEM—COMMUNICATION WITH U.S. AUTHORITIES

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Prime Minister returned from Washington and reported on the conversation he had with regard to the A.B.M. system I wonder whether he or his colleagues have communicated any position, even of an interim nature, to the government of the United States with respect to the establishment of A.B.M.s.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** When I came back from Washington I reported in general terms that I had expressed some concern over the A.B.M. system and its consequences on the equilibrium of forces of deterrence between the Soviet Union and the

United States of America. As I reported to the house, we also received certain explanations from the United States government concerning that system, but no specific decision has been taken beyond that and therefore no representation has been made based on such a decision. I merely want to repeat that, of course, the A.B.M. system is of importance to us but it is important to the whole world, and we are one of the countries considering it.

NORTH BAY—POSSIBLE REMOVAL OF BOMARCS

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister whether the Bomarc missiles at North Bay are are going to be removed.

**Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** There are no plans at present to remove the Bomarc system. This is a phase that is envisaged with the development of O.T.H. and AWACS, and I think it is slated for some time in the mid 1970s.

[*Translation*]

## AIRPORTS

STE. SCHOLASTIQUE—INQUIRY AS TO THE COST OF LOCATION

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

Is it his intention to rectify the mistakes he made, according to an editorial in *Le Devoir,* regarding the cost of the site of the Montreal international airport?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, in due time I would be very happy to correct those mistakes, and I am a little surprised that the editorial writer concerned did not get information from Ottawa as he surely did from Quebec sources, before writing his article.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*English*]

## DRUGS

NON-MEDICAL USES—DISCUSSIONS AS TO PERSONNEL OF COMMITTEE

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Speaker. Has he discussed with the provincial premiers and with the Alcohol and Drug Research Foundation the make up of the committee which he proposes to establish?



**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** No I have not, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Rynard:** Does the minister not consider it worth while to tap the reservoir of experience and research available in this foundation?

## AIR TRANSPORT

LANDING RIGHTS AT TORONTO FOR INTERNATIONAL CARRIERS

**Mr. Barney Danson (York North):** My question is intended for the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker, but in his absence I will address it to the minister who is answering for him. Since authorization has been given to international air carriers en route to and from Montreal to seek landing rights at Halifax and Gander I should like to ask the minister whether similar authorization might be given for landing rights at a point where some 75 per cent of the passengers originate and terminate their flights—Toronto.

**Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services):** This is the sort of question which is being reviewed by the Transport Commission. I shall be pleased to pass this suggestion along to the Minister of Transport.

**Mr. E. B. Osler (Winnipeg South Centre):** I should like to ask the minister whether at some time consideration could be given to using, as a gateway, Winnipeg International airport where people are willing to work—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

POSSIBLE STRIKE OF CANADIAN PACIFIC AIRLINES MACHINISTS

**Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova):** Could the minister tell us whether he has received a request to set up a conciliation board in the matter of the differences between Canadian Pacific Airlines and the machinists union?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** I understand that such a request is on its way, though I have not received it yet. There is no particular reason why such a request should not be granted. The procedure, as hon. members know, is for the minister to take a week or ten days in which to study the matter and decide whether or not such a board should be set up. If he reaches the conclusion that it should, the next step is to set up the board and appoint a suitable chairman. After the board has examined the situation a report is made to the Minister of Labour and

he either accepts it or rejects it, depending on whether he thinks it is complete or incomplete.

## FLOODS

### ASSISTANCE FOR AREAS IN WESTERN PROVINCES—USE OF ARMED FORCES

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Is the Prime Minister in a position to say whether or not the premier of Saskatchewan has placed before the Government of Canada any claim for assistance in connection with the recent flood damage in that province? Second, has any estimate been made by the Department of Agriculture, officials of P.F.R.A. or any other federal authority as to the extent of the damage?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Without getting into details I can say that the premiers of several western provinces have applied for federal assistance. We are waiting to learn the extent of the damage and to receive more concrete figures before deciding in what way we can answer such requests.

Now that the danger of the floods has receded it might be worth while to point out that the federal government did play an outstanding part in providing needed assistance. Hundreds of members of the Canadian Armed Forces were at some time or other manning the dykes, and other departments, such as the Department of National Health and Welfare, and P.F.R.A. officials were involved in the operation.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I agree entirely with what the Prime Minister had to say in the latter part of his statement. We are all very grateful for what was done. I would ask him now to answer the second question: Has there been any estimate made of the damage in the province of Saskatchewan? When he mentions other provinces he must be referring to the province of Manitoba.

**Mr. Trudeau:** And British Columbia.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Yes, and British Columbia. Has there been any estimate as yet on the part of the federal government as to the extent of the damage?

**Mr. Trudeau:** To my knowledge the costs involved have not yet been fully appraised but I shall check to find out whether there has been some later development.

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** While the federal government is considering making contributions in respect of flood damage, will it not also consider contributing toward the cost of flood prevention? I am thinking specifically, now, of the town of Lumsden in the Qu'Appelle Valley, and of similar areas.

**Mr. Trudeau:** At various times the federal government has taken action to help prevent floods. I believe the Canada Water Act will have something to say about that; it is due for introduction before the end of the session.

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** In connection with the use of the armed forces to restrict the danger of flooding in the provinces, would the government consider refraining from making the usual charge to the provinces for such services?

**Mr. Trudeau:** In view of the fact that the charges are seldom paid anyhow, Mr. Speaker, it might be worthwhile looking into that suggestion.

## AIR CANADA

### STRIKE OF MECHANICS—ATTENDANCE OF MEDIATOR

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour arising out of the welcome news—I hope it remains true—that Air Canada and the International Association of Machinists are again in negotiation. Is the minister considering steps to have a mediator present in order that the second round of negotiations during the strike might be more productive than the first round?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** I am happy to say that the machinists and Air Canada have been meeting since two o'clock this afternoon. I am particularly encouraged by the fact that the meeting was arranged on their own initiative. I hope these talks are productive and that they will bring an end to this strike, because I can assure both Air Canada and the union concerned that if they do not settle it of their own volition at this particular round of talks they can be prepared for a long strike, if they expect the government to step in and put an end to it through legislation.

**Mr. Lewis:** I agree with the minister's last remark—that the government will not attempt to interfere in that way. However when a striking union and the employer get together for a second time during a strike, the result must be satisfactory or there will be difficulty for a long time, and in these

circumstances I ask the minister whether he is considering stepping into the picture himself, or getting someone else to do so on his behalf?

**Mr. Mackasey:** I apologize for not having answered the original question fully. I think it is in the best interest of both Air Canada and the machinists, at least for a few days, that they should negotiate in the absence of any representative of the Department of Labour. They concur in this particular philosophy. Since this meeting was arranged mutually, I am hopeful that the spirit of co-operation will continue and that they may be able to arrive at a collective agreement on their own initiative.

**Mr. Lewis:** I should like to ask the minister this supplementary question. Since the parties are meeting of their own volition, and in view of his decision, which I am prepared to accept without qualification as a wise one at this stage, to let the parties meet on their own, has he arranged for machinery to keep him informed of the progress of the negotiations, so that should there be any danger of a breakdown he will be in a position to intervene before a breakdown actually takes place?

**Mr. Mackasey:** Both parties have been particularly co-operative in this matter and are aware that the full resources of the Department of Labour are available to either or both sides, if such services are felt to be needed.

## CANADIAN CONFEDERATION

MANITOBA—PARTICIPATION BY OTTAWA IN CELEBRATION

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** My question is directed to the Secretary of State and it relates to an important event in Canadian confederation. I refer to the entry of Manitoba into confederation in 1870,—the first "in" province—making possible a Canada from sea to sea. When will the Secretary of State and the government be in a position to announce the extent of Ottawa's financial participation in this historic centennial occasion.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, this matter is being looked into and I hope to be able to inform the house at an early date in this connection.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dinsdale:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether I could ask the Secretary of State, the Prime Minister and indeed all members of the house if they have completed their personal plans to participate in this important event in the keystone province?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State.

Could he tell us whether it is the intention of the government to subsidize the erection of a monument commemorating Louis Riel, in front of the Manitoba parliament buildings?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I think this question should be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

H.M.C.S. "BONAVENTURE"—AUDIT OF DAVIE SHIPBUILDING BOOKS

**Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario):** I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Supply and Services. Would the minister make available to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts the report of the audit team that audited the books of Davie Shipbuilding in regard to the cost of the *Bonaventure* refit?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. It seems to me that this is a question that should be considered by the committee itself rather than by the house.

## THE MINISTRY

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF REVISED LIST

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. Would the minister table for the information of the house the revised list of ministers, acting ministers and second acting ministers, as he did earlier in the year, so that we can have a complete rundown?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I would be glad to do that, Mr. Speaker.

## AIR TRANSPORT

EXTENDED WORK LOAD OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

**Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport, but in his absence I will direct it to the minister acting in his place. Will the minister undertake to make a statement next week to outline the action that he intends to take to reduce hazards caused to the travelling public by the shortage of air traffic

controllers at Montreal, Toronto, Edmonton, Moncton and other important air centres in Canada?

**Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services):** I will be pleased to convey that request to the minister, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Thomas (Moncton):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Recognizing the fact that it takes five years to train a controller, and that five years from now we will need twice the number we presently have, will the minister undertake to make a second statement on motions in the near future to outline his plans for increasing the number of men training to be air traffic controllers?

## WATER RESOURCES

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—COMPENSATION TO FISHERMEN FOR LOSS THROUGH POLLUTION

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries. Can the minister say whether consideration is being given by the government to assisting fishermen in the St. Marys and Placentia Bay areas whose livelihood has been affected by the pollution problem there?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Carter:** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Can the minister inform the house whether officials of his department have reported to him as to their findings regarding the same problem?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, they have. I presume the hon. member is referring to the Placentia Bay area. I am hopeful that members from Newfoundland will meet with those officials later on this afternoon.

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister of health. Would the minister advise as to the results of the investigations made by his department in the St. George's Bay area in western Newfoundland in regard to evidence of possible pollution?

**Mr. Munro:** Mr. Speaker, I may have misled the house yesterday when I indicated that my officials were in that area. They were in the Placentia Bay area rather than St. George's; but they do advise, as the hon. member will learn this afternoon, that the situation in St. George's Bay is not serious.

## FISHERIES

SALT COD—IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW POLICY

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I have a related question for the Minister of Fisheries. Is the minister in a position to announce whether or not the advisory committee under the new salt cod policy has been established, and when can we expect implementation of this new policy?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** All of the members of this committee, Mr. Speaker, have been approached by letter. Most of them have already agreed to serve; the others, I hope, will do so very shortly. The committee will be meeting within the next ten days. The policy, as the hon. member knows, has already been announced, and it will be implemented in that form.

## CONSUMER AFFAIRS

DANGER ARISING FROM DISPOSABLE BOTTLES

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I should like to direct to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In light of the recent decision by the Ontario Federation of Home and School Associations to ask the provincial government to ban the sale of beverages in one-way bottles, can the minister now report on the outcome of his promise to try to get co-ordinated action with the provinces to deal with this dangerous, expensive, unsightly and increasing problem?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. It seems to me that the hon. member is raising a question which, in my view, should be discussed by way of a statement on motions. I hope the hon. member will agree with me on this point.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** With great respect, Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question was going to point to the fact that we are just at the edge now of the litterbug season, and both from the standpoint of public safety as well as unsightly littering—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Had I known what the supplementary question was going to be I would have allowed the question.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** Then may I put that question to the minister.

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, there was some discussion of this subject with the

ministers concerned at the recent federal-provincial conference. As the hon. member undoubtedly knows, the Consumers Association of Canada is conducting a widespread inquiry into the whole question of disposable bottles, and I would not want to take action until they had completed their study and I had had the benefits of the views of the Consumers Association.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask a further supplementary question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would suggest to the hon. member that the question has been asked. We are running out of time, and if there is an urgent supplementary it might be discussed at the time of adjournment.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, all I want to know is whether the minister knows when this study is likely to be complete and the results made public.

**Mr. Basford:** I cannot speak for the Consumers Association of Canada, Mr. Speaker.

## INDUSTRY

TIMMINS, ONT.—SUBSIDY TO TEXAS GULF

**Mr. Walter Deakon (High Park):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious we cannot have the last word because the girls take precedence. My question is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Can the minister advise the house whether the federal government has provided for, or intends to provide for a subsidy to the United States firm, Texas Gulf, for the purpose of erecting a smelter in the Timmins area?

**Mr. Winch:** Author?

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, I think it has already been announced that we are going to give a grant of, I do not know the exact amount but I think it is over $1 million.

[*Translation*]

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ABITIBI—GRANT FOR INDUSTRIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Could he tell us whether consultations are taking place between his department and the Quebec government for the designation of Abitibi as a special area with regard to the granting of financial assistance to promote industrial development in that area?

**Mr. Speaker:** I feel that the question should normally be put on the order paper or discussed at the time of adjournment.

**Mr. Laprise:** At ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

## SEARCH AND RESCUE

SUMMERTIME NETWORK MANNED BY STUDENTS

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last the minister of manpower told the house that the government had a plan for summer employment of students, though he did not say what that plan was. My question is to the Minister of Transport. As part of the government's drive to provide jobs for students, is the Department of Transport going to establish a summertime network of search and rescue co-ordination centres in the inland waters of Canada to be manned by students?

Is the minister considering hiring students for the summer months to run routine checks on the large numbers of pleasure craft to ensure that the provisions of the Canada Shipping Act are carried out, plus relieving the police of these additional time consuming duties?

**Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services):** Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the new Minister of Transport will want to consider that question.

## NATIONAL SECURITY

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. What progress is being made to provide parliament with the expurgated edition of the report on security procedures which the right hon. gentleman has promised from time to time?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I will not surprise the house by saying that progress has been slow. There has been progress. I hope to be able to announce the date soon.

## CONSUMER AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO SETTING UP OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** I would like to ask my good friend the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether the extraordinary delay in announcing the appointment of the commission on prices means that the minister has abandoned this idea? Does he believe the government has already licked inflation or is he actually going to set up a commission?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** I would like to tell my good friend the Leader of the Opposition that the government has not abandoned its policies to establish a prices and incomes commission. I am most anxious to have this established as quickly as possible. I have had some difficulty in the selection of personnel for the commission. I expect this difficulty will be resolved very shortly.

**An hon. Member:** Jim Tucker is still available!

**Mr. Basford:** I am delighted to hear a nomination from members of the opposition. However, under the circumstances it is one I cannot accept. I hope to make an announcement shortly. The prices and incomes commission will be part of the program of this government's determination to beat the inflation problem.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I have had bad luck with assurances today, but could the minister assure us the commission will be announced and appointed in 1969?

**Mr. Basford:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the difficulty the minister is having in recruiting members for the commission, would he consult with the Leader of the Opposition, who will be most helpful in this regard?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## FLOODS

TRAIL, B.C.—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON FINANCIAL AID

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. In view of the continuing and disheartening delay of any firm commitment from either the provincial or federal authorities in respect to the flood disaster in Trail, B.C., may I ask the minister what recent discussions, if any, his department has had with the provincial authorities in British Columbia on sharing the costs of the disastrous Trail flood?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, we have had no discussion with the province of British Columbia. That province has not asked us for aid. As the Prime Minister explained, the matter of floods in three provinces is under study and a report is expected momentarily. In the meantime, we have not turned down the possibility of giving assistance in Trail. We are waiting for the report to assess what would be proper.

**Mr. Harding:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that federal assistance has been given to other areas, such as the city of Alberni where similar disastrous floods hit, what guidelines for cost sharing have been laid down by the federal authorities—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

REQUEST FOR MEASURE RESPECTING CRIMINAL RECORDS

**Mr. D. R. Tolmie (Welland):** I wish to direct a question to the Solicitor General. Will the minister be bringing forth legislation at the next session of parliament pertaining to the subject of the sealing of criminal records?

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** Yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member referred to the next session. Perhaps the question might be asked then.

**Mr. Tolmie:** I think it is rather urgent, Mr. Speaker, that the government should start this legislative program. It is a matter of urgency.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

ENLISTMENT GOALS FOR ARMED SERVICES

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. To answer

shocking rumours in Nova Scotia, have the goals for the number of personnel in the armed forces remained approximately the same since April of last year?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question should be placed on the order paper.

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

### LEGISLATION RESPECTING DESIGNATED AREAS

**Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca):** My question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Will he be bringing in any new legislation concerning designated areas before this session expires?

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** I hope so, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

### DELAY IN ISSUING PASSPORTS

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Could he tell us if he intends to take other means than those he announced last week in the house to correct the deplorable situation that exists at this time about the issuance of passports at the passport office in Ottawa?

**Mr. Speaker:** It seems to me the hon. member's question was considered by the minister last week, but it is possible that the minister may want to answer it.

[*English*]

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** As a result of the measures taken, the volume of passports being issued is increasing very rapidly. Yesterday for example 2,674 passports were issued. We are gradually overcoming the backlog.

## STUDENT UNREST

### ROLE OF ACTIVISTS OUTSIDE CANADA

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** My question is for the Solicitor General. Could the minister make a statement on motions as to the extent of evidence and information obtained by the R.C.M.P. with respect to student activists outside Canada and their role in precipitating student unrest?

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, I will consider the suggestion and statement. I regret the hon. member did not put the question yesterday in the Estimates Committee when this subject was before the committee. Appropriate officials with detailed information were available at that time to answer detailed questions.

[Mr. McCleave.]

**Mr. Lundrigan:** A supplementary question. Could I ask the minister what action has been taken by his department in trying to curtail such infiltrated activist movement which is precipitating this student unrest?

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the information sought by the hon. member might be included in the statement which the minister may make to the house.

**Mr. Lundrigan:** The minister did not mention he would make a statement; he said he would take it under advisement. We are not all members of this committee he referred to.

## CONSUMER AFFAIRS

### EFFECT OF INTEREST RATES ON COST OF LIVING INCREASE

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Does the minister intend in the interest of consumers to have his department undertake a study of the effect of skyrocketing interest rates on the cost of living?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** This is really a question for the Department of Finance which is responsible for financial matters in the country. It could be a suitable subject for the prices and incomes commission to look at.

[*Translation*]

## SPORTS

### REQUEST FOR REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AMATEUR SPORTS

**Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the minister of National Health and Welfare.

Could he tell us when the special committee on amateur sport will table its report?

[*English*]

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I expect to be in a position to table the report of the sports inquiry next Monday, May 12.

## THE MINISTRY

HANDLING OF MATTERS SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO INDIANS

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Can the Prime Minister advise the house whether he intends to name another Minister without Portfolio with duties specifically related to Indian affairs, beyond those carried out by the present minister, in response to the legitimate aspirations of all Indians in Canada who have now reacted to the last changes in the cabinet?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** No, Mr. Speaker. We are responding to those legitimate demands in a very effective way.

[*Translation*]

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ATLANTIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD—GOVERNMENT POLICY

**Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Does he consider the reports of the Atlantic Development Board, published recently, since the winding up of this agency, as valid as far as the formulation of the policy of its department is concerned?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is requesting an opinion from the minister. I do not think that the question such as formulated is acceptable.

[*English*]

## AIR TRANSPORT

NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN C.P.A. AND TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS EMPLOYEES

**Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour):** I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Have Canadian Pacific Airlines and the Transportation and Communications Employees Union completed their negotiations?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that not only have they completed their negotiations, but they arrived at a settlement which I believe was ratified yesterday. This is a very important union representing close to 800 key employees of Canadian Pacific Airlines. I congratulate both parties.

**Mr. Perrault:** I wonder if the minister is in a position to tell us the nature of the wage settlement.



**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder whether this is the kind of information which ought to be given. If hon. members wish to hear the information they might indicate so, but I really do not think this is the time. I believe this is the kind of information which normally is given by way of a statement, but if the minister wants to make a statement perhaps we might take thirty seconds to allow him to make it.

**Mr. Mackasey:** Mr. Speaker, I bow to your wisdom. I do not think I should elaborate on the statement, other than to say the basic settlement is 8 per cent in the first year and 7 per cent in the following year.

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the House Leader. Is there anybody attending Liberal caucus meetings these days?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

## PRIVILEGE

MR. DOUGLAS (ASSINIBOIA)—INCORRECT POLITICAL DESIGNATION IN RADIO PROGRAM

**Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. On a C.B.C. radio program "Sunday News Magazine" last Sunday I was referred to as a Conservative member of parliament. Mr. Speaker, I waited two or three days thinking the Conservative Party would register a protest, so now I feel it desirable to inform the house that I am still a full-fledged member of the Liberal party.

• (3:10 p.m.)

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, May 6, consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 34, Mr. Allmand.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, while considering the previous amendment, I

dealt generally with the word "health" which is used in a vague sense in clause 18 of Bill C-150.

As motion No. 34 tends to qualify the word "health" used in respect of abortion, I am glad to congratulate the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) who laid down and defended so eloquently his approach to the problem. I was quite astonished, however, to see the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) throw cold water on his enthusiasm.

Not so long ago, the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) also moved an amendment. You will remind that it was beaten all hollow. I thought then that perhaps the amendment was not of a swinging type or that it did not get the approval of the new Liberal members since the hon. member for Gatineau belongs to the old guard.

At any rate, in so far as the amendment now before us is concerned, that cannot be the case, since it is moved by a Montreal lawyer, a new member of parliament, a member of the young team.

Mr. Speaker, during the last election campaign, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) took pleasure in emphasizing across the country the importance of dialogue. Since the election, he has proved his point by hiring defeated Liberal candidates; in fact, many offices have been opened. Several of those defeated candidates are meeting people across the country. Several of them have been mobilized and they travel across the country to carry on a dialogue with the public. In the meantime, in this house, the members normally elected by the people, such as the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce and the hon. member for Gatineau, are ignored. The views of those members, the views of even the Liberal members are of no interest whatever to the Prime Minister.

The proposal of the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce is rejected in advance. The Minister of Justice made it clear yesterday, as reported on page 8399 of *Hansard*, and I quote:

> Despite the obvious sincerity and the wealth of argument introduced by hon. members who support this amendment ... I suggest to the members who are supporting this amendment that the words in the bill itself more adequately and conclusively convey the meaning that they themselves wish to convey than do the words that they are offering to the house.

How stupid can you be?

In Poland, where abortion is commonly practised, any reason is good. Health grounds are also recognized. In order to set women free, any reason is valid. For health reasons, women undergo abortion and a week later, those very women are engaged in road building like men.



Everyone will agree that is the way to recover quickly. It was certainly advantageous for the Polish government to legalize abortion since the legislation in that regard, passed without opposition, is profitable to the state, which is the main employer. Polish women are not healthy enough to have children, but they are in perfect health to work for the minister of highways at $13 a month.

In that socialist country where there is a guaranteed monthly salary of $11, the department of highways is so generous that it pays as much as $13 a month to women working at the construction of roads. Not healthy enough to be wives, with everything that is involved in that state of life, but in perfect health when it comes to working in plants, building highways and bridges and farming. One third of Polish farms are owned by women. In approving abortion for Polish women—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I must interrupt the hon. member and beg him to come back from Poland to Canada and more especially to the amendment before us.

It seems to me the hon. member's comments of these last few minutes have nothing to do whatever with the amendment under consideration.

**Mr. Godin:** I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I shall get back to the matter since, for all kinds of reasons, people talk of abortion in that country.

I was in Poland and I wish here to thank the Canadian government for having given me the opportunity of making such a trip.

Abortion is accepted in order not to lose three months of work.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it important that Canadian women should know what the future has in store for them when this famous bill is passed or when, unfortunately, clause 18 is passed.

I wish to point out, once again, that so as not to lose three months' work, women agree to resort to abortion. Yet, the average salary in Poland was $25 per month. In that country, where a 9 cubic foot refrigerator costs $450, you can imagine how many months one has to work in order to buy one, Mr. Speaker.

Here in Canada, the government's refusal of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce proves that clause 18 of the legislation before us is a totalitarian measure.

Maternity leaves will become non-existent, for the benefit of Insurance companies which have been collecting fees for those leaves, for several years.

The Minister of Justice has said that he is against the amendment proposed by his colleague. May I go back to the amendment, of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce which proposes to modify Bill C-150, and I quote:

—by deleting in clause 18 the words "or would be likely to endanger her life or health" on lines 4 and 5 on page 43 and by inserting the following words:

"endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health".

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is against the amendment because pregnancy, childbirth, would not be considered as an illness by the Canadian government and consequently does not endanger the life of the mother.

Through his contract as an employer, the Canadian government proves that pregnancy does not endanger health because the Canadian government does not even grant a maternity leave to his "female" employees.

Generally speaking, female employees are fairly well treated. Regular work, time off for lunch, time off for coffee, weekends off, leave on important feast days, annual leave, accumulated leave, call it what you will, they benefit from them. All in all, we can say that the working conditions are fairly good. We are glad to work with secretaries in top condition and who retain their youth.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that when a human being is well treated, he or she stays healthy longer.

Mr. Speaker, none of the secretaries of the House of Commons, 80 per cent of whom are married have maternity-leave clauses in their contract. This shows that the government recognizes that pregnancy is not a sickness but a natural event.

In the legislation now before us, why give so much importance to pregnancy? Why try and educate by pointing out inexistent dangers?

Who else but the financiers would profit from section 18, legalizing abortion?

• (3:20 p.m.)

Maternity leaves are disappearing, the birth rate is falling and, as a result, there are less family allowances to pay, and all this is profitably replaced by taxes deducted at the source. So the question of abortion should not be raised in the parliament of Canada. Everything should be done to help the married woman to play her role in our society. It is well known that childless married couples not only are less costly to the state, but they pay more taxes as well.

Collecting taxes is important, but to make investments is a necessity. And for the survival of the country, the Canadian government should first take into consideration the opinion of the 70,000 Canadian women who expressed their views to the right hon. Prime Minister a few days ago.

It is obvious that the proposed amendment tries to clear things up and I hope that the government will take the opportunity to clarify this ambiguity and, hence, will prove that the participation of the people, the dialogue recommended by the head of the government not so long ago on the hustings was not a promise made in jest.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question?

[*English*]

The question is on motion No. 34, (Mr. Allmand) which reads as follows:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or would be likely to endanger her life or health" on lines 4 and 5 on page 43 and by inserting the following words:

"endanger her life or seriously and directly impair her health".

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. Speaker:** All those opposed please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost on division.

Motion No. 34 (Mr. Allmand) negatived.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford),** on behalf of Mr. Rodrigue, moves the motion No. 35.

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or health" on line 5 on page 43.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the house agree to adopt the said motion?

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, because of the absence of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue), who has just got visitors in good health in his office, I would like to sponsor this motion.

Amendment No. 35 aims to delete from section 18 of Bill C-150 the words: "or health".

This would only mean deleting two words but would change the whole meaning of the bill and would be in line with the principles we have already put forward in this house.

In the course of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I shall try to confine myself to the subject of health. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that you look the picture of health today. Generally, a healthy person has a ready smile. We hope that good health will long keep you smiling in this house.

Mr. Speaker, we want to speak about health. Health is not easy to define. What is health? Where does it start, where does it end?

It is a subject which, according to medical books, does not require long developments, since health can be defined as the absence of illness.

It is the absence of all forms of illness, because often even a healthy man is a sick one who does not realize he is sick.

The present bill provides that for health reasons abortion may be allowed. Well, the word "health" has not been defined. We have not been told, clearly what illnesses pregnant women could contract due to pregnancy.

We have not been given in the bill what health reasons a doctor or an abortion committee could invoke to carry out an abortion. That has not been defined.

Books on medicine are all wrong when they deal with health, because it is a difficult subject to define.

In the Quillet dictionary, page 5175, health is defined as a state of a living being where all organs perform their functions freely.

[Mr. Speaker.]

In the Larousse Dictionary, at page 586, almost the same definition of health appears; it is the state of a person whose body functions well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to define health, unless we say that it is an absence of illness.

In the text of the bill, we are not told which are the illnesses that abortion could cure.

On the other hand, while studying medical books, we find that the illnesses pregnancy may bring about in a woman cannot be stated. However, some illnesses that pregnancy can correct in certain cases are specified.

I do not intend here to mention all the medical experiments of the past which have shown that some women who had been suffering until then of various illnesses had been cured for ever on the occasion of their pregnancy.

Personally, I have known a lady who had always worn glasses until her marriage. The moment she was pregnant, the doctor told her: as soon as you have your first child, you will no longer need glasses. Why? Because pregnancy brings maturity to a woman and involves unique biological, psychological and physical consequences.

Now, in certain cases, pregnancy corrects illnesses that otherwise a woman could not get rid of.

Since no such reference is made in the wording of the legislation, Mr. Speaker, we cannot accept minor ailments as diseases. A person might have an indisposition without necessarily being ill. One may feel indisposed one day, have a headache. Those are discomforts—not diseases. The wording of the legislation does not clearly specify what is health, was is illness, what is discomfort.

So because of everything we are told about health, because it is vaguely defined or even not at all, women will be able to claim they suffer minor ailments and still get an abortion.

And here, I refer to a doctor's testimony, that of Dr. Marcel Boivin, who says about such discomforts, and I quote:

In the name of such subjectivism, must the doctor or all professionals concerned readily comply with their patients' requests who are in a state of stress, because this is actually the case in point. Are doctors usually ready more or less to prescribed penicillin to every patient who asks for it?—

• (3:30 p.m.)

Does a physician give penicillin to any woman as soon as she feels unwell? Is morphine given to any patient who asks for it? Are X-rays, laboratory tests or hospitalization recommended for no reason at all?

If it is therapeutic to comply with a request or a wish, to yield to feelings of freedom or immediate compassion for anything related to medicine, we only have to rationalize all our sympathy and compassion, to cry with depressed persons, to be frightened with those suffering from phobia, anxiety or obsession and to give them at any time the therapeutic care they ask.

I therefore suggest that medicine should be really, adequately and efficiently organized to take care of all underlying conflicts of those who believe that an abortion is essential.

A physician has said in the logical way of scientists:

It seems that medical science has always tended to prevent rather than to cure. There may be circumstances when abortion appears necessary, but all things being considered, we realize it is a desperate solution. I do not think medicine should endorse despair, but by basing its actions on symptoms, incite a re-organization of the patient's global energies. Who, in his medical or personal conscience, has not often considered abortion as a therapeutic solution but has finally found other possibilities? The function of a physician has never been to deny pain or suffering, or to prevent death, but rather to help and release recuperative powers, to stimulate curative powers on the physical, psychological and mental planes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a proof that we cannot accept at first hand, the definition of health given in this bill and that it has been impossible for the Minister of Justice and even for physicians to say what is meant by health, when it starts and where it ends.

And when, for instance, the employees of the various health departments are sworn in, before serving in various health services, here are the words they utter about health:

Faced with the abortion problem, employees in health services turn more and more to the code of ethics which says, among other things:

Any health services employee must consider abortion as something harmful biologically, medically, psychologically and sociologically. The principles of socialist humanism and of medical knowledge require that human life be respected from its very beginning. Consequently, the health services employee should strive to consider the human privilege of motherhood as of greater value than the privilege of abortion. As a health services employee, it is his duty, in each individual case, to seek the professional help which is likely to be to the best advantage of the woman and of the family. At the same time, he must, because of his profession, work towards making useless, through responsible parenthood, such extreme measures as abortion.

That is the code of ethics by which health services employees must abide, whatever the services they are called upon to give to the sick.

Prevention more than cure is the object of medicine. If we accept abortion on grounds of health, it would mean that we are putting aside the principles of medicine, that we are saying that physicians are not sufficiently skilled to cure the discomforts of pregnancy. I do not say the ills of pregnancy because pregnancy is not an illness.

There are no ilnesses either that can justify abortion during pregnancy. To accept abortion for reasons of health is to deny the beneficial effects of medical science, to deny medical science, to deny also that there is now on the market good and efficient medicine to cure various indispositions and, if need be, real illnesses.

It is to deny also that our hospitals have at present to provide medical care to sick people and pregnant women, when the removal of the foetus is decided upon for reasons of health. To do that is to want to kill instead of curing. To want to kill instead of caring for. To want to kill instead of providing treatment.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, we cannot accept that because the words "or health" are not defined in the Criminal Code, abortion should be permitted. I wish the provincial governments, that are now against the abortion legislation, could pass a law in order to define health and prevent the Criminal Code from being used in such cases as a means to procure an abortion.

Mr. Speaker, we do not accept abortion for reasons of health. First, because it is an act of folly, it is pure nonsense and it runs counter to real medical science. It means admitting a pregnant woman is right by accepting to procure her miscarriage instead of giving her the proper care, so that the pregnancy may be completed in due time.

Unfortunately, in the Liberal party, even outside that party, no doctor has given clear, definite and precise grounds as to health or illness that could be used for resorting to abortion.

There was but one instance in the past, which was the most frequent one, where abortion had to be automatically performed: in the case of German measles. But nowadays, German measles can be very effectively cured, because medical science has developed efficient vaccines against it. Besides, we have no more cases, no other medical indications

according to which a doctor can, today, practice an abortion for true reasons of health.

Therefore, we think that this amendment, notwithstanding what the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) says or what is said by the government members, is most serious because we want to remove from the Criminal Code reasons that cannot be defined, diseases that are not specified, discomforts even that could be put forward in order to get an abortion, though it would be a matter of discomfort and not a disease.

Because abortion is a very important subject and because people tend to use spurious reasons to save the mother's health such futile or commonplace reasons seem unacceptable to us.

Mr. Speaker, I would still like to mention testimonies of physicians who have studied all aspects of medicine, they are to be found on page 6200 of the book "*Biologie et médecine*" which deals with what is normal, and statistically normal. I quote:

In very general terms, it can be said that the majority of human beings for most of their lives, are not prey to conscious sufferings. This state is subjectively that of good health.

And a little further:

One day, in Geneva, some young women asked surgeons whom they trusted to remove unsightly tumours from the anterior part of their necks; these tumours were goiters.

First stage: goiters suddenly become a pathological phenomenon. It did not happen until the middle of the XIXth century, in an enlightened Western society, because these goiters, in fact, were undesirable only from an esthetic point of view.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Formerly, a person with a goiter was said to be ill, but the medical science says it is nothing but an esthetic flaw. I resume the quotation:

Third phase: a surgeon is sure enough of his technique to allow himself to operate goiters.

Today, surgeons have confidence in themselves, and statistics prove that goiters can be operated on with good results. What used to be considered as an incurable disease can now be cured by a minor operation.

Third phase: The patients present a special pathological picture, resembling certain states of cretinism with cutaneous infiltrations, the nature of which was unknown.

I could give other examples of illnesses which used to be incurable but which to-day, thanks to medical science, have become curable.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

Wanting to kill a foetus because a pregnant woman believes she is ill, is contrary to medical knowledge, medical science.

Further on under the title *Standards and Time* in the same book, one reads, and I quote:

A normal man is indeed an infant, then a child, an adolescent, an adult and an old man.

Still, it must be recognized that certain organic crises such as puberty or menopause, certain periods such as pregnancy, although they must be considered as physiological and normal—

No longer, in this day and age, as illnesses but as discomforts.

But, Mr. Speaker, this amendment deals with "health",—it was mentioned earlier that certain illnesses were considered as discomforts—and we cannot accept to kill a foetus on the basis of temporary discomfort.

For instance, if a woman at the beginning of her pregnancy had discomfort, she might have applied for an abortion pretending that she was sick. And, because pregnancy is something natural, normal, after two or three months, everything is back to normal. The discomfort disappears but not the illness, as she was not sick; the discomfort disappears and from then on she begins to love her child and afterwards the idea of an abortion gets off her mind.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we look at this bill we find that it is not based on any scientific or moral principle. It is not based on any biological or scientific fact. On what is it based then? On the protection, not of medical skills, but on the fact that some doctors, with this bill, will have a free hand and will have no concern because they will be protected by the Criminal Code. They will be able to allow abortion on request, not on the basis of sickness, but of discomfort.

Mr. Speaker, that is why these proposed amendments are absolutely in order, logical, and should be accepted by the minister.

If for any discomfort the foetus should be eliminated for such trifling reasons, I would not want to have on my shoulders or on those of future generations, the heavy responsibility of a stupid act, of an abominable killing which, for the sake of "health"—which is not defined—will lead to the elimination of foetuses in this country. To reduce the population and even be finally threatened with extermination, as is now the case in Japan where the number of abortions exceeds that of births, is a terrible thing. Within ten years, the Japanese race will be altogether exterminated. Why? Because any disease, which

actually is not a disease but a minor ailment justifies an abortion.

That is why this amendment is most serious, because we do not want to allow abortion on request for mere reasons of health.

The government members should speak on this bill, because they are concerned with the same people we are concerned with, and instead of sitting there, sucking their thumb, as the Liberal party whip (Mr. Pilon) does, they should now and then give their opinion on such an important amendment.

**Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) has absolutely no idea of the government's position, simple and clear as it is.

The government wishes to leave the practice of medicine to the doctors. The government wants them to look after the health of Canadian citizens. The government believes that this health will be in better hands than in those of our Créditiste friends. After all, it is rather surprising that these would-be defenders of life are willing to wait until a woman is at the point of death before a medical committee can decide whether or not a therapeutic abortion is necessary.

I wanted to give in a few words the position of the government and the reasons why this amendment is unacceptable to the government.

**Mr. Romuald Rodrigue (Beauce):** Mr. Speaker, I moved this amendment to make it clear that it is the mother's life that will be endangered, and not only her health, if therapeutic abortion is not performed.

Paragraph 18 (4) (c) of Bill C-150 reads as follows:

—has by certificate in writing stated that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health.

This paragraph may be interpreted in various ways, and have quite a wide scope according to the person interpreting it.

Some people think, it seems to me, that the new legislation on abortion will only legalize abortion on serious grounds, namely to save the mother's life. Even if that is seldom necessary, it is generally admitted that abortion made on such grounds is already legal. The changes proposed in the bill opens the door much wider.

Bill C-150 proposes to legalize abortion to safeguard health. The decision on such a matter is left to the discretion of a small abortion committee. In fact, the act will allow two medical practitioners to authorize abortions on grounds of moral, physical or mental health.

During a television program, on December 27 last, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) said that the abortion committees would lay down the law. He stated that the word "health" would not be interpreted by courts of justice, but by every therapeutic abortion committee. In other words, the decision of those committees lies beyond the scope of the legislation and could have a different meaning according to the members.

In Colorado, in California and elsewhere, the result of legislation similar to the one which is proposed to us has been to increase the number of abortions. Up to 90 per cent of abortions performed in hospitals are made on so-called "mental health" grounds, a term which is used abusively to cover anything.

If there are more abortions in hospitals this does not mean that the number of criminal abortions has decreased

In Great Britain, for instance, under a liberalized legislation, the rate of deaths due to criminal abortions is higher than in Canada.

In 1966, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics reported only nine deaths due to criminal abortions in Canada, whilst in a six-month period, sixteen were reported in England. This amounts to 32 deaths a year.

Then what is the reason which could justify the change? To clarify the present legislation? In fact, it is not through the use of words which we are unable to define that we will reach that goal.

Could it be to meet an urgent medical need? Doctors recognize themselves that such need does not exist and our decreasing maternity death rate proves it. Today, it stands at only 3 deaths on 10,000 living births, which is over ten times less than the 1940 rate.

On February 7, 1968, Dr. FitzGibbon stated to the Committee on health, welfare and social affairs the following, and I quote:

As it has been said on several occasions during the audience of the above mentioned case, there is no sound medical reason to interrupt a pregnancy. Abortion requests addressed to doctors are almost invariably of a social nature—

Could the proposed amendments to the law be a concession granted to a small pressure group of doctors who want to free themselves from all legal restriction?

The main justification put forward is that the bill will clarify the existing law on abortion. The spuriousness of this claim may be demonstrated thanks to the evidence gathered by the parliamentary committee on health, welfare and social affairs.

Abortion, we are told, should be legalized for "health" reasons, but what does the word "health" mean? In the Minutes of the Proceedings of the said committee, it is obvious that there was no consensus on the significance of that word. This ambiguous term can be taken in its broad or narrow meaning. According to an Ottawa doctor, "health" may even mean "happiness". How can a word that nobody can define clearly help clarify the law?

In reading the evidence given to the Standing committee on health, welfare and social affairs, we found that generally speaking, everybody agrees that abortion is an attack on human life. Out of the 26 doctors who have appeared before the committee, only one has tried to deny this. Will the broadening of the law on abortion increases the necessary respect for a human life or will it lessen it?

It is time that we should get down to the facts concerning the amendments to the abortion law as proposed in Bill C-150.

Is the government really anxious to protect the life and health of women? If so, where is the evidence that the proposed changes will achieve this goal?

Never was the health of Canadian women as well protected as it is today. At the present time Canada has one of the lowest mother death rate in the world.

Can we really believe that the changes as proposed in paragraph (c) of the bill will bring still greater improvements?

During this debate on abortion, there was nothing to show that such improvements would take place. It is somewhat surprising that nobody up to now has thought of asking that obvious question. It is significant also that no doctor has tried to prove that some social advantage would be forthcoming.

In Japan, as in many other countries, abortion is legal and is granted on request, even for sanitary reasons, according to a broad interpretation of the facts. Now, according to U.N.O. statistics, the death rate among mothers in Japan is three times as high as in Canada.

In Yugoslavia, with a similar legislation, the mother death rate is four times as high as ours.

[Mr. Rodrigue.]

How are we then to believe that permissive abortion laws promote health?

• (3:50 p.m.)

Let us keep in mind also the tremendous medical progress achieved over the last ten years. The maternal mortality rate has decreased from 10 to 1 in a single generation.

Today, there are less medical indications than ever before. Medical authorities accept that fact and statistics prove it. So it is ironical to claim that the amendments to the abortion legislation proposed in the bill now before us reflect the needs of modern society.

On the matter of saving the mother's life, I should like to quote part of a document prepared by the Medical Council of Laval Hospital, and I quote:

> An abortion performed because the mother's life is endangered, may be considered not as euthanasia, but as a case of self-defence.
>
> But before an act can be considered to be in self-defence, there must be, on the one hand, some proportion between the defensive act and the aggression and, on the other hand, the defensive act must also be the only possible means of protection.
>
> Now, according to experts, cases where the foetus must be killed in order to save the mother's life are extremely rare.
>
> Dr. René Simard, director of obstetrics at Laval University, states that he has never seen any.

For his part, Dr. Roy J. Hefferman, a famed American gynaecologist, states:

> To perform a therapeutic abortion, is either to overlook modern methods of treating pregnancy complications or to refuse to take the time required to apply them.
>
> Moreover, the inefficiency of the therapeutic abortion is proved by—
>
> —several studies.
>
> Considering the scarcity of the cases where therapeutic abortion is necessary to save the life of the mother, we can ask ourselves if legislation to allow it is justified. Thus, if the legislator wants, through legislation, to rule on those extremely uncommon cases, he should include in that legislation some very strict guide lines similar to those advocated by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists.

Through the ages, several persons have tried on many occasions to define the word "health". Health cannot be defined by a legal term and this is the reason why I have proposed this amendment striking out the words "or health", in order to clarify paragraph (c) in subsection (4) of clause 18, in this bill amending section 237 of the Criminal Code.

In order to make more clear the views of certain physicians, I would also like to quote Dr. Whyte:

> I am not aware of the World Health Organization's definition. That is a very hard word to define, I agree; you can define it as meaning happiness if you like. But I would certainly say that in my opinion the words "physical and/or mental health" would cover what normally we have in mind.
>
> It is therefore commonly recognized that the word "health" as used in the bill concerned will have the necessary extension to encompass physical and psychic health and the socio-economic grounds which certain persons of means could include under the term "psychiatric indication".

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the remarks made by the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Cantin) because quite frankly I had decided, not to speak on this amendment. But in view of the comments of the hon. member for Louis-Hébert, I feel compelled to challenge his statement.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Louis-Hébert says we do not know what we are talking about, I simply want to tell him that, on the contrary, we have understood the bill full well for having read it line by line, and it is because we have understood it that we move amendments like this one.

The hon. member for Louis-Hébert says that the government wants to leave it up to doctors to settle abortion matters. This is all very well and so do we, but what kind of doctors, that is a different story, and what kind of problems is another one too.

We ask for a better definition of those very aspects in amendments such as No. 13, for instance, which seeks to remove any mention of the health of the mother, because we are in favour of a full protection of the life of the mother, but—I repeat as I did yesterday—we reject a measure that allows abortion in cases when pregnancy "would be likely to endanger her health".

We are also opposed to such expressions in the statutes. Considering that in the medical profession as in any other there are profiteers, it is easy to imagine that it will always be possible to find two doctors to say that the life of the mother or the unmarried girl "would likely be" endangered.

For those particular reasons, we want to remove this question of "health" from the bill, because while the government insists on being vague regarding the life of the mother, we wanted to replace "likely" by "indirectly" in danger. Nobody can blame us for requesting the clarification of a text so obscure and so permissive on the matter of abortion.

Instead of debating the subject in direct relation with abortion, it would have been more profitable to pass a law against abortion in order to protect the health of the mother, because I think a pregnant woman enjoys the best of health, and the fact that she is pregnant is sufficient proof. I think it is a natural state for her; it would be abnormal to reject maternity. A pregnant woman is one that is living a full life.

I do not see why we should be trying to pass legislation today in order to make abortion easier, when we should be legislating abortion out of existence, as far as reasons of health are concerned. It appears as if we were striving for the past few months, and especially since the coming to power of the new government, to adopt laws against nature. We shall soon have to change direction, in order to pass legislative measures aimed at protecting not only pregnant women but society as a whole, and to stop legalizing this or that and permitting everything in the end.

Mr. Speaker, my only purpose in rising was to warn the house that I shall vote in favour of this amendment, which is very sensible, because it states exactly what is expected of the bill, and that is full protection for the life of the mother. By protecting the life of the mother, we oppose life to life.

But, we have no right to sacrifice a life on grounds of "probable health". It is useless to discuss the question of saving two lives; one must choose the lesser of two evils. Two lives are threatened at a given moment, that of the mother and that of the child. Which one should be saved? We say that of the mother. That is our intention. But if the choice is between the health and happiness of one person and the life of the other, we do not have the right to sacrifice life for some small happiness or some uncertain health.

And when we are told that we did not understand anything, I think that there are some in this house who do not want to understand, who do not want to be logical, not only on a legislative point of view but on a rational point of view. I think that everybody will admit it.

It was even said in this house that if such a woman—and examples were given—had not been aborted, she would not be dead. This is perhaps true. But, as for me, I know by experience that if a certain woman, a close

relation of mine, had not been aborted she would not be dead. But, here again, I do not blame those who did it. The doctors acted according to their conscience.

• (4:00 p.m.)

But, all this means it is relative. I want to stop quoting these factual examples suggested by fatherly, motherly or brotherly love. It is only normal. But, let us stop all these comparisons because it would never end. We have cases where if nature had been left to take its course, it would have accomplished its work marvelously well. But nature was violated, was acted against, and death occurred.

I think that there is still the great doctor, as an old doctor in my area used to say. The great doctor is still good old nature.

Let us stop acting against nature in this parliament. Since this government came to power, the only pieces of legislation I have seen were against nature. Are we finally going to act like men and stop reversing the natural processes?

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that we must restrict ourselves to the matter being discussed, and deal with equations rather than with impressions. Let us discuss the problem of two lives or two healths, but let us not discuss one life and one probable health. It cannot be discussed.

We simply say that when the probable health of a person is involved, that such a term should not appear in the legislation on abortion, which is a murder, which is the murder of an innocent being or the murder of another person. But that we must choose between two lives, that is fine. The middle course between two lives? There is no middle course between life and probable health. And I want to draw the attention of the house and of the members to this point. It is more serious than the members of the other side might think, and even if they play politics, that is enough, because this is the crux of the matter. And I wish the people will pay them back in their own coin.

Mr. Speaker, without being a physician, a lawyer, one can be a head of family, human and logical; we can judge, of course. Are we going to be called idiots because we are neither physicians nor lawyers?

Mr. Speaker, as someone said in a letter I received yesterday, the world, with that type of professionals, will not often go very far.

Once again I urge all the members to study this amendment, to consider it seriously; this is no joke. We must consider the health of the mother, 100 per cent. We must protect her life 100 per cent, but it is different to say that we probably should also protect her probable health, that of the pregnant woman, when the word "health" cannot even be defined. I cannot see it. Does the word "health" apply to her social relations, her sports activities or social function? It has not been defined.

That is why I feel that certain groups of doctors, that I admit, will use this act with reservations; on the other hand, others may use it for financial purposes. We will have them, just as they can be found in every other country, the world being what it is.

In England, an attempt is being made to pass legislation designed to restrain abortions, because 20 years ago mistakes were made. We are plunging head first into the same errors which were made in the old countries and which they are now trying in every way to correct.

We need not go into the details of every other country but it seem to me it is often wise to study what went on in other countries in an attempt to avoid making the same errors and to do better than they did. History should serve that purpose, amongst others.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I ask sincerely and openly to those members who have a conscience, who are humane, who want above all the good of the Canadian people, to think of the life of the Canadian mother.

As the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Laflamme) said yesterday, we are going towards abortion on request. Canada will err in this as England did and other countries where they started with a small insignificant act. They are caught now and they are wondering how to get out that trap.

I think the best way to get out of it is not to get into it. I have full confidence in the medicine of sincere doctors. Doctors are like businessmen. In fact, they are businessmen. Some of them are honest, and some are crooked. The laws are not made for honest people. Laws must be made for crooks.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I have always thought so.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the doctors will think of the health of the mother, and seriously, but there might be 50 per cent of crooks among them, who will take advantage of the flexibility which is allowed.

Even for 20 per cent, even for 15 per cent, it is necessary that restrictions be clearly mentioned in the law.

I hope that I made myself understood, and that the government members will stop shouting at us that we do not know anything about it. I think that when one has raised eight children and when one wants them in good health—our daughters and boys too—I believe that we have our word to say, and the government will realize that the Canadian people of Quebec have still a lot to say in these decisions and in these laws, these two laws against nature which are going to be voted on in a few days.

**Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane):** Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. If the hon. member wants to speak he must be in his seat. I recognize the hon. member for Richmond, and possibly I will return to the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. De Bané:** Since my speech was meant for the members of the Ralliement créditiste, I wanted to get on the same level so as to be better understood.

• (4:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I must remind the hon. member of the rules of this house. He must speak from his seat.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the business of the house, but I believed I ought to speak for a few minutes in order to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue) and explained by our colleague from the Ralliement créditiste, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau).

First, so as to set the problem in its proper perspective and emphasize the absolute necessity of this amendment, one must know its true nature. The amendment says in part, and I quote:

> That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code . . . be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or health" on line 5, on page 43.

One needs only to know what health means here. Where does it begin? Or is it possible, certainly possible, or probably possible, to lose health?

I believe that word implies many things and especially a lot of ways of thinking. In order that doctors may come to a positive and sure diagnosis, one must, know, when analyzing the word "health" as regards pregnancy, if such a pregnancy is or will be successful, as far as the mother's health is concerned.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, looking at the words "or health" in the wording of the bill before us today, such wording must determine the right of the therapeutic committee, comprised of three members, to decide whether abortion is to be performed or not so as to protect the mother's health.

Mr. Speaker, I think that to make a positive diagnosis, with sufficient certainty, and to decide whether to practice or order an abortion, doctors certainly need much instinct and knowledge, because they have told the hon. members of the committee on health, welfare and social affairs, that it is very difficult to decide whether a pregnancy is likely to undermine the health of a woman.

The bill before the house, which we want to amend by eliminating the words "or health", in terms of science and medicine and according to the doctors who have come before the committee, is very difficult to understand and even more so to explain.

This is a very serious question, to decide whether prejudice should be caused to a living being, be it a foetus or even a child, one or two weeks before term. I think it is very important to know where we are going. That is the substance of what many doctors or specialists told the committee on that subject.

Neither the gynecologists nor the specialists in any field could come up with a certain and definite conclusion.

First of all, regarding moral health, it was often mentioned by previous speakers that there can be no psychological reason for prescribing a therapeutic abortion.

It was also mentioned times after times that a nervous breakdown or other psychological troubles cannot be cured by an abortion. It is the abortion itself which causes theses troubles and not the pregnancy.

We cannot kill a child in his mother's womb because she suffers from psychological problems.

Why should innocents pay for others' diseases? If this bill is passed as it is now, if it is not amended, psychological grounds will often be invented out of whole cloth to justify the decision or, perhaps, a divided decision of

the medical practitioners making up the psychiatric committee.

All hon. members know that, but only those of the Ralliement créditiste dare to say it, and even claim it. Members of the government, of the Liberal party, why have you not express your views? I apologize, one or perhaps three or four out of a large number did so. It would have been easier to circumscribe the problem had some of you stated what they think of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of the bill as it is means that if a mother gives birth to a child, she always suffer from psychological troubles from the very beginning of her pregnancy.

As I said earlier, this is as if we were saying that the infant must be killed as soon as he is born, because many people suffer from psychological troubles.

Now, as far as physical health is concerned, how many times does this situation occur? I have been told that the ratio of 1 to 10,000 was close to the truth. I do not have on hand that doctor's statement, but I know he quoted these figures before the committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

When the pregnant mother catches some disease, the doctor ordinarily prescribes an immediate treatment to neutralize it, so that the mother can have a normal delivery.

Mr. Speaker, owing to the great advance in the field of medical science, the emergency cases where it is necessary to make a decision as to the life of the child are becoming less and less frequent.

• (4:20 p.m.)

It is therefore useless to include in this bill the words "or health". How many times have you seen a mother suffer from any illness after a childbirth? That happens very seldom and I have explained why. I firmly believe, for those are my convictions and my principles, that there are only the most urgent reasons—and they are very few and far between—that can justify be it even a discussion on a possible abortion.

I don't like the words "or", "if", "perhaps or likely". I would like to feel myself on firmer ground. That is why I favour the amendment in order to remove the words "or health".

In so doing, we would prevent innumerable abuses and protect medical practitioners. That is very important, because if a committee of doctors decides to prescribe a therapeutic abortion and a patient makes up her mind to institute proceedings against the doctors, because she suddenly felt remorse, or for any other reason, she will damage the reputation of the gynaecologists, of the specialists of this hospital, of the therapeutic Committee or even the reputation of the hospital itself.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members want to participate in the debate, I invite specially my friends,—I have several among the Liberal members,—in order to see if any Liberal members in this house know exactly the importance and the seriousness of the bill under consideration. That would make me very happy.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of deleting in clause 18 of Bill C-150, the words "or health".

**Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane):** Mr. Speaker, I should like first of all to point out on the occasion of that nth amendment introduced by my colleague from the Ralliement créditiste that our parliamentary institutions, through the Créditiste's fault, is becoming a laughing-stock.

Mr. Speaker, when I see people who, for the sake of their conscience, their moral principles, their scruples, in the name of democracy, have been paralysing the business of this house for 19 days—

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gauthier:** I believe that the hon. member is not speaking to the amendment.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I think it is only fair to the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) that the Chair at least hear his opening remarks. As I have explained to other hon. members of the house, the Chair has tried to be as generous as possible in applying the rules of relevancy, sometimes possibly too generous in the case of some hon. members.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I would say that we have been particularly generous in terms of the Ralliement Creditiste. I think it is only fair that we hear the hon. member for

Matane for a while and I hope that eventually, or may I say very quickly, he will get to the amendment itself.

**Mr. De Bané:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. De Bané:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was saying that for 19 days now, the Ralliement créditiste has brought the work of this house to a standstill with innumerable amendments, including this one, in order to paralyze this democratic institution.

You will undoubtedly recall that this bill, which is brought again without too many changes before the house today, has already undergone the test of an election. The Ralliement créditiste then concentrated all its forces and the people backed up the government.

**Mr. Beaudoin:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Beaudoin:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the hon. member that those amendments have been accepted by the Speaker before they were discussed. Therefore they were in order.

**Mr. De Bané:** Mr. Speaker, the Ralliement créditiste is entitled to its opinion and I respect it, but what I do not accept is that a minority try to impose their opinion to a majority, and to a majority of people from the Province of Quebec.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. De Bané:** In the same way, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Gauthier:** What have you done since you have been in office?

**Mr. De Bané:** —Clam up and let me finish!

In the same way, Mr. Speaker, that I respect their opinion and that they are entitled to it as well as to their conscience and morals, I say, however, that a minority has no right to impose its way of thinking to the majority.

Mr. Speaker, all kinds of bugaboos are thrown at us, when it should be realized that the proposed amendment to delete the term "health" is a ridiculous argument, because the term is found in all laws on abortion, in all Western countries, and mostly in Latin America where 99 per cent of the population is Catholic.

I would go even further, Mr. Speaker. The newspaper *Le Droit* which is owned by the Oblate Fathers, has said that it was shameful to see people—

**An hon. Member:** It was not an Oblate Father who said that.

**Mr. De Bané:** —use religion to serve political ends.

You no doubt recall that the Governor General in the Speech from the Throne at the beginning of the year said that Canadians no longer had any confidence in their parliament.

Mr. Speaker, it is through demonstrations of this kind that a group, in the name of democracy—which respects the views of all—tries to paralyse this democratic institution. Mr. Speaker, it is through such manoeuvres that we shall destroy our institution.

I wish to blame the government for not having forced upon us rule 16A as amended of the standing orders because of fossils and demagogues.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say once again that the members of the Ralliement créditiste are entitled to their opinions which I respect, but they cannot impose their views on the majority.

**An hon. Member:** Cut if off, then.

**Mr. De Bané:** This is precisely what I am saying. I regret that the government did not impose it. But what the members of the Ralliement créditiste are trying to do is to paralyze the government and then they will tour the province of Quebec and arouse the passions by what I would term disgusting means in order to get re-elected. Those are the methods they resort to.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I wonder if the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is rising for the same purpose as I am.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Very likely, Mr. Speaker. I am wondering what the remarks of the hon. member have to do with the amendment before the house.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** That is exactly the reason I was rising myself. I do remind the hon. member for Matane that during the past few days the Chair has tried as faithfully as

possible, yet as fairly as possible, to administer the rules of relevancy. They, of course, apply to both sides of the house and I would invite him at this stage to restrict his remarks to the amendment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. De Bané:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The point I wanted to make was of course that, since it would be ridiculous and untimely to take part in the discussion on every amendment, I wished to express my views on the whole of them, and, in particular, at the end of my remarks, if I am permitted, I wish to comment on this specific health issue.

I was trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that, for one of the few times in the history of our country, we are studying a bill which went through the test of an election and which, because of the Ralliement créditiste in particular, has become a controversial issue in the province of Quebec.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Abortion was the main topic in my constituency during the whole election campaign. It was the same thing elsewhere.

Some people voted for the Créditistes, others voted for the Conservatives, some voted for N.D.P., and the majority voted for. the government.

[*English*]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, you and I seem to be rising together a few times. I wonder if the hon. member should not be asked to relate his remarks to the amendment before the house.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I would point out to the hon. member that the rules of relevancy restrict debate at this point to the specific amendment which is before the house which deals with the deletion from clause 18 of the words "or health". At this point, speeches must be confined to this specific amendment. I would suggest to the hon. member that possibly some of the remarks he is anxious to make now—I do not want to interfere with his right to make these remarks—might be made on third reading. If the Chair is to apply the rules of relevancy, they have to be applied to each hon. member. I think it is in the interest of our procedure that we should restrict our remarks as much as possible to the amendment.

**Mr. De Bané:** I would respectfully submit, Mr. Speaker, that in my remarks I might deal not only with the amendment but with the speeches which have been made by members of the Ralliement Créditiste on that amendment. They have supported the amendment with arguments which I would like to rebut, if that is in order.

[*Translation*]

What I mean, Mr. Speaker, is this: I am of course unable to speak on each of the 38 amendments. We are now dealing with health, on which I spoke specifically earlier in the day—and I say this for the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who was not in the house when the hon. members of the Ralliement créditiste spoke and who did not hear the arguments they used to justify their own amendment. I would like, at this point, to speak on this sensitive matter.

As I was saying, our debates here have become irrelevant, because, as the Speech from the Throne indicated at the beginning of the year, the people have nearly lost confidence in an institution paralyzed by a minority. A minority is tyrannizing us.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Hold a referendum, then.

**Mr. De Bané:** With regard to the referendum, that is precisely what you had in the province of Quebec at the time of the last elections. What did you talk about if not of homosexuality and abortion?

With regard to health, Mr. Speaker, let us put things back in their right perspective. To do so, with regard to abortions for reasons of health, those who would speak in the name of their conscience should be reminded that never in the history of Canada has a doctor ever been prosecuted for having performed a therapeutic abortion. If the members of the Ralliement créditiste had been well informed before turning to demagoguery, they would have known that if a topic is that important, it is high time it should be regulated. Go around the hospitals in the province of Quebec and you will see that therapeutic abortions are performed there. But no, you are not interested in that; what you want is demagoguery, you want to paralyze a democratic institution.

I say, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to those who do not have the time to study comparative law and to see what goes on in the Western world, that we are one of the last countries in that world to adopt an act on abortion. Contrary to the recommendations made to Parliament by the Canadian Medical and Bar Association to the effect that the government

should accept therapeutic abortions for various reasons, we have one of the most strict acts of all.

But once again, that is not the point I want to make. I am not interested in those people who would deliberately paralyze a democratic institution and then go beg for votes in the province of Quebec, through false representations and demagoguery.

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** I am most pleased to contribute in a positive way to the discussion on this amendment, moved by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue), amendment to delete from the bill the words: "or health".

I would like to ask the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) not to run away, to stick to his seat. It is the first time we see him since the beginning of this session. I should like him to have at least the courage of his convictions, and to remain here.

Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. De Bané:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. De Bané:** On a point of order—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** —when the hon. member for Beauce—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** —moves his amendment—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Would the hon. member resume his seat? That is not a point of order. I would make the observation again to hon. members that points of order and questions of privilege are important parts of our procedure. If hon. members use them in an exchange with each other, that only serves to diminish their importance. I would caution against this kind of exchange which has occurred before. If the hon. member has a point of order and would cite the relevant Standing Order which pertains to his point of order, I would be pleased to hear it.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ouellet:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I think that in the course of his remarks the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), who was often interrupted, was telling a few home truths to the members of the Ralliement créditiste, and—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ouellet:** Such truths were not taken into account—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the hon. member rising on a point of order or a question of privilege?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ouellet:** I rise on a point of order.

The members of the Ralliement créditiste have constantly interrupted the hon. member for Matane while he was making his speech, which shows a lack of decorum at this stage of the debate, and I would have this to tell them: For about fifteen days, I have seen them in the house wearing a white beret, and I think this shows a total lack of decorum. Let them take off their white berets.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, after these remarks,—

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Stupid—

**Mr. Fortin:** After these remarks—which the member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) rightly said were stupid, to respect the decorum of the same member—I would like to come back to the proposed amendment.

I appreciated the remark of the hon. member for Matane when he told us that the Ralliement créditiste is wasting the time of the house, that the Ralliement créditiste is boycotting or filibustering the debates. I will tell him that when he makes such statements, he is entirely wrong. What we have been doing, for over fifteen days, or nearly nineteen days,—time is not important in this house, what counts, Mr. Speaker, is the legislation we pass and not the stupid speeches that can be made by the hon. member for Matane.

It will take all the time required, but when we are through, the Canadian people will recognize that the Ralliement créditiste has the courage of its convictions, that it is faithful to its constituents, and that it has made its best sincerely and honestly—and not paid to

be here doing nothing, like the member for Laurier (Mr. Leblanc)—to improve the legislation so that it may meet the needs of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, I think this was the first speech made by that member since he came to the house, and he had to launch his political career with such an irrelevant speech.

Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate your leniency. The hon. member for Beauce moved an amendment to delete the expression "or health", an expression which can also be found in the bill, in the clause concerning abortion, a clause which was recommended by the very member for Matane, who used to be the secretary to the Prime Minister when he was Minister of Justice.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Let him stand up and tell us what his motives were. He does not have the courage of his beliefs, all he can do is rail against the others.

**Mr. De Bané:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, if it is to raise a point of order as foolish as the others, I have a right to my 20 minutes and I intend to use them.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. De Bané:** Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague has asked me to get up and answer a statement he just made—

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, he is wasting my time. I have much more serious things to say.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member can only rise on a point of order, not on the invitation of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin). Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

**Mr. De Bané:** It was on his invitation.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I point out to the hon. member that simply because the hon. member for Lotbinière invites him to make remarks, that does not give him the right to make those remarks.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How can the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), know the standing orders when he has never read them and is never here.

So the hon. member for Beauce—I will be able to make my speech if they stop interrupting—proposes to delete the words "or health" from the clause on abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I shall start all over again and I hope that will not be counted on my time. So the hon. member for Beauce wants to delete the words "or health". The bill before us says:

—would or would be likely to endanger her life or health—

We should then ask ourselves sincerely, and not with preconceived and narrow-minded ideas, as some hon. members opposite can show, but ask ourselves sincerely and seriously—if the hon. member for Matane could remain in his seat, Mr. Speaker, we might have a chance to complete his education—if the fact of being pregnant for a woman can endanger her health.

As for the first part, "would endanger her life", I am inclined to believe that in certain border-line cases, this can happen. This is why, when I made my first speech in this house on the omnibus bill—that was some time ago, and the members opposite still have not understood anything—I stated that I would perhaps be in favour of a therapeutic operation to terminate a pregnancy in certain border-line cases, provided it was a proven fact that the woman's life was seriously and directly in danger.

Now, in the same bill, even if I wanted to vote in favour of abortion in the case where the life of the mother would be in danger and support those provisions, I cannot do so for the very simple reason that, at the same time, the expression "would endanger her health" would be included.

What is meant by "health" and "would endanger her health"? The other day, the Minister of Justice gave his own definition of the word "health". He said: We do not know the exact meaning of "health". Besides, the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) made that point very clear.

They cannot give a definition. That is why the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Cantin) could not say more than a sentence in reply to the suggestion, because he does not know either what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, before adopting or rejecting the amendment, I think we must ask the following question—before I go any further I would ask the whip of the Liberal party to count his members, because there are less and less Liberals in the house.

**Mr. Boulanger:** Stop those platitudes!

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, the member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) wastes his time saying that we utter platitudes! Let him stop being so dull and still in his seat. Let him rise and speak! That would be interesting.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, in view of the many questions that we can rightly ask ourselves concerning the liberalization of homosexuality—when I see Liberal members, the word "homosexuality" comes to my mind, Mr. Speaker—but I mean the liberalization of abortion, in view of the number of questions we are entitled to ask ourselves as to the definition of the word "health", if we take into account all the evidence we can find in libraries, the briefs which were submitted by the Medical Association, etc., and the consultations we had in our respective committees, and this, Mr. Speaker, throughout Quebec and Canada, one realizes that it is not a minority which is imposing its views to the majority. I would rather say it is a majority government which wants to impose its views to a majority of Canadians which are against the bill. Let us not reverse the roles, Mr. Speaker, let us be honest and recognize facts.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Fortin:** In support of what I say I will add this: a brief from the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards contains a few interesting things regarding the bill on abortion. I would like the attention of the hon. members on the other side of the house, should they still be courageous enough to listen to us. I hope they are because up to now they have been rather narrow minded. At page 11, under the title: Medical data regarding the "health of the mother in abortion cases", I quote:

> The so-called therapeutic abortion is an abortion which is performed in order either to save the life of the mother, or to safeguard her health. Various laws use shades of meaning such as:
>
> danger to life
> danger to health
> grave danger to health
> danger to physical and mental health
> certainty of foetal malformation
> probability of foetal malformation, etc.

Before pursuing that most interesting and important quotation, I should like to tell this house which problems may crop up if we allow the words "or health" to remain in the bill.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, many problems can arise; they are not imaginary or minor points but major ones. If we intend to fight and induce hon. members to examine the matter thoroughly, it is precisely because we believe that the words "or health" bring about problems, and not because we would promote political interests. We have no electoral fund and, on our side we do not land in helicopters to kiss girls.

> First of all, let us say that cases where abortion is the only way to save the life of a pregnant woman have become exceedingly rare—

I repeat that point, Mr. Speaker, because it is extremely important.

> First, let us say that cases where abortion is the only way to save the life of a pregnant woman have become exceedingly rare, not to say inexistant, because of the therapeutic means available.

I am not quoting the newspaper *Le Droit*, nor the Liberal or the Progressive Conservative parties, nor the Ralliement créditiste, Mr. Speaker, but the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards. And I continue the quotation:

> On the other hand, some people give a broader interpretation to the words "danger to life" and take into account the cases where it can be presumed that continuance of pregnancy might shorten the patient's life.
>
> As concerns danger to health—

And this is where it becomes most interesting. As members of parliament, Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that we hasten to study thoroughly the meaning of these words. I quote:

> As for the danger to health, it presents a whole problem of interpretation, if we refer to the definition of health given by the World Health Organization: State of physical and mental well-being.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I should like to have your co-operation in order to silence the hon. member for Mercier or to ask him to make a speech also. Only, I am tired of being interrupted unnecessarily and stupidly.

**Mr. Boulanger:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Mercier is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Boulanger:** Mr. Speaker, it was precisely one of his colleagues who was speaking to me. I would ask you to turn on the lights for him also.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I would ask the co-operation of all hon. members so that we may go on with this debate in an orderly fashion.

**Mr. Fortin:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like the hon. member for Mercier to read the Standing Orders and to be more often in the house. Perhaps he would then be able to understand them and above all to value them.

The legal definition of health—and this is acknowledged by specialists—given in the Criminal Code is extremely vague.

And this is why they go on to say:

In many concrete cases, it is quite difficult for doctors, confronted with the various shades of meaning listed above—

—to take a stand.

Those are not my words, Mr. Speaker, but those of physicians.

We do not ask for anything as members of the Ralliement Créditiste, but rather as legislators taking a positive part in this discussion. We must specify or, if we cannot do so, let take those words off the act, as you will agree that when we leave in the Criminal Code expressions which are impossible to define, this opens the door to every pretense and every possibility.

That was experienced by other countries because of the interpretation that was given to legislations purported to be restrictive. For instance, the phrase "in danger of death" includes cases where—

And we could go on, but I do not want to carry on quoting what anybody can refer to.

But we should have enough courage, goodwill and sincerity to look into the matter and reflect upon it.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Beauce is a real contribution to this debate compared to that of many members opposite.

We are entitled to ask questions. This is a strong argument—and I was struck by the point—when listening to the speeches delivered by my hon. colleagues of the Ralliement créditiste who are also doing a tremendous job.

Mr. Speaker, when one says: Delete the word "health", the consequences are extremely serious. In fact, should a woman appeal to the therapeutic abortion committee, if the bill were adopted, the doctor and the patient would have to choose between the life of the woman and the life of the foetus or between the health of the woman and the life of the foetus. Whatever the case, in a request for an abortion, more lenient, since that evidence that is threatened. The foetus is an innocent being and unable to defend itself. The mother can, if she argues that her health is endangered. She weighs the pros and cons and she places her health in the balance, something that cannot be defined. The minister of Justice himself is unable to define it.

She then on the other hand weighs her health against the life of the foetus.

Mr. Speaker, I said it at the start that personally, I would not be against therapeutic abortion, by a committee of specialists, in a recognized hospital, when the life of the mother is threatened and when there must be a choice between the life of the mother and the life of the foetus.

It will be agreed, in all honesty, Mr. Speaker, that these are border-line cases and that, consequently, in order to legislate on those border-line cases, it is not possible to propose clauses 14 etc., concerning abortion and so open the door wide to all kinds of pretexts, and accept as valid reasons every alleged disease, because this results in jeopardizing the health of the mother. Let the therapeutic committee decide whether her health is really endangered, since it is not even possible to define what is health.

On the other hand, when the foetus is killed, Mr. Speaker, everybody admits that it is a case of homicide, it is a crime, since a human being is killed.

Therefore, I think that all the talk about the just society, is sincere. One cannot compare the life of the mother—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I suppose I have still three minutes left, because of the number of interventions and of points of order which were not valid.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member knows that he must get the unanimous consent of the house since his time is up.

Does the house give its consent.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** There is no unanimous consent.

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I am told that I am about to make the same speech. I speak about my hon. friend for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch). I wish he could do the same thing. He has been here a long time, and when he defends his bills he can do it very well.

So, as far as this bill is concerned, I am against it. I am defending an amendment and I think I have the right to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) who earlier made to this debate a contribution he thinks important. I, for one, do not feel that he should be proud of it. He gave us new arguments, should we run short.

But when the hon. member for Matane has acquired a little more experience, first, he will know that he can speak only to the Speaker and he will know also that he cannot speak from anywhere but from his seat. Any member has to know that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I want to remind the hon. member that the Chair exists specially to call hon. members to order.

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue) introduced an amendment to the effect that the words:

"or health"

be deleted from clause 18 of Bill C-150.

I support this amendment, Mr. Speaker, because I sincerely believe that if these words are left in the bill, they would open the door to many abuses and give rise to fantastic interpretations and to complications which we might regret some day, and perhaps soon, after this bill is passed.

I objected yesterday to an amendment of that kind, but I objected because yesterday's amendment did not go far enough, while the one before us now would completely delete the words "or health" so as to make the bill very clear.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, I accept the idea that whenever the mother's life is endangered, the medical practitioner, who must procure the abortion, or the doctor who has attended that woman during her pregnancy, could perform an abortion.

• (5:00 p.m.)

People speak at length on such a broad subject, on health, a word that is by no means defined in the law. It is liable to the most fanciful interpretations, as indeed has been the case up to now, since in the evidence given, in favour as well as against Bill C-150—or Bill C-195 previously introduced—or also as regards certain bills submitted by the members in order to make the law on abortion, more lenient, since that evidence has shown that doctors, lawyers or social workers allowed themselves the most fanciful interpretations of the word "health".

Besides, we know that wherever abortion is performed on request, some women will seize upon any excuse to justify abortion.

Mr. Speaker, one could ask certain questions. Why are some women sickly? Why should or would certain women tend to ask termination of their pregnancy for reasons of health?

Let us put the question frankly, sincerely: In what situation do too many of our Canadian homes find themselves at the present time?

Let us just look at the results of surveys made by our unions who follow closely the situation of our workers. A fantastic number of people, for a country as rich as Canada is supposed to be, have to content themselves with living in an unbearable situation, in the type of situation found in the so-called underdeveloped countries.

For instance, let us look at the housing problem. How many housing units are clearly inadequate, for Canada, to house families properly, to house the families we are entitled to have?

Our housing system or economy clearly does not meet the needs of Canadian families. First of all, there is a housing shortage. That is a fact. A lot of housing units are no better than slums and while some of them might be considered as decent, comfortable houses, they only have one or two bedrooms, and seldom three. Under those circumstances, how can children develop properly in houses that are much too small?

When a family finds itself in such a situation, they ask themselves: Should we have more children?

Mr. Speaker, economists and social workers have looked into the matter. Problems have been found to exist but adequate solutions have seldom been proposed.

There is another point which is very important and must not be overlooked. Since the family income is too often inadequate, the young wife must work.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The remarks of the hon. member are very interesting, but I cannot see how they are related to the amendment moved by his colleague for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) to delete in clause 18, line 5, page 43, the words "or health".

Soon the housing bill will be dealt with in this house and it will then be proper to discuss housing in Canada.

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I think I am not out of order, because I am seeking the reasons which would prompt women to request an abortion for reasons of health. Those are the reasons I am trying to set forth in order to make my point.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Laprise:** If the income is inadequate, then the woman worries all the time. She will not be able to feed her children properly, and give them a decent home.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I see no relation between the mother's health and the arguments put forward by the hon. member.

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, I accept your remarks, but the amendment makes it quite clear, as you said yourself a while ago that it is meant to delete from clause 18 of Bill C-150 the words "or health", to avoid ambiguity in this legislation.

So I think that we have the right to express or explain our interpretation of health. If not, the debate on the bill is as good as over. These are grounds that may lead a woman to ask for the termination of a pregnancy, on grounds of health.

Another excuse can be put forward: the danger of mental deficiency. Yesterday, in another debate, I stated the opinion expressed by Dr. Marcel Boisvert in that respect. I am not going to quote him all over again. It is all in yesterday's *Hansard*.

But, I have in hand another interpretation from another doctor just as prominent, who can very well understand women's behaviour in such a situation, since this doctor is a women, Dr. Suzanne Carreau. She states and I quote:

—if we refer to the most recent biological data, all the characteristics of life are found in an embryo of less than four months, the period during which abortion is usually carried out.

The abortive methods then applied are, in general, curetting or injections designed to bring on the miscarriage.

[Mr. Laprise.]

But I think that the fact that abortion is ten times more dangerous than childbirth is not emphasized enough.

There, Mr. Speaker, is the evidence of a woman doctor on the matter. If we make it easy for any woman to get an abortion for health reasons, Dr. Suzanne Carreau warns of the risk involved when she says, and I quote:

—abortion is ten times more dangerous than childbirth. Moreover, since health is a state of physical and mental well-being, it leaves a very large margin of interpretation. For a doctor, it is sometimes difficult to make a very clear diagnosis as to the state of health of the patient faced with another pregnancy.

That is the question, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes we hear doctors tell a woman that her health will be endangered if she pregnants again. But in that case, every time, and I believe rightly so, the doctor gives the necessary advice to prevent another pregnancy. It is right at that time that the question should arise.

Those are the reasons why I support the amendment of my colleague, the hon. member for Beauce, in order to prevent any misunderstanding and so that the legislation on abortion will not be jeopardized, but given all the required scope, as I hope we are willing to do. That is why I said a while ago and am repeating now that, personally, I accept that a pregnancy be interrupted if the life of the mother is in danger, because it is a potential life at that moment. We must also respect that one.

For those reasons I accept the amendment on the question of life, but I object to the inclusion of the health clause, because I believe in the conscions developments of medical science, and I feel there are other ways of improving the health of a woman apart from taking a life or terminating a pregnancy.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I believe it is easier to provide medical care than to perform surgery and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment of my colleague the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue).

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to speak, but after listening to the nasty remarks, the wrong interpretation given by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), I feel it my duty to bring out some facts. We, in the Ralliement créditiste, are the champions of the truth and of christianity—and we have been

so since we came into the house, because we are not backed by an election fund. We therefore want to speak up in this parliament for those who are afraid to do so.

The hon. member for Matane has been interfering in several occasions during your absence, Mr. Speaker, and he tried to ridicule the Ralliement créditiste which represents the voice of truth.

I shall say it over and over again. We would have passed the omnibus bill in three days, if the government, that is to say the Prime Minister, through the dictatorship he is exerting on his ministers and on the government members, had accepted to delete the provisions of the bill regarding abortion and homosexuality. For this reason, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I believe the hon. member will agree that since he took the floor, he has been completely out of order, since he has not dealt with the amendment under consideration, and I should like to remind him that the Chair has been informed that the hon. member for Matane had also been called to order.

**Mr. Dumont:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe it was only normal that in my opening statement, I should explain why I would have spoken of the word "health" in the bill before us.

Then, we have here an amendment moved by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue) which reads as follows:

That Bill C-150—

We find the quotation somewhat long, whenever we have to refer to it, and some people have even called that legislation the "autobus". The amendment ends as follows:

—be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or health" on line 5 on page 43.

We have to admit that the word "health" has been interpreted by many people in many ways. Few problems compare with "health", for, in that case, the lives or deaths of thousands of human beings are at stake. Few problems are more important since, on that question, Parliament will be called upon to reject or to maintain ways of thinking on which our legislation and our social values have been based so far.

Has the problem been really thought out? Whenever an important and complex question confronts our nation, we spare nothing, indeed, whether in money or personnel, to achieve a complete study and reach proper decisions.

It is a serious problem to define the word "health"; has it been studied with all due care? What funds were devoted to such a study? What experts were hired and what subjects were they experts in? What amount of time would have been devoted to debate on that point, if the Ralliement créditiste had kept its peace? What amounts of money have been spent to inform the people properly?

In accordance with his own representations, why did not the hon. member for Matane visit his constituency, tour Canada all over to explain the meaning of the word "health", so that the people, by means of a referendum, as requested by us, might decide on the amendments we have moved and on the one just introduced by the hon. member for Beauce. We might then have a chance to get to the truth once and for all, for, at the present time, we receive too many protests from everywhere and we would not want to witness in Canada a re-enactment of the century-old Riel affair.

People have said, and the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) has repeated some time ago, that the French Canadians had adequately represented the province of Quebec in Ottawa. For once there are free members who can rise and speak according to their conscience. This is the favour that we are asking, to be in a position to resort to every authorized democratic procedure, because on the government side, we know that closure has been imposed by one of the most intransigent prime minister we have ever known in the last 100 years and who was called Macdonald.

Therefore, coming back to the clause on "health", I will say that no solution is proposed to the problems of illegal abortions, the causes of which are not well known unless the word "health" could be given a rather broad interpretation to include the grounds put forward by women who want to be aborted.

Would it not be better for the common good if before enforcing a legislation which would endanger human life, our leaders would devote five to ten years to study thoroughly the problem and to find out if such a legislation is necessary?

In some cases, we need ten years to realize what is being asked, but why when Christian life is jeopardized in Canada, would we not accept to discuss the word "health" in order to find a good definition of it so that the legislators will be recognized as responsible

people. Tomorrow, the lawyers will have to interpret the laws which we will have passed. And as mentioned by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), there will always be some falsifiers to misinterpret the law, enabling unscrupulous people to be heard and backed up.

Is it not the responsibility of the state to sanction the respect of life?

Because life is the first human right and that our fundamental social values are based on respect for it, I would think it is the duty of Parliament to protect any life and to make this known in its laws, and to give the term "health" a definite, precise and clear meaning.

If, by allowing abortion, we ruin the health of people as a matter of fact, with a confusing law, how could the entire population fail to find as anything but irresponsible.

Some physicians may question the value of life, but value judgments are not medical decisions, and physicians are no more competent than others to pass them.

In medical terms, they know the problem and the situation. That is why, at present, too much responsibility is given to physicians who want the automatic rejection of the bill or, at least, mitigating action through which amendments would clearly define the law.

There could be special cases when the mother could die unless an abortion were performed. It would then be impossible to save the child, since the mother's death would kill them both.

But every time the child can be saved, he is entitled to our protection because, tomorrow, under the protection of our laws, which will be sensible laws we hope, this healthy child will keep the democratic institution of parliament going—if there still is a parliament; indeed the present dictatorship makes one wonder if tomorrow our country will not have turned socialist.

This eliminates abortion for any other reason than for the purpose of saving the mother's life. For instance, abortion is ruled out as a means to increase the mother's life expectancy. To justify an abortion by putting forward such a reason is to deny that all human lives are of equal value, because it is to take for granted that the few years added to the mother's life are more important than the whole life of the child.

[Mr. Dumont.]

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words to add, but I should like, as a last recommendation, to ask once again the 264 members of the house to listen to the voice of truth calling for a referendum in Canada and for the immediate rejection of all these abortion and homosexuality measures. I urge that all our amendments concerning the word "health" or any other terms be taken into serious consideration.

Members of the *Comité d'action Hull-Gatineau*—some are very familiar with this organization which is against abortion—are asking and I support them:

1. That a serious study be undertaken on the abortion problem before the legislation is amended;

—by considering, for instance, amendments such as the one tending to delete from the text of the legislation the word "health".

2. That positive and immediate steps be taken to reduce the social pressures which drive women to seek an abortion and that enough time be devoted to the review of the findings arrived at before condemning a life;

We are convinced that this amendment aimed at deleting the word "health", would give an automatic opportunity of studying more seriously the recommendations we have brought forward:

3. That all necessary services be set up for the purpose of educating the people in the fields of family life, sexuality and birth control before replacing by the so-called "remedial" measures the preventive methods not yet existing;

4. That, in the meantime, the respect Canadians have towards life be reaffirmed by Parliament by clarifying the wording of the law and by refraining from extending the grounds for legal abortions;

—which could ipso facto jeopardize completely the health of a person, but if the word "health" were allowed to be deleted, we could then, ponder seriously over the amendments we are proposing and which have been quite serious from the beginning.

We are not the ones who have wasted the members' time. If the two amendments I referred to earlier had been scratched, those dealing with abortion and homosexuality, the bill known as the "autobus" bill would have been carried, because, three days ago, we were willing to accept the other amendments. But, in our minds, we can never accept abortion, let alone homosexuality.

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, we have had the opportunity, in the course of th eafternoon, of hearing numerous arguments having regard to health. That proves, I

think, that the problem of health may be considered from many angles.

To say that we are simply repeating ourselves may not be entirely accurate, since what we are discussing now, that is health, is such a vague word that it may include many different things. And, judging by the exclamations heard from government members, we have seen that the health of the members themselves could be affected.

We have reached one of the most important aspects of clause 18 of the omnibus bill, for the simple reason that the matter gives rise to a flow of protests. And it is precisely because of this word "health" that the protests have arisen and continue to rise from all sides.

That is understandable, since everybody is almost ready to accept therapeutic abortion, that is an abortion that is necessary because, in the opinion of the physician in charge of the case, there is no other way to save the life of a pregnant mother. We do not object to that, to that kind of abortion where it is a choice between the life of the mother and the life of the foetus. Surely no one, even among members of the Ralliement créditiste, is opposed to that. That is what is being done now when a therapeutic abortion is authorized. In such cases, the abortion is self-defence, I repeat self-defence for the mother, the woman in question.

It is her life or that of the foetus; in those cases, therapeutic abortion is acceptable, but not without reservations, since even in such a case, we must admit that the role of a conscientious doctor is to try to save both lives, if possible.

Even with regard to the mother's life, there are some reservations, some doubts, and it is not every day that a case occurs where the mother's life is weighed against that of the child. Such cases do not occur every day. That was emphasized yesterday, and I will not dwell on that.

But, when we come upon the second expression to be found in the bill, when it is no longer just a question of life, but the question of "health" is added, especially when one reads "likely to endanger her health", that is the substance of the whole discussion about abortion. It is the main element, the reason why so many public as well as private organizations have protested. They have realized that the only free spokesmen in this house are the Créditistes, and it may be that they have entrusted us more specifically with their submissions because they knew that we had the greater freedom of action.

Mr. Speaker, we are now playing a role as essential as that which some are trying to suppress, the role of doing away with the normal transmission of life. Some will say I am exaggerating. This goes entirely beyond the purpose of the legislator.

• (5:30 p.m.)

We do not have to discuss the purpose of the legislator, because we are known for having both feet solidly on the ground and not to get lost into the clouds. Consequently, we know very well that the intentions of the legislator, as noble, as logical and as admissible as they may be, are nevertheless something else in practice.

That is why we are fighting. On some points we might be inclined to say: In theory, this is true, it is not funny to be sick, to lose one's health because of a pregnancy and all that.

We are often charged of playing morality and sentimentalism. This is sentimentalism. That is where sentimentalism is.

When one wants to permit abortion under the pretense that the health is affected, that the pregnant woman will miss a series of social events, and that she wants to get rid of the product of conception, of course she will get sick.

It took only a few days of discussion to make the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) really sick.

This essential point raised in this amendment deserves that we look at it most seriously and perhaps,—I said perhaps,—if the words "or the health" were deleted and if the clause was limited to life, that the present discussion would end and that we would be most happy to deal with something else.

Amongst the organization which got in touch with us, there are excellent ones which will be called upon to apply the act we are now discussing.

Those organizations are the hospital associations to which will be entrusted the duty of applying the act on abortion. Now those organizations are doubtful, to say the least, that clause 18 is justifiable. They have doubts to the extent where if we refer to the amendments to the Criminal Code proposed last year, when Bill C-195 was studied, and to the 880 pages of *Proceedings and Evidence* of the standing committee on health, welfare and social affairs, we see that the various interpretations of the word "health" given by the witnesses uphold one position as well as the other.

Mr. Speaker, when the committee on health, welfare and social affairs sat in 1967, many doctors, many specialists, could have discussed at least as long as we have on the definition of the word "health".

We must realize that if numerous doctors, who know what they speak of, and numerous specialists do not agree on the meaning that should be given to the word "health", especially with regard to abortion, how are intentions ever to be justified, even the best of them?

There is only one possible solution, the only one on which we should have dwelt: to amend the Criminal Code in such a way that the doctor who, because of his diagnosis, must treat his patient in such a way that it finally leads to abortion cannot be prosecuted under the law.

If ever, following the treatment which he gives the patient who is really ill, he decides to perform an abortion, it is because the doctors or the hospital wanted it that way.

That is why when we see the extremely broad meaning that they want to give—I will be told that it is not, in fact, broad, that it has indeed a lot of good sense, life and health—we know, of course, that there are millions of people who are ready to broaden the meaning of the little word, and who are ready to extend it in such a way that inevitably, as all those who lived through the same experience—I mean here all the countries that had the same experience—and that we will automatically reach abortion on request.

That is what some people foresee and that is why we are asked to be far more precise in regulating abortion. We are requesting for tighter regulations. We are requesting in fact, that the doctor, the surgeon, the gynaecologist have no responsibility which they could not assume. And even the psychiatrist does not want to be compelled by all kinds of pressures coming from the patient herself, from her parents, from her family, from her neighbours and friends. The psychiatrist does not want to be confronted with this frightful problem in which he will find a patient who, in the beginning, is not at all ill, but who wears herself out slowly and surely to reach at last a real state of illness.

They do not want to have this problem on their shoulders, simply because the law is too broad, simply because the word "health" has not been defined. And I understand them, because it is very easy to understand.

And the time must come for every member in this house to understand the meaning of



such findings, which are not merely those of the Ralliement créditiste as some are led to believe, because we are the ones who defend life, because that is a part of our concern about the freedom of the individual and because we do not want to impair our country's development through inadequate laws that I would go as far as to call terrible.

If we look at the series of definitions given by doctors, agencies, hospitals, we realize that the interpretation of the word "health" becomes a major problem.

And strange as it seems, hon. members do not realize that, if a group of experts cannot agree on such a meaning, we, even if we are from Matane, are not any wiser than all those people put together and cannot claim the right to decide, in a field as vital and essential as the right to live, that the foetus itself cannot defend.

And when we talk about "health", it should not necessarily have to do with illness. One may talk about good health and one may talk about health in jeopardy.

The word "health" may mean many things, and it may mean among others, to be in good health.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Motherhood, pregnancy is precisely the state, in the highest sense of the word, where we see a woman blossom, where we see a woman really in full possession of all her potentialities. It is perhaps the only occasion that a woman has to reach her maximum of fulfillment.

Mr. Speaker, I am most happy that my wife is now pregnant. I already have three children—it will then be my fourth one—and I assure you that it is an extraordinary pleasure for me to see my wife blossoming because she is pregnant.

I would like to stress the positive side. Health, it is precisely that which is health, because it is natural, and many old women and young ladies have difficulties, precisely because they have not had a taste of motherhood. They lack something to enjoy life fully.

Thus, why say that an instinctive thing, that a natural phenomenon, a really true phenomenon owing to which we are all here, is something which is connected with illness? Here we make a serious mistake. It is unfortunate that we should not insist more on the "good health" aspect of the thing and that we should linger on some very particular exceptions in which "health" could be affected

owing to pregnancy. That would be extremely strange, and I would say it does not exist.

As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) was pointing out earlier that he could see cases in which a woman who did not enjoy good health could recover owing to her pregnancy.

That is why I am in complete agreement, for instance, with the "Serena" teams who talk about love and fecundity, and who, as regards abortion, said as was reported in the newspaper *La Presse* of yesterday:

The "Serena" teams believe that abortion was not considered with the attention such a serious question deserves. The members of the congress, convinced that abortion is a direct aggression against the developing life of a human being, beg the government to withdraw from the Omnibus Bill clause 18, dealing with abortion and to refer that subject to a Royal commission of enquiry.

The leader of the Ralliement créditiste, the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), also asks for a referendum and we give him of course our full support.

The Serena teams point out that over 50,000 signatures of protest were sent.

In order to prevent abortions, the members suggest as positive measures:

Let us stop talking about disease, let us stop talking negatively. Let us stop trying to allow indiscriminately something intended for only a very small part of the population. And let us think positively.

Various medical services sponsored by the Quebec government intended for all expectant mothers so that they will find solutions to the problems caused by pregnancy.

We know that we can help—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Has the hon. member the consent of the house to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. There is no unanimous consent.

Is the house ready for the question?

All those in favour of this motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

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

Pursuant to standing order 75, paragraph (11) and a special order of the house agreed to last Tuesday, May 6, the recorded vote on the proposed motion is deferred until the report stage of this bill is resumed tomorrow.

**Mr. Fortin (for Mr. Rodrigue)** moved motion No. 38:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "a majority" in lines 38 and 39 on page 42 and substituting therefor the words: "unanimous decision"—

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to amendment No. 38 moved by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue) and which essentially provides that when the therapeutic abortion committee will meet to decide and discuss the specific case of a patient, it will have to make a unanimous decision as to whether the abortion will be approved or if a certificate authorizing the abortion of a patient will be issued.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to support the amendment of the member for Beauce, in order to better safeguard the work of the various therapeutic committees in the hospitals where such committees will be established. In short, the amendment is easy to understand, the bill provides that a mere majority of physicians on the committee can decide if they will deliver a certificate stating that the continuation of the pregnancy would or would be likely to endanger the life or health of the pregnant woman.

Through our amendment, since the provisions of the bill are extremely indefinite, since we are unable to define the word "health" and extensive academic discussions are still going on among physicians as to whether a pregnancy can endanger life or health, since there is no unanimity in most cases, since some doubts remain not only in our minds but especially in the minds of experts, we suggest an amendment providing for the agreement of three doctors, since a life is at stake.

I think, and this is the principle of the amendment, that since a human life is the most fundamental value, the members of a therapeutic abortion committee of a hospital should agree, from a scientific viewpoint, and consent unanimously, regarding the issue of a certificate allowing or refusing abortion.

Therefore, from the physicians who are members of a therapeutic abortion committee,

we do not expect a majority vote, but rather, and still better, an unanimous decision so that there will be no possible mistakes. Human life will be protected and the rights of foetuses will be recognized.

• (5:50 p.m.)

On the other hand, supposing the members of the therapeutic abortion committee admit that pregnancy endangers the woman's life then, Mr. Speaker, it would not be difficult for them to agree unanimously.

But for cases when one or more of the three members doubt that the life or health of the mother is threatened on account of pregnancy, we must legislate in favour of the preservation of life, and avoid murders or homicides that might otherwise be encouraged by irresponsible legislation which did not receive thorough consideration.

We are seeking unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, for security purposes in every respect, and I should like, with your permission, to touch on those points.

The first important point we have to deal with, with respect to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Beauce, is the following.

Mr. Speaker, if the mother's life is really endangered because of her being pregnant, then it would be easy to obtain unanimous consent within the committee.

However, Mr. Speaker, all cases that are likely to come up will have to be considered and studied by the committee. The therapeutic abortion committee will have to consider each individual case. It will have to consider scientific data, documentary information, X-rays, etc. in order to determine whether the life of the woman is threatened by the pregnancy.

So, the therapeutic abortion committee would not base its decisions on all kinds of considerations not directly related to the life of that woman, but on scientific considerations, to determine whether or not the life of the woman is in danger.

The members of the committee will have to be in agreement. Each one has his personal experience. Each one has his own skill. Each one has acquired knowledge in those fields and is able to give an opinion in which confidence may be placed I think, in the majority of cases.

Mr. Speaker, if two of the members of the committee say: "We are in favour of issuing a certificate allowing the abortion of such and such a person" that is legitimate because her life is in danger. They have established that, through examination. If the other doctor does not agree—we have every right to suppose that he too is competent, that he too is respected and respectable from the point of view of professional ethics—he must therefore have personal reasons to oppose the abortion.

Now it will be very difficult for him to defend his case if the other two can give scientific proof of their stand, that the life of the mother is really in danger.

There might then be some discussion within the committee and probably, or rather certainly, the two doctors who agree will manage to convince the third, who disagrees, that obviously the life of the mother is in danger. That carries a lot of weight in the decision.

That is why we say that, in such a case, where the life of the mother is really in danger, unanimity will force the doctors to seek out scientific reasons, to seek out scientific proofs.

We do not request unquestionable evidence—nothing is certain in this world, particularly in the scientific world. Everything is developing and progressing, so that it will be more and more possible to determine and to establish if really the life of a woman is endangered because of her pregnancy. Therefore, it will be easy for the members of this committee to decide unanimously whether the mother's life is really in danger.

In another case—it was the second point I wanted to discuss—the woman can go to a doctor and ask for an abortion. She can put forward all sorts of reasons. She can refuse her husband because she disagrees with him, she wants to divorce, she does not want to be encumbered with another child, or because she does not want to stay attached to the house. Or if she is unmarried, she can refuse motherhood.

There might be an infinite variety of cases. Let us just take one case that every member could imagine: if a woman presents herself before a therapeutic abortion committee, and asks them to issue a certificate, then, the committee would have to establish whether scientifically, from the medical point of view, the life or the health of this woman are probably and certainly endangered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this committee will not be able to establish scientifically that the life of this woman is in danger, because, scientifically professionally these doctors will not be able to establish that in some of the cases

which I was enumerating a while ago that the physical health of the mother or her health, as the minister wants to define it, are endangered. The therapeutic abortion committee will still be responsible for a crime and will be answerable for it if they grant a certificate authorizing an abortion without scientific considerations.

And we can hope that, of those three physicians, at least one will be conscientious enough, will respect his professional ethics enough to say: Hon. members of the committee, we cannot deliver a certificate allowing the abortion of this patient, since neither from the scientific point of view nor from another point of view is the life of the patient or her health really in danger. We have no evidence of it.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in that case, this physician who is conscientious enough to do his duty according to his professional ethics, will protect not only the foetus but the woman as well, whose abortion could have been a danger and a misfortune rather than something good, because absolutely negative reasons or psychic disorders induced her to seek abortion.

And that doctor will have protected—and that is the joint I am interested in and which I want to emphasize—not only the foetus but also the patient, because her motives were negative.

The important point is that the therapeutic abortion committee of that hospital will also feel secure, will also be protected, for the simple reason that it could not be made responsible of a decision that was not in accordance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock and call an ambulance for the Liberal members?

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. It being six o'clock the house stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at two o'clock.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Thursday, May 8, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

## THE ROYAL ASSENT

**Mr. Speaker:** I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received which is as follows:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE
OTTAWA

8 May 1969

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Ronald Martland, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, acting as Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 8th day of May, at 5.30 p.m. for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Esmond Butler
Secretary to the Governor General.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Fourth report of Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs—Mr. Tolmie.

[*Note: Text of above report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

### THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ALLEGED UNPRECEDENTED INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING—MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the unprecedented and very serious increase of more than 1 per cent in the consumer price index, the cost of living, during the past month—the culmination of the steady rise in the cost of living which has been taking place for the past several years because of the failure of the government to take steps to deal with this critical situation, and particularly the refusal of the government to arrange for this house to discuss and debate the economic problems which have brought about this serious situation.

**Mr. Speaker:** The motion proposed by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) is based on a Dominion Bureau of Statistics report which indicates an increase in the consumer price index. As hon. members know similar motions have been proposed earlier in the course of the current session, motions which dealt with D.B.S. reports on unemployment.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Standing Order 26 requires not only that a problem be important, urgent and national in scope but that the discussion of such a matter be a matter of urgency. Even under the new rules the relevant factor in Standing Order 26 is urgency of debate rather than urgency of the matter itself.

It would appear that a motion such as this one can be allowed only if the ensuing debate could be expected reasonably to affect the course of the urgent situation or to result in immediate corrective action. I doubt that this could possibly be achieved by an adjournment debate dealing with a continuing situation such as unemployment or the international balance of payments or the volume of exports or inflation.

Since the beginning of the session we have had a number of debates dealing with economic matters. These debates have ranged far and wide, touching particularly on unemployment, taxes and inflation. It can be expected that a number of similar debates will occur before the end of this part of the current session. I have in mind particularly the debate on the anticipated presentation by the Minister of Finance.

For the moment I do not think I would be justified in allowing this additional debate in preference to the planned business of the house.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

[*Translation*]

## PRIVILEGE

MR. SERRÉ—IMPROPER POLITICAL INDENTIFICATION OF MEMBER

**Mr. Gaétan-J. Serré (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I put a question in the house to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux). Now, in yesterday's issue of *Le Droit*, I am referred to as a Conservative member of parliament.

I consider that a serious insult not only to me but also to the people who elected me.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Serré:** I would point out that even though I am surrounded—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Serré:** —by Conservative members—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. He stated his question of privilege, but I must remind him that according to Standing Orders he should have given notice of it to the Chair.

I have always tried to insist on this point and I believe that if I made an exception in this particular instance, it would be very difficult for me in the future to apply or to enforce the rules which stipulate that notice must be given.

Under these circumstances, I do not think that the hon. member should be allowed to carry further the question of privilege he has just raised.

**Mr. Serré:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that even though I am surrounded by Conservative members, the latter have not yet had enough influence over me, not even the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis)—

[*English*]

**Mr. Baldwin:** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am sure this party would be willing to give unanimous consent because our social standing is being seriously endangered by this sort of thing.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. MacInnis:** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have ruled that there is no question of privilege. The hon. member on the original point of order was actually pursuing a question of privilege. If hon. members want to debate this kind of point they are free to do so, but as far as I am concerned I think we should go on with the business of the house.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, obviously some people never know when they are lucky.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSESSION OF ATOMIC BOMB BY ISRAEL—CANADIAN NON-PROLIFERATION EFFORTS

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to change the tone of the discussion by asking the Prime Minister a very serious question arising from the apparent confirmation that Israel possesses the atomic bomb and that Arab states are seeking nuclear weapons from the Soviet Union. Will the Prime Minister say whether Canada, as one of the signatories of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, will consult with our allies in an effort to keep the nuclear ingredient out of the already tense situation in the Middle East?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might be permitted to reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Of course, we have no means of knowing about the accuracy of the reports which have appeared in the press. The Israeli government has affirmed that Israel would not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons in the area. In a press report Mr. Gideon Saggi said:

> Israel is not a nuclear state and, just as has been stated in the past, will not be the first to introduce atomic weapons into the area. The reports are speculative, inaccurate and unauthoritative.

That is the statement of the government of Israel. As far as the Canadian government is concerned, we share the hope of the Leader of the Opposition and, I am sure, of all members of this house that these reports are not true. We hope that Israel is not acquiring nuclear weapons. Canada, as one of the first countries to ratify the non-proliferation treaty, has urged nations, including Israel, to sign and ratify that treaty, which should preclude the acquisition of nuclear weapons by additional countries. We would hope that Israel would accede to that treaty and we are urging her to do so. This would of course, effectively end all speculation.

**Mr. Stanfield:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he will seek to verify directly whether this report is correct and whether, as a good friend of Israel, he as a representative of Canada will make direct and forceful representations in this regard. I ask also that renewed efforts be made by the government of Canada to strengthen efforts being directed toward the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. But even if this report turns out to be untrue, as I hope it does, it surely warns us once again of the grave danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I can reassure the Leader of the Opposition on this point. We have the greatest concern, which I know reflects the concern of all Canadians, about this development. May I add that Canada itself has not been participating in any of the scientific work that has been going on in Israel relating to the nuclear bomb. There has been no co-operation between Canadian and Israeli scientists in this field, and we have not been providing any uranium that could be used for this purpose.

[*Translation*]

MAINLAND CHINA—NEGOTIATIONS TOWARD CANADIAN RECOGNITION

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Would the minister tell the house what progress has been made in the talks with the Peking government with regard to the recognition of Communist China?

[*English*]

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that our ambassador in Stockholm will shortly be meeting with the representative of the People's Republic of China in Stockholm.

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont):** I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Inasmuch as the negotiations with Mainland China may take some time, I wonder whether the minister or the government are giving consideration to the establishment of some interim contact, either in the nature of cultural delegations or possibly of student exchanges in the coming months?

**Mr. Sharp:** We would welcome in general these kinds of exchanges and if, as the hon. gentleman suggests, these negotiations are prolonged, I think this might be a very useful initiative for Canada and for the People's Republic of China to take.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Can the minister assure us that the house will have an opportunity to express its views on the recognition of Communist China before the government makes a decision in the matter?

[*English*]

**Mr. Sharp:** I hope that as many members as possible will express their views so that the decision of the government, when taken, will reflect the opinions of hon. members.

## THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

GOVERNMENT STEPS TO CURTAIL INCREASING COST OF LIVING

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister regarding the figures released today, indicating that the cost of living for the month of April increased from 123.2 to 124.6, which represents an increase of 1.1 per cent for a single month. This is a sharp increase in the cost of living for the balance of this year, if continued at this monthly rate. What steps does the government intend to take to stop this spiralling cost of living which is having such an adverse effect on people generally and particularly those on lower and fixed incomes.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to indicate a series of steps which will be taken and we hope will have the support of this house, because the matter raised by the leader of the New Democratic party and the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings is a very serious one. Apart from the continuing steps we have taken to curtail expenditure and to keep collective bargaining within reasonable limits, we on this side hope that in the budgetary debate, which I take it will take place in a few weeks time, when we announce the composition of the commission on prices and incomes and when we announce to the country our further expenditure cuts, we will have the support not only of the

opposition but also of the various sectors of the community. There will be a need for the government to introduce some very severe expenditure cuts which will hurt different vested interests in the country. We hope we will have the support of the opposition parties on that.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Why have you taken so long?

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Prime Minister's statement yesterday about an adjournment of the house in the early summer, can he give the house an assurance that before parliament recesses legislation will be introduced to place some restraint on unjustifiable price increases, in order that the Canadian people may know that the government is seriously trying to stop this spiralling cost of living?

**Mr. Trudeau:** I doubt very much that any type of legislation has ever been suggested, including that from the N.D.P., but may I remind the house that we did introduce several cuts in very important areas across the country in the past months, and in each case the opposition parties have told us to re-establish these vast expenditures which we had to cut down.

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. He stated in the house on September 13 that the government's attack on poverty could be centred on an attempt to control inflation. Can he tell the house with any assurance that he expects in the months ahead the government's attack on poverty in this regard to be a great deal more successful than it has been since last September?

**Mr. Trudeau:** I cannot venture to prophesy the effects of our future actions. I will just remind the house that had we heeded the opposition pleas and not proceeded with the cuts, inflation would have been a great deal worse.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Hees:** Does the Prime Minister not agree that what he just said is a further example of his many attempts to mislead the Canadian people on most of the important matters?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think the further supplementary question is argumentative.

**Mr. Hees:** It is just a statement of fact.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the hon. member for Témiscamingue wish to ask a supplementary question?

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question of the Prime Minister.

In view of the fact that he just said that new restrictions would have to be imposed in various sectors of the Canadian economy, is the Prime Minister considering the serious suggestions made in the house by the Ralliement créditiste?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, I think that all those who know about such things agree that the suggestions coming from the creditiste system are, essentially, of an inflationary nature and inflation is precisely what we are trying to fight.

[*English*]

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he does not think it is possible to overdo restraint, as appears to have been done now for some time by his associate, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Again I think that this supplementary question is argumentative.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether, keeping in mind financial priorities and keeping in mind the increasing cost of living, he has any ideas or policies to assist senior citizens who cannot live on their meagre pensions?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think the hon. member is asking now for a general statement of policy. If the question were allowed we would be getting into a debate which, as I suggested a moment ago, should not be allowed.

**Mr. Hees:** This is simply not included in the just society.

## TRADE

### WHEAT—DISCUSSION WITH MAINLAND CHINA RESPECTING SALES

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, whom we welcome back from his extensive pilgrimage.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Baldwin:** We hope he has returned a wiser man, from the east. Will the minister take up with his colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs the possibility of a representative of the government discussing with representatives of the government of Mainland China the question of wheat sales, unless, of course, this runs contrary to the indicated views of the Prime Minister on government involvement in the sale of Canadian wheat?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** I thank the hon. gentleman for welcoming me back. I promise to keep my Asiatic smile.

On the subject of communications with China, I wish to rectify what seems to be a false impression on the other side of the house. We are in touch with China. We had a trade commissioner at the Canton Fair. As a matter of fact the trade commissioner was good enough to meet me in Bangkok to report to me on what was happening there. In the second place, the assistant chief commissioner of the Wheat Board was in Hong Kong recently discussing wheat sales with the interested parties on the communist China side.

WHEAT—POSSIBILITY OF DEFAULT IN U.S.S.R. AGREEMENT

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Would the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce end the uncertainty and confusion sweeping the Canadian grain market by advising this house, and indirectly western farmers, whether the U.S.S.R. has in fact cancelled a substantial part of its order and is considering whether it should even pay for wheat it has already received, citing grain damage.

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** This is not so. Negotiations between the Wheat Board and Export Khleb, the agency of the U.S.S.R. government, are continuing. The situation in the U.S.S.R. is not such, however, that they have found it possible to live up to their commitment to Canada, but there is no reason to believe they will not honour that commitment.

[*Later:*]

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Do I understand from the minister's answer with regard to the commitment of the U.S.S.R. that there is a question whether this long standing agreement—a matter of three years—will be honoured?

**Mr. Pepin:** That is not what I said. I said there was no reason to believe that the U.S.S.R. would not honour the commitment it has with Canada with respect to wheat purchases.

[*Translation*]

WHEAT—POSSIBILITY OF BROADENING LIST OF PURCHASERS

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

As he just said, he must have talked about wheat here and there during his trip. Did he find in other countries or on other continents new customers for our wheat surpluses?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, everywhere in the world today there are wheat surpluses. In Australia, for instance, the government just took steps to restrict the production of wheat. The Australian government will not take the responsibility of selling more than 350 million bushels and everything produced in excess will be at the farmers' own risk.

I just want to point out that overproduction of wheat in the world at the present time affects not only Canada but all the exporting countries also.

[*English*]

WHEAT—STATIONING OF SALES REPRESENTATIVE IN MAINLAND CHINA

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of trade and commerce. Will the Canadian government consider stationing a permanent sales representative of the Canadian Wheat Board in China once diplomatic recognition has been achieved?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I wonder whether this is the type of question that should be asked now.

WHEAT—POSSIBILITY OF ADDITIONAL SALES RESULTING FROM VISIT OF MINISTER TO ASIA AND ANTIPODES

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to find out from the minister of trade and commerce, following his safari in Asia, whether he would inform the house about possible increases in sales of wheat that have been

obtained as a result of his presence for so long in that very productive area in which he travelled?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, this trip once again gave me the occasion to witness how extensive was the sales promotion system of the Canadian Wheat Board. I met the wheat board people in Bangkok doing research into the wheat requirements in the area. I had the occasion of witnessing how good was their sales promotion.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think—

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the right hon. gentleman rising on a supplementary?

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I do not think the hon. gentleman understood my question. As a result of this visitation and his meetings with the Wheat Board representatives, is the minister in a position to say whether any country in Asia is going to increase the amount of wheat that it purchased last year. Have new purchasers been secured or potential markets obtained?

**Mr. Pepin:** Mr. Speaker, I am not in the habit of claiming credit for selling wheat, as was a previous government. I can tell the house that I did have useful discussions on the I.G.A. with Australian ministers and with the Australian wheat board. While I was in Singapore a sale of wheat was made by the Wheat Board. However, as I was on the spot I did not find it possible to board a plane back to Singapore to sign the contract.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I must bring to the attention of hon. members that perhaps we should pass on to another subject and resume tomorrow the debate on this particular topic. I had already started to recognize the hon. member for Swift-Current-Maple Creek.

WHEAT—REASONS FOR LOSS OF MARKETS

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the minister, following all his discussions in regard to the wheat situation, can inform the house, and particularly the farmers of Canada, why Canada lost 33 per cent of her markets last year?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I suggest to the hon. member that this question is not the type that can be asked.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

BEEF—REASON FOR STATEMENT ABOUT NEW ZEALAND EXPORTS TO CANADA

**Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Is the minister going to make a report to the house on the results of his long trip to Asia and the Antipodes? Secondly, would he explain why and on what basis he told the New Zealanders that they would have a greatly expanding market for beef in this country?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. While the first question might be in order, the hon. member knows he cannot ask the minister to comment on statements that even he has made outside the house. I believe the first question was whether a statement should be made, and perhaps this might be answered.

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, being a very humble person, I would not want to take the time of the house to make such a statement today, but I think I did make a good speech in Vancouver the other day, of which I will send the hon. member a copy. On the subject of beef, which is an important subject—

**An hon. Member:** The question was ruled out.

**Mr. Pepin:** Was it? O.K. Then—

**Mr. Harkness:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a supplementary question?

**Mr. Harkness:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the minister for his offer to send me a copy of his speech, but he has already done so. It is on this basis that I asked the question about beef. I would respectfully point out that if a member of the government makes a statement that is of great importance to one segment of industry in this country, then I think it is quite in order, and always has been in this house, for members to ask that minister for the basis upon which he made the statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. That is not my understanding of the rules. It is certainly not what the book says.

## GRAIN

WHEAT—ASSISTANCE TO CANADIAN FARMERS TO REDUCE ACREAGE

**Mr. George Muir (Lisgar):** In view of the fact that there is such a large surplus of

wheat in exporting countries, has the government given any consideration to assisting our farmers to reduce their wheat acreage?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Western farmers are used to making their own decisions. I understand there will be a reduction of 12 per cent in wheat acreage in the coming year.

WHEAT—INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF TWO PRICE SYSTEM

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister inform the house and the western farmers whether or not he, his department and the cabinet are seriously considering the inauguration of a two-price system to allow the farmers to stay in business?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, the cabinet is very conscious of its responsibilities in this matter.

**Mr. Horner:** Are you?

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

BAN ON TOBACCO ADVERTISING

**Mr. H. E. Stafford (Elgin):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. In the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's ban on tobacco advertising on its radio and television networks, Dr. Davidson, president of the C.B.C., referred to the continuous deliberations of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs which has been considering this subject and related matters.

Did the C.B.C. consider that it was prejudging the possible results and conclusions from those deliberations, and did it consider that it was acting on a matter which is under active discussion by a standing committee of this house; that it had insulted—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Stafford:** —that committee by taking this action before the tobacco industry—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I have to interrupt the hon. member's speech. Will the hon. member resume his seat. I suggest to the hon. member that he may like to discuss this matter at the time of adjournment.

**Mr. Stafford:** Ten o'clock.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## INDUSTRY

FAIRBANKS MORSE (CANADA) LTD.—ATTEMPTS TO AVOID CLOSING OF PLANT

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, just to continue the pattern. In view of the government's efforts to ensure that foreign owned companies in Canada act in Canada's interests, would the minister attempt to dissuade Colt Industries, Inc. of the U.S.A. from closing down Fairbanks Morse (Canada) Ltd. in Kingston?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I think the question might be put on the order paper.

## HOUSING

ONTARIO—ALLEGED DELAY IN PROVINCIAL PROGRAM

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. In asking the question might I call his attention to the fact that in the legislature of Ontario a day or two ago the minister of trade stated that a substantial part of the province's housing program had been held up due to the lack—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member must ask a question directly.

**Mr. Brewin:** My question is this: I know that the minister is new to his responsibilities, but will he answer the request of the provincial minister?

## AIR CANADA

STRIKE OF MECHANICS—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. In view of the expansive statement of the Minister of Labour yesterday in reply to the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour on the settlement of the dispute between Canadian Pacific Airlines and the Transportation and Communications Employees Union, can the minister say what progress is being made in the much more important dispute between the machinists union and Canadian Pacific Airlines and Air Canada?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, the parties met yesterday

very briefly to discuss the procedure they would follow. They have agreed to that procedure and I understand the meetings continued last evening, that they were quite productive and are carrying on today.

I might mention to the hon. gentleman that it is a matter of opinion which strike is the more important at any time.

[*Translation*]

## EXHIBITIONS

### PARTICIPATION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OPERATION OF "MAN AND HIS WORLD"

**Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Mr. Lucien Saulnier, president of the executive committee of Montreal, during a long interview granted to the *Montreal Star* on Tuesday last, has invited the federal government to participate permanently in "Man and His World". Could the minister tell the house whether Lucien Saulnier or His Honour Mayor, Jean Drapeau have communicated with him in this connection and whether the government intends to answer in the affirmative to that urgent and important invitation?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received verbal representations in this connection from Messrs. Drapeau and Saulnier. However each department of the government is entirely free to take its decisions in that field and in the past as this year also, a certain number of departments and organizations of the government, for instance, the National Film Board, the Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation, the Travel Bureau—have participated to "Man and his World" in one way or another, but I do not have time to elaborate.

I wish also to point out that the government has recently taken part in a tripartite negotiation with the Quebec government and the City of Montreal which has indirectly resulted in a grant of more than $1 million to "Man and His World".

**Mr. Prud'homme:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question.

Would the minister tell the house whether various departments of the federal government intend to participate in "Man and his World", especially the Secretary of State?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order! In my opinion, the supplementary question is much too general and cannot be asked at this time.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

[*English*]

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

### CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I wonder if he will make a statement to the house about the extent of Canadian participation in the twenty-fifth anniversary of the D-Day exercises. Also, to what extent will Canadian personnel be participating in that exercise?

**Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, at the invitation of the government of France a Canadian delegation will commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the D-Day landing on French soil. The names of those who will be on the delegation have already been announced. Two members of the House of Commons are included, as well as the Sergeant-at-Arms and other distinguished persons who will well represent the government of Canada and the veterans of this country.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister indicate which two members of parliament are to be on the delegation?

**Mr. Dubé:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. One will be the hon. member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Smith) and the other the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall).

**Mr. Speaker:** I draw the attention of hon. members to the time. There are only four or five minutes left in the question period. Perhaps we might go to other subject matters.

## NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

### SERIOUS ERRORS AND INADEQUACIES IN RECORDING OF EXPENDITURES

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. It relates to the government of the Northwest Territories. What action has the minister taken as a result of the Auditor-Generals' findings that there were such serious errors and inadequacies in the records of expenditures and revenues of the Council of the Northwest Territories that no reliable financial statement could be prepared therefrom.

Is anything being done to correct what might be a very awkward situation.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I must advise the hon. member that I am not aware of that statement by the Auditor General, but I will inquire immediately and report as soon as possible.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

### REQUEST FOR REDUCTION IN RATE ON "MONTREAL" MAGAZINE

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Communications.

It can be foreseen that, following the increase in its postal charges from $28,000 to $55,000, the magazine *Montréal,* which made Canada known throughout the world, will disappear. Does the minister intend to grant a reduction in postal rates to that magazine?

**Mr. Speaker:** The question should be put on the order paper.

**Mr. Dumont:** Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

## HEALTH AND WELFARE

### TOBACCO—RESEARCH TO REMOVE HARMFUL INGREDIENTS

**Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Because the action of the C.B.C. in curtailing tobacco advertising has serious implications for Canadian tobacco producers, will the minister advise the house if the government has advocated any stepped-up research program so that alleged harmful ingredients of this Canadian product might be removed either at the production or refining stage?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what action has been taken since the C.B.C. made its announcement that the hon. member referred to. Our department has a continuing research program to identify the harmful ingredients.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

### PASSPORTS—SUBSTITUTION OF NEW APPLICATION FORMS

**Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, may I change the subject matter we are discussing and direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs about passports. In order to avoid many errors being made on applications, will the minister withdraw all the old application forms and replace them with new forms; or would he see to it that government agencies and persons handing out these applications will at least change the price from $5 to $10?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will certainly take these suggestions into consideration. This however, has not been the main source of trouble. It has been the incomplete filing of information.

**An hon. Member:** People pay $5 too little.

**Mr. Hales:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister ask his colleague, the Postmaster General, to advise his staff not to hand out forms on which there is printed the $5 figure. The $5 figure should not be on the form, but should be changed to a $10 figure.

### NATO—GOVERNMENT POSITION ON OVERSEAS CAPABILITY

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Is it the position of the government of Canada that there ought to be no over-all military reduction of NATO capability overseas.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please. I wonder whether the Leader of the Opposition is not asking for a statement of policy. I doubt whether that kind of statement can be made now.

**Mr. Stanfield:** May I rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister can answer in a word. Was the Minister of National Defence speaking government policy on Friday when he said that the government, generally, agrees with the proposition that there should be no over-all military reduction of NATO capability overseas.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** It is part of the government's policy, Mr. Speaker.

**An hon. Member:** What part?

## ARTS, LETTERS AND SCIENCES

### NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE—PRODUCTION OF "ANNE OF GREEN GABLES"

**Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the

Secretary of State. Considering the tremendously enthusiastic reception London is giving the Canadian play "Anne of Green Gables", will the minister consider bringing the cast to Ottawa so that this great play can be included in the opening festival of the National Arts Centre.

**An hon. Member:** It's too clean.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Bring Don Messer to the hill.

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION FOR BAN ON TOBACCO ADVERTISING

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State. May I ask him to express our appreciation to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the excellent example it has set to other media by announcing last night that it will discontinue all cigarette advertising.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

LAKE MÉGANTIC AND COATICOOK—ESTABLISHMENT OF MAIL DELIVERY

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Communications.

In answer to requests by the municipalities of Lac-Mégantic and Coaticook, could he say whether those cities will soon by provided with letter carrier delivery as the government has been promising for three years, considering the representations and the expenditures those municipalities have made to meet the requirements of the department?

**Mr. Speaker:** Such a question should normally be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

## GRAIN

WHEAT—REQUEST FOR ACREAGE REDUCTION PAYMENTS

**Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and is related to the question asked a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Lisgar. In light of short wheat sales and the resulting low income of western farmers will the minister and the government give consideration to introducing acreage reduction payments?



**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, the previous answer covers that question.

## HEALTH AND WELFARE

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN TRAINING OF NURSES

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Since the Canadian Nurses Association has pointed out that the attitude of the federal government to nurses' education has been one of lethargy, bordering on antipathy, may I ask whether it is the intention of the government to increase resources devoted to educating nurses, especially at the baccalaureate, masters and doctorate levels.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please. I venture to suggest to the hon. member that that is a question touching on general policy and normally it ought to be put on the order paper.

## FINANCE

DEPARTMENTAL SPENDING SUPERVISED BY BUDGET BUREAU

**Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Is it his intention to set up a budget bureau modelled on United States lines in order to place departmental spending directly under the control of the Privy Council?

**Mr. Speaker:** I would suggest that that question too should be placed on the order paper.

## HOUSING

REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

**Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the minister in charge of housing. Will he be introducing amendments to the housing legislation before the house, as a result of the persuasive arguments of the members of the housing committee of the Liberal caucus on Wednesday morning?

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the day.

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, may I request that tomorrow you turn your eyes

in this direction during the question period, because we are not part of the Liberal rump.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I will cast both eyes in the direction of the hon. member tomorrow.

## TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

### REQUEST FOR DEBATE ON FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order may I direct a question to the government house leader in connection with the business of the house. He did not announce in the business for the balance of the session before the summer recess whether or not the government intended to bring forward legislation to deal with the Maritime Freight Rates Act, but will he bring forward for debate the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. This is not a point of order. The hon. member might have asked that question during the question period. I regret that I did not have an opportunity to call on him but I will do so tomorrow.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## CRIMINAL CODE

### REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Wednesday, May 7, consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 38, Mr. Rodrigue.

**Mr. Speaker:** The house will now proceed to the deferred divisions on proposed amendments Nos. 33 and 35. The question is on motion No. 33 (Mr. Laprise):

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the word "female" on lines 28 and 29 on page 42 and the word "female" on lines 3 and 23 on page 43 and the word "female" on line 39 on page 44.

*Division*

The house divided on motion No. 33 (Mr. Laprise) which was negatived on the following division:

● (3:00 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Beaudoin
Caouette
Dionne
Dumont
Fortin
Gauthier
Laprise
La Salle
Latulippe
Matte
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Tétrault—13.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Asselin
Badanai
Baldwin
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Brown
Buchanan
Burton
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Carter
Chrétien
Clermont
Code
Comeau
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Danforth
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Drury
Dubé
Émard
Forest
Forget
Forrestall
Foster
Gervais
Gibson
Gilbert
Gillespie
Gleave
Goode
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Gundlock
Haidasz
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Hellyer
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Horner
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kierans
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Laflamme
Laing
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lang
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Lind
Loiselle
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan

*Division*

MacInnis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
Macquarrie
McBride
McCleave
McGrath
McIlraith
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Marshall
Mather
Mongrain
Monteith
Morison
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Munro
Murphy
Nowlan
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Orlikow
Peddle
Pelletier
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Ritchie
Roberts
Rochon
Rock
Rose
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Rynard
Saltsman
Schreyer
Scott
Serré
Sharp
Skoberg
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Southam
Stafford
Stanfield
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thompson
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Winch
Woolliams
Yanakis
Yewchuk—182.

• (3:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is now on motion No. 35 (Mr. Rondeau, for Mr. Rodrigue):

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "or health" on line 5 on page 43.

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. Speaker:** All those opposed 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.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the wish of hon. members that we proceed with the vote immediately?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

The house divided on motion No. 35 (Mr. Rondeau, for Mr. Rodrigue) which was negatived on the following division:

NAYS

Messrs:

Asselin
Beaudoin
Bigg
Burton
Caouette
Carter
Comeau
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne
Downey
Dumont
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Horner
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
La Salle
Latulippe
Lundrigan
McCleave
McGrath
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Monteith
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Peddle
Reid
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rynard
Scott
Southam
Stewart (Cochrane)
Tétrault
Thompson
Yewchuk—41.

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Baldwin
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Bell
Benjamin
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chrétien
Clermont
Code
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Dubé
Émard
Forest
Forget
Foster
Gervais
Gibson
Gilbert
Gillespie
Gleave
Goode
Gray
Guay (Saint-Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Gundlock
Haidasz
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Hellyer
Hogarth
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Kierans

Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Laflamme
Laing
Lang
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Lind
Loiselle
MacDonald (Egmont)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
Macquarrie
McBride
McIlraith
McIntosh
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mather
Mongrain
Morison
Muir (Lisgar)
Munro
Murphy
Nowlan
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olson
Orlikow
Pelletier
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Ritchie
Roberts
Rochon
Rock
Rose
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Saltsman
Schreyer
Serré
Sharp
Skoberg
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanfield
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Winch
Woolliams
Yanakis—151.

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

**Mr. McCleave:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder whether it would be possible, for the convenience of all members of the house, that when there are deferred motions to be voted upon they be printed in the one place where hon. members naturally look to find the order of business, namely, *Routine Proceedings and Orders of the Day.* We have had to hunt for these amendments. It is true that we can find them in *Votes and Proceedings* of a day or so ago or in the Special Notice Paper that was printed a few days ago, or a few weeks ago, because it seems that long. I think some hon. members have had difficulty in finding precisely what they are voting on. I may say, without mentioning names, that one hon. member thought he was voting on something else. I think my suggestion would clear up a lot of confusion.

• (3:30 p.m.)

**An hon. Member:** That was the Prime Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** I must say that we attempted to produce a paper which would help hon. members. However, we will look at the situation again and consider the very valuable suggestion of the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants.

**Mr. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which has been initiated by what the Prime Minister indicated. I rise now to draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that the votes of the Secretary of State for External Affairs and one other member should be set aside because they obviously broke the rules and procedures of the house in taking their places when they did.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have to rule on the point of order raised by the hon. member. I cannot agree with his suggestion. The Standing Order which the hon. member should consult says that an hon. member cannot take his seat once the question has been put. Of course hon. members will recognize that the hon. member sitting to my left came in before the question had been put. Both hon. members voted according to the rules.

**Mr. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, in all fairness I think that the member whom Your Honour identified as a member to your left should not be identified as a Conservative but as a member of the N.D.P.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I do not think the matter should be discussed further. I appreciate the fact that the hon. member thought he had a legitimate point of order but the fact of the matter is that the Standing Order permits members to come in and take their seats as long as the question has not been put. Of course the moment the Speaker starts to put the question it is a well known rule that members cannot take their seats.

**Mr. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on exactly that point of order. Your Honour was on your feet and had started to speak before the minister took his seat.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane):** Mr. Speaker, in the same vein as my hon. colleague, I think that all those votes are not important any more because this institution has become the laughing-stock of the population and a minority is destroying it—

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr Speaker, I do not think parliament is becoming a laughing stock, but that could happen if we ever have too many incompetent or irresponsible members, such as the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané).

**Mr. Speaker:** I would ask the hon. member to think before he speaks. In my opinion, the hon. member has no right to use the kind of words he just said. I suggest to him to use discretion in the choice of his words, and above all to keep his remarks to the motion now before us.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, that is just what I intend to do, and I thank you kindly for your relevant remarks However, it would be easier for us to keep to our remarks if we were not interrupted all the time.

It should be noted, first of all, that the bill now before us would authorize abortion when the life or the health of a woman is endangered, whether this can be determined with certainty or not. This excludes abortions on any other grounds, such as refusal of motherhood or misunderstandings with the husband.

That is why the government proposes the establishment of a therapeutic abortion committee whose duties would be to determine such questions and issue a certificate to authorize an abortion.

What can one say about such a legislative proposal? We believe it is not enough to provide in the bill that there will be in each institution a therapeutic abortion committee whose function will be to decide when abortions should be authorized.

We think that this mere fact is not sufficient to ensure a greater guarantee, more security to the patient, to the doctor who will perform the abortion and to the government legislators who will pass this legislation.

In our opinion, it is definitely not enough to require a majority vote within the committee, for the sole purpose of authorizing the abortion, in view of the many doubts and the numerous cases which may occur from one patient to another.

Therefore, we think that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue) is acceptable and desirable, for all the reasons I stated briefly yesterday.

I would like to take a few minutes to explain the reasons why we believe the decision of the committee should be unanimous for every abortion, rather than taken by a majority.



As I said yesterday, there are a great many academic discussions among doctors, which indicates that opinions are divided and that the same yard-stick cannot be applied to everyone when considering the various cases.

We have heard last night about all kinds of cases: the unmarried mother, the married woman pregnant with an adulterine child, the woman taken unaware by a pregnancy, the female worker who wants to get rid of the child to pursue her work unimpeded, the society woman, the artist, who would consider giving birth as a catastrophe, the woman who suddenly panics and becomes neurotic.

Those are some cases that I chose, among others, to demonstrate what problems the therapeutic abortion committee will have to face and also that very likely the members of the committee, for similar reasons, may be unable to arrive at a unanimous consent.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the advantage is that the grounds on which a woman requests an abortion may not always be acceptable and it might be difficult in many cases to establish whether or not her life or her health is really endangered.

Consequently, we want a unanimous decision, so that if a woman falling under the categories I have just mentioned applied for an abortion to the therapeutic abortion committee, of course, two doctors might say: We are prepared to allow an abortion and issue a certificate. However, the other doctor who, in accordance with his code of professional ethics, his conscience and his knowledge, has more misgivings than the two other, might discover that the applicant is an unwed mother, that she rejects motherhood, and that abortion would not solve her problem but rather aggravate it.

Consequently, that physician would be justified in objecting and his refusal could convince the other two not to deliver a certificate authorizing abortion, so that they could then consider the case of that woman and help her otherwise and better than by procuring her abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see in today's issue of *Le Droit* an article on abortion by Dr. Noel Walsh which is entitled: "A psychiatrist's opinion"

This psychiatrist backs us up fully, Mr. Speaker, when we say that physicians are far

from having, unanimous views. In almost 80 per cent of cases, an abortion is not a solution to the problem of the pregnant woman, but rather worsens her condition and such is the opinion of a majority of physicians.

In this regard, Dr. Noel Walsh said, and I quote:

> There are many aspects to the problem of abortion that I cannot consider due to lack of space. In conclusion, I would like to sum up the main ideas I developed:

You must agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that this psychiatrist shares our view that termination of pregnancy is not a solution but a complication and that we must consider each case in particular. He does not say there must be unanimous consent of the committee, but his conclusions indicate that we must take every possible precaution in order to protect the physical, mental and physiological health of the woman, to ensure the full and safe enforcement of the law and to secure understanding and a code of professional ethics within the therapeutic committee.

The first conclusion drawn by Dr. Walsh is as follows:

> In the present state of psychiatric knowledge, there are to my mind no psychiatric grounds to justify abortion and, on this point, my opinion is shared by many psychiatrists. I even believe that I have demonstrated that abortion, in the views of psychiatrists, is always harmful.

So, Mr. Speaker, if Dr. Walsh, an eminent psychiatrist, is able to say that in almost all cases, abortion is harmful, and that the patient's case is aggravated, by it, we must take into consideration this expert's view and ask ourselves the following question: Would it not be better to stipulate that the therapeutic abortion committee must be unanimous in its decisions and that such decisions must be based on scientific and medical information and not on sentimental grounds in order to avoid the risk of allowing an abortion that could be more harmful than beneficial to the person in question?

• (3:40 p.m.)

Dr. Walsh states as a second conclusion:

> There is every reason to fear that this bill does represent, in the structure of Canadian justice, a first crack which gradually could lead to a deterioration of human rights.

Here again, because I ask myself the question with regard to the amendment, I wonder whether these therapeutic abortion committees will not be in fact—as I have said earlier—the corner-stone of this legislation concerning abortion and therefore will have to ensure the enforcement of the law and of justice for each human being, each patient, and if they cannot implement the legislation in accordance with medical and scientific standards, a deterioration of justice will follow and once again Dr. Walsh would have been right.

And to eliminate this problem and put all the chances on our side, because we are referring here to a guarantee and not a filibuster, the unanimity which should prevail, in our opinion, within the therapeutic abortion committee would be a tremendous guarantee for the patient, for the therapeutic abortion committee, for the government and for the administration of justice.

Dr. Walsh comes to his third conclusion and I quote:

> The legislation will have adverse effects on the Canadian woman, Canadian family life and the quality of Canadian life in general.

Mr. Speaker, this does not necessarily relate to the amendment.

The fourth conclusion is really interesting and I quote:

> The legislation will have a detrimental effect on the medical profession.

Mr. Speaker, one can see that we have here an interesting conclusion:

> The act will have a harmful effect on the medical profession.

Therefore if we ask and demand that the therapeutic abortion committee make not a majority decision but a unanimous one as to the approval of abortion or the issuing of a certificate allowing abortion in the case of a patient, this will oblige doctors to perform abortions willingly only when it is really in the interest of the patient and in accordance with the ethics of the medical profession.

Short of that, we are in danger of minimizing the role of the medical profession.

That would justify Dr. Walsh who is afraid that the act will have a harmful effect on the medical profession.

We must maintain the confidence of the Canadian people in their doctors and protect the doctors themselves through certain safeguards in the law, with respect to their patients, in order precisely to strengthen the confidence that should be established between doctor and patient.

In his fifth conclusion, Dr. Walsh says and I quote:

> The act will not reduce the number of criminal abortions.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that if we do not ask the therapeutic abortion committee to

make a unanimous decision, it would mean, in the case of a majority decision only, that many cases would obviously occur where an abortion would be allowed that would really be on a pretext, because the bill in itself has too broad a meaning.

When it is said that abortion would be allowed in all cases when pregnancy would probably or would be likely to endanger the life or health of a woman, the number of such patients would be pretty high because the word "likely" is so difficult to define, so wide, and opens the way to so many reasons, as well as the word "health" which is impossible to define. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) himself recognizes the fact.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Thus, all the cases which could be covered under the expression "would be likely to endanger her life" should be scrutinized by the therapeutic committee, and a certificate could not be delivered unless the decision of the committee is unanimous.

I would not like to give more details, since I think I put forward the main arguments which make me support the motion without any qualification. That is why I shall vote in favour of the motion moved by the hon. member for Beauce.

I think it is a constructive amendment which actually changes but one word in the bill, "unanimous decision" being substituted for "majority". I am convinced that the minister will certainly object to that, or is likely to.

I find it hard to believe he will oppose it, and to understand his motives. But I should like to urge him strongly to study our proposal to ask that each committee reach an unanimous decision in every case submitted to it, because he will surely agree with me that if abortion is a problem, we must not aggravate it through a law that is incomplete, too vague, which opens the door to every pretext; which would not consequently create justice but would contribute to degrade the justice we want to establish.

Mr. Speaker, I should like the Minister of Justice to reflect seriously on the matter, and to make his comments, in the hope that he might tell us he agrees with us for once.

As for us, we are convinced that this is a positive measure and that the house would be well advised to support it.

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, in the standing committee on justice and legal affairs, we considered many amendments, because the government received almost 25 of them.

But now we have reached the report stage, and the government supports the bill as drawn up and amended by the standing committee of the house. Because we support the report, I therefore feel, for good reasons, that we must reject the amendment moved by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue). I shall explain why.

When he spoke in the house, the member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) a doctor, reminded us, and rightly so, to my mind, that medical science is not an accurate science. It is, precisely a matter of judgment, a matter of experience, a matter of delicate medical analysis, which goes beyond the qualifications of the doctor.

Thus it would be unreasonable to insist and to demand unanimity of a medical council, where medical art founded upon human judgment. And I think that we should not expect unanimity concerning the symptoms which tell whether the health or the life of the mother are in danger. It is not a mathematical question. It is not an exact science. It is an art pertaining to professional judgment.

This is why I regret to have to say once again that the government cannot recommend to the house acceptance of the amendment presented by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue).

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words, to second the amendment of my colleague from Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue), who has just supported my colleague from Lotbinière and, at the same time, to comment on the statement which has just been made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner).

He quotes the statement of his colleague from Hull (Mr. Isabelle) to the effect that the medical science is not infallible and that it is rather an art than a science. On this point, I would be inclined to agree with him and it is precisely that which led the member for Beauce to present this amendment.

If the doctors, with all their science, can err, it stands to reason that two doctors can err in a worse way than three.

As a therapeutic committee made up of three medical practitioners is required—not by us but by the government—it seems important that these three highly qualified doctors should be enabled to cut short a human life only if all three are agreed.

Mr. Speaker, in other fields of human activity, where committees, such as arbitra-

tion or legal committees, made up of several members, are required to render a decision, there is always a difference when a unanimous or a majority decision is reached.

That is why we insist on providing in the bill, if clause 18 is passed, that a unanimous decision is reached by the therapeutic committee concerned.

A few minutes ago, the Minister of Justice referred to the comments made a few days ago, in a similar situation, by the hon. member for Hull. During evidence he gave before the committee on health, welfare and social affairs, as is recorded on page 11 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence, No. 1, the hon. member for Hull said in answer to a question by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), and I quote:

> Mrs. MacInnis, there is one general observation I want to make on your bill. First, I am not too sure that we can achieve a change. I am for change, but how are we going to achieve this change?

At that time, the hon. member for Hull was asking himself that question.

> Another thing is this: you are aware of the fact that for the past 25 years many countries, especially the Scandinavian countries, Russia and some other countries, have widened their legislation on legal abortion and since this legislation has been brought along, strangely enough there has been an increase of illegal abortions in those countries. This is something that we cannot understand, but it could be easily understood in the light of Mr. Stanbury's point of view that therapeutic abortion committees—

**Mr. Cantin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The parliamentary secretary is rising on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Cantin:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is entirely outside the bounds of the amendment. He is taking us through various countries, reading us quotations 25 years old and talking a little about everything. The question is whether or not a committee should be unanimous in its decision. I suggest that he should be called to order and that he should speak only on the meaning of the amendment.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I was listening to the hon. member for Abitibi very carefully, but sometimes it was difficult to know whether the argument he was developing was leading to a point that was related to the amendment. I was trying to give him the benefit of the doubt. However, I hope he will observe the point raised by the parliamentary secretary, that he is required to confine his remarks to the amendment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Laprise:** Mr. Speaker, I think I am as conversant with the Standing Orders as the Parliamentary Secretary of the Minister of Justice.

I only wanted to speak about the conclusion reached by the member for Hull in the committee of health, welfare and social affairs. I was just coming to that conclusion in which the hon. member, who is himself a doctor, reminds us that even therapeutic abortion committees, judges, lawyers, doctors etc. are at odds on such matters, which accounts for the fact that the number of therapeutic abortions has decreased while the number of illegal abortions has increased.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, when a woman or a girl comes before a therapeutic abortion committee to request an abortion on physical or mental health grounds, apparently there will be three doctors to pass a judgment, but only two of them will have to decide whether her health is in danger.

But the hon. member for Hull answers the question we are likely to ask ourselves. As the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) was asking him: "Doctor, is the mental health of a person easy to determine?", the hon. member for Hull replied: From the medical viewpoint I think two doctors are not enough to make such an important decision. This is exactly what the amendment is aiming at. It sees to it that two doctors will not be able to grant an abortion, if the third one is opposed to it.

In closing I shall refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for Hull who said that if there are too many of them, there will be chaos then.

Therefore, if we must accept a therapeutic committee to decide whether or not an abortion will be carried out in the case where the health of the mother would be in danger, I would have preferred that one of the three practitioners on this committee to be a gynaecologist. Since we ask that the committee be composed of three doctors to decide if the abortion will be carried out or not, I believe we should state in the legislation that the decision for or against the abortion should be

unanimous. Then there would not be any possible ambiguity.

As the hon. member for Hull pointed out, the danger in this amendment lies in the fact that in cases where the committee will refuse an abortion in the light of the reasons given, then the woman or the young girl requesting the abortion for health reasons, whether physical or mental, will probablement go to a quack and that will not settle in any way the problem we want to solve by this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons that I support the amendment moved by my colleague from Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue) and I believe the other members should do the same when the vote is taken.

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, we are once again considering an amendment which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) could have looked at from another standpoint.

We support this amendment on the ground that doctors themselves have a great deal of difficulty reaching complete agreement on the nature of abortion and that the law would protect them further if it required unanimous agreement within the committee whose duty it will be to decide whether or not a female person should be aborted.

Mr. Speaker, by demanding unanimity, we feel sure that the committee will not be faced with a situation which would result in decisions based on uncertainties. The amendments increasing the number of responsible members within the abortion committee have been written off so that the committee will be made up of three members, instead of four or even five.

Therefore, it is most important, if only three doctors remain on the board, that those three be unanimous in their decision, so that in a field as serious as human life, a less conscientious doctor should not be left to influence the others unduly.

Mr. Speaker, that is perhaps the reason why, some time ago, the editorial writer Claude Ryan, of the newspaper *Le Devoir*, referred to those sham practitioners who, for a year or a year and a half now, have flooded radio and particularly television—mostly our national system—with their views on abortion. For one doctor who favours abortion, and on request, there are thousands of others who have had no opportunity to express their own opinions publicly. Those sham practitioners were the ones alluded to by the journalist.

Now, the very same newspaper *Le Devoir*, mentioned by my friend the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) a while ago, has published also a letter from Dr. Maurice Jobin, who supports abortion. In that letter, Dr. Jobin took exception to Mr. Ryan's condemnation of sham practitioners.

And Mr. Ryan, in a foot-note to Dr. Jobin's letter said this, and I quote:

> I wrote and I repeat that too many sham practitioners flood the air with their superficial talk on extremely complex and delicate subjects such as abortion.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I must remind him that the motion we are considering deals with the question of whether the decision of the therapeutic abortion committee ought to be unanimous. I do not wish to restrict the right of the hon. member to speak on the motion but, so far as possible, I feel he ought to confine his remarks to the specific motion now being considered.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, thank you for your remarks, but the purpose of my intervention is to show it is important that the committee be unanimous, because doctors do not all share the same views and we require unanimity to avoid a situation where two doctors on the committee might be in favour of abortion for some women, while the third would be against. Such a situation, if it arises would be exceptional and would be frowned upon at first.

It is impossible, when human lives are concerned, when the right to live is involved to ignore 33⅓—since one out of three would represent 33⅓—who might be right, and to leave it to two out of three to make that decision. It would be a serious mistake to leave things as they are, since an indefeasible and unquestionable right is involved the right to live of a person of 90, 100, 101, as well as of a person of 50, 10, 9 years and that right also exists for a human being still in his mother's womb. This is our opinion and many physicians, especially those who have studied genetics, agree with us. They tell us that life begins at the time of impregnation when the impregnated ovule is actually implanted in the womb.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, as far as unanimity is concerned I would like to denounce, along with the editor of *Le Devoir*, Claude Ryan, the sham practitioners. There will always be a

few who will exert influence on such committees; it is therefore quite important to distrust them. By requiring the unanimous consent of the abortion committee in accredited hospitals, we would thus secure a better guarantee than by leaving the clause in its present form.

I did not say that those sham practitioners were physicians, even if it is possible for physicians to turn quickly into sham practitioners when they take cover under their specialization to uphold views which strictly have no direct or causal connection with their competence. As for the argument about figures put forward by Dr. Jobin in his letter, it is entirely his own. It is not with such computations that we can prove the basic truth of a statement.

Dr. Jobin can also claim full ownership of his gratuitous innuendoes about his medical colleagues who do not think as he does on the question of abortion.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker I was in order.

I wanted to show the present disagreement among physicians. A great number of them, and the majority in Quebec, are against abortion. They have various reasons but one of them is that therapeutic abortion is no longer necessary today. That is what Dr. Noel Walsh said and I quote:

> This leads me to refer to the relationships between psychiatry and abortion. As you may know, according to obstetricians and physicians, medical and obstetric indications justifying abortion have practically disappeared and mostly, favourable indications to be expected in the future will be of a psychiatric nature. The question we must ask ourselves, then, is: Are there any psychiatric grounds for abortion?

Here again, you can appreciate the problem, Mr. Speaker, since there is no longer such a thing as therapeutic abortion. This is one of the main reasons why we are so much opposed to the present bill. The way we have insisted and come back to the same subject these last few days proves we are dealing with blockheads—if I may use the expression. All obstetricians and all physicians quoted are not Créditistes, Mr. Speaker, but people who are mainly concerned with this important problem of abortion. We have no objection against therapeutic abortion, provided the bill has no serious consequences.

We do not object to therapeutic abortion, Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason that it no longer exists. With medical progress, abortion is now uncalled for. If it were a matter of life and death for a pregnant woman, if a choice had to be made between the life of the foetus and her own life, we would not be opposed, then, to the doctor making use of all treatments required to try to save the life of the mother and at the same time the life of the foetus. We have no objection to that and we do not understand why so much time must be wasted on a question that medical science is on the point of solving definitely.

If doctors themselves hold such opinions, you will readily understand that they have some doubt as to the usefulness of the bill as it now reads. It would have been possible to legislate about abortion but in an acceptable manner.

It would have been sufficient to delete one small thing from the Criminal Code, that is the possibility of instituting proceedings against a doctor who, because of the treatments given by him to a pregnant woman, has caused an abortion.

At the present time, nothing prevents that woman or some other persons from suing the doctor. That was the only point that needed to be dealt with. There was no need to authorize or to legalize abortion on such and such a pretext.

As I just said, several doctors were in favour of abortion. Others are much more broad-minded, and claim that individual freedom would allow a woman to get rid of a foetus she is bearing, just like having a tooth pulled.

Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of people in any profession, including the medical profession. It is to be wondered why they are more influential, and why their opinions are mostly retained.

That medical committee could always find somebody who would be either against or for abortion. So, it would then be necessary, in order to ensure an accurate diagnosis, to require unanimity. That would be a formal guarantee which, in my opinion, should have been considered much more seriously.

In so vital and so essential a matter as the one under consideration, it is extremely unfortunate to see some members take it so lightly as to call this debate a public mockery. I think it is extremely disastrous for the house to find that for some members the right to live of future generations is not worth anything more than that.

As far as we are concerned, it is to think of the people of the future, of the thousands or millions of people of the future who will not come to life because abortion is being legalized, is much more serious than just a mockery.

Our position is justified. As regards an amendment such as this one, when we ask once more the Minister of Justice and urge him to seriously consider this question, we abide by the standing orders. It is quite logical and it delays in no way the business of the house.

I repeat what I already said on several occasions, Mr. Speaker. Should the minister want a little more time to consider this, should he like to receive other briefs, or obtain further information, let the house adjourn and let us wait. Why such a hurry? Why do we have to pass the bill to legalize abortion? What is so urgent about it?

Who is urging us on? Is there at present such a great number of women at grips with that problem and who are waiting for this legislation to be able to get rid of their foetus?

We wonder why we are being accused of filibuster since we were not responsible for introducing the bill. Since the minister has just told us once again that he would not accept this amendment—and this time he seemed to be a little sad in telling us that—and if he thinks that he is not yet sufficiently informed—we should like once more to adjourn this debate, to wait and to proceed with some other business.

The bill on the official languages should be one of highest priority for the government and I think that the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is very pleased to see this debate drag on because it enables him to set aside the bill on the official languages and it provides him with a justification for not introducing it. He will say: the Ralliement créditiste did not want it because they drew out the debate on abortion.

We anticipate all these things and even though the matter we are discussing now might embarrass us politically this is not why we fight for our point of view; our inspiration is the significant principle of life.

• (4:20 p.m.)

That is our position and there is no political capital involved. We are not claiming to be defenders of morality, but defenders of life, of human rights, of freedom and of the human being. And as far as we are concerned, human life begins within a few days after conception.

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, the amendment we want to incorporate today in Bill C-150, reads as follows:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code . . . be amended by deleting in clause 18 the



words "a majority" in lines 38 and 39 on page 42 and substituting therefor the words: "unanimous decision".

I think it is important to know the big difference between "a majority" and "unanimous decision". This amendment is very serious because the question is whether to end life or not. The difference between "a majority" and "unanimous decision" is most important, because I feel the terms are contradictory, if a decision is to be made by the therapeutic committee in hospitals and clinics for or against abortion. There must be no doubt as to the health condition of the person on whom an abortion is to be performed, because, in my opinion, "doubt" means "a majority".

In this case, I think that "majority" is contrary to "unanimity" because in such a vital matter it is most important that the committee take a unanimous decision. A doubtful decision can be prejudicial to the health and probably to the life of thousands of people.

I would not want, because of some "nearly" or "perhaps", my progeny, which I value more than anything, to be in danger. I have ten children, which makes me very happy, and I would like to have more. Not for anything in the word would I want a therapeutic committee to decide, without being unanimous, the abortion of some of my progency.

For those reasons, I want such a committee be very serious and its decisions to be unanimous. That is why I fully support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue).

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question is on motion No. 38 (Mr. Fortin, for Mr. Rodrigue). Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion? All those in favour please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my view the nays have it. Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75 the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

**Mr. Romuald Rodrigue** moved motion No. 37:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting paragraph (c) of sub-section 4 in clause 18 on page 43 and substituting therefor:

"(c) has by certificate in writing signed by the three members of the Committee, stated that in its opinion, the life of the mother cannot be kept safe from danger with the continuation of her pregnancy."

[*Translation*]

He said: Mr. Speaker, I shall try to be brief in introducing amendment No. 37 since we have already discussed related subjects when amendments No. 26, 33, 35, 36 and 38 were discussed.

The purpose of the amendment I have moved is to replace clause 18 (4)(c) of the bill by the following:

"(c) has by certificate in writing signed by the three members of the Committee, stated that in its opinion, the life of the mother cannot be kept safe from danger with the continuation of her pregnancy."

Therefore the legislation would allow two doctors representing the majority, such as mentioned in paragraph (b) of subclause 4, on a three-member committee, to authorize abortion on health grounds, such as specified in section 18 (4)(c) of the bill now before us.

Some people may have different views on this subject, and the same may be true of abortion committees.

The community will soon find out which committees are more broad-minded. That is one of the reasons why I am inclined to think that the bill, as drafted and submitted, will lead people to believe that abortions will be performed on request.

Some doctors may question the value of the life destroyed by abortion. However, judgments of value are not medical judgments, and doctors are not any more competent than others to pass such judgments. In any event, Bill C-150 would confer upon them the supreme authority to judge what a human being is worth before his birth.

The establishment of committees does not provide any guarantee that the law will be properly interpreted, that this legislation will safeguard the common good and will be observed.

If we consider the differences in the frequency of abortion in the world, we find that the hospitals where the greatest number of abortions are carried out are those where the committees are the most tolerant.

I sincerely believe that in so amending the legislation, committees called upon to take such a decision will be respected.

If the majority reports is accepted as such, the reasons put forward by the third member of the committee who will refuse to sign the report, would probably be as sound as those of the majority.

The decisions to be made by the committees are most important and we must take all the necessary steps to prevent lives from being destroyed, or health endangered, because of a hasty decision.

It took the medical profession many centuries to gain the trust and the consideration of the people for its devotion to life and the relief of suffering. The best medical tradition has always showed deep concern for the life of innocent defenceless, weak or crippled human beings.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Now, we are asked to change all that and to renounce one of the main provisions of the Hippocratic Oath, which reads as follows:

I will give no deadly drug to any, though it be asked of me, nor will I counsel such, and especially I will not aid a woman to procure abortion.

Modern medicine provides us with hospitals and techniques which surpass anything mankind has known so far; nonetheless, we are constantly told that the progress of medical sciences dehumanizes the patient. The patient has become a "heart case", a "brain case" and so on.

We feel sure that the legislation on abortion will speed up this process. The doctor recommending abortion will become, reluctantly perhaps, a sort of quality expert. As his counterpart in industry, his responsibility will be to reject substandard, abnormal human beings.

There is no easy solution to the abortion problem and it is a mistake to try to solve it through a vague legislation.

Because of its complexity, we cannot hope to settle the problem easily.

The procedure to follow is quite different. Respect of human life throughout its various development stages should be promoted through education and educational laws. A serious study should be undertaken on the frequency of illegal abortions and on the measures to be taken to eliminate them. Such a procedure must promote medical research and really attempt to make available to moth-

ers in trouble the resources of medicine and psychiatry. It must ensure a greater understanding of unwed mothers and of their children and actually meet their needs. It must promote research and the implementation of a more adequate social and family policy.

Everybody seems to agree on the meaning of the word life. But we are unable to define health, because this term is quite ambiguous. It is all very well for the legislature to use it, but somebody else will have to interpret it. Numerous pieces of legislation give rise to the same problem. I think the world life is clearly defined. We all know what we are talking about and we can actually tell if the life of such or such a woman is in danger.

Mr. Speaker, it is wise for the legislation to require that three doctors sign the certificate, and such is the main purpose of this motion. Doctors will enjoy some protection, patients will be assured that their case will receive serious consideration and will not be treated as mere correspondence.

Doctors who have authorized therapeutic abortions are certainly no criminals.

I feel this motion will clarify the legislation under consideration and that it will be approved by the house.

**Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, the comments which we could have made on that amendement were similar to those made when amendment No. 35 was under consideration. I had the opportunity yesterday to say a word on that amendment and the same remarks apply, but I would add that this afternoon, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) set forth the reasons why he rejected amendment No. 38.

Now, amendment No. 37 has the same meaning and the same motivation as amendments Nos. 35 and 38. Then, the same arguments apply and for the same reasons, the government cannot approve that new amendment.

**Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane):** Mr. Speaker, as mentioned by the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Cantin), the amendment now under consideration moved by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue) is a rehash of the one discussed yesterday.

Through a legal expedient, the Ralliement créditiste has decided to destroy the democratic mechanism which is Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, that the amendment brought in by the Ralliement créditiste is obviously a

[Mr. Rodrigue.]

method, a means to snatch away from the Canadian people the exercise of democracy, that is—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This afternoon, we have strictly confined ourselves to the amendments before us. We have been most conscientious. We are making rapid progress in the consideration of the amendments and we find the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) is not justified in making such remarks, because they are out of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. If the point of order the hon. member is making is that possibly the hon. member for Matane is out of order, I must say that from what I have heard so far I am in agreement. I have been paying fairly close attention to the debate this afternoon and endeavouring to apply the rules of relevancy in order to expedite this matter. I would now invite the hon. member for Matane, if he wants to contribute further to the debate, to restrict his remarks to the amendment before us.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane):** Mr. Speaker, the Ralliement créditiste has been out of order for 19 days. I dare them to say how—

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. De Bané:** I would ask the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) to wait until I am finished.

**Mr. Caouette:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. De Bané:** All right, go ahead.

**Mr. Caouette:** I think this is no business of the member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) who is presently behaving like a clown. He is out of order, and to show how smart he is, he is constantly picking on Créditistes. The member for Matane knows we are ready for an encounter anywhere, because we can settle the hash of a hundred like him.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. As I pointed out to the hon. member for Matane, it

is sometimes difficult to apply the rules of relevancy. In the first instance the Chair must respect the rights of hon. members to express their points of view, and one must hear that point of view before one can judge whether or not it is relevant. At that point it is sometimes apparent to other hon. members that the remarks go beyond what appears to be relevant. The Chair attempts as far as possible to apply the rules with fairness to all hon. members. I think it is in the interest of the application of these rules of relevancy that hon. members restrict their remarks to the matter before the house.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. De Bané:** Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that it will not be the member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) or the admirers of Hitler and Mussolini who will teach us the rules of democracy.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I again point out to the hon. member for Matane that the Standing Order and the citations are very specific in respect of relevancy. I am wondering whether, if we continue to proceed in this way, we will advance the legislation before us. I can caution the hon. member only so many times.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. De Bané:** That minority is trying to—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. De Bané:** Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal specifically with the amendment under consideration, but I cannot refrain from saying a word, apart from the amendment, about the supporting arguments put forward by members of the Ralliement créditiste. And it is with that in mind that, before dealing with that specific point, I wish to say that the Ralliement créditiste is holding up the business of the house after its members tried to secure the voters' support which failed them at the last election.

I remind you that, in the Matane constituency, Créditistes did not muster 10 per cent of the votes while the whole campaign hinged on the abortion problem, and they were defeated on that particular issue—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I think this is the third time I have pointed out to the hon. member that the rules in respect of relevancy are very specific. Remarks of hon. members must be directed to the amendment. I intend to enforce these rules as forcefully as I can, but I should also point out to the hon. member that if I were to allow him to continue in this fashion I would then have no option but to allow other hon. members to pursue the same course. This would only produce disorder in the house, and my responsibility is to maintain order. Let me point out to the hon. member that he must confine his remarks to the specific amendment before us. The rule of relevancy applies to him as it does to all other hon. members, and I intend to enforce it in respect of all hon. members.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. De Bané:** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you for the shrewdness and the fairness with which you are presiding over the debates of this house. As for the amendment before us, it is, once more thanks to a legal fiction, the repetition of the motion which has just been defeated this afternoon by 90 per cent of the members.

Mr. Speaker, what is the Ralliement Créditiste trying to achieve with this amendment? We have just heard the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue) repeat a lot of platitudes and nonsense, while the bill is the first attempt to regulate therapeutic abortion in Canada. Never has a physician who had performed a therapeutic abortion been prosecuted in Canada in the last 100 years. An effort is now being made at last to regulate this vexing subject.

In view of the democratic system, that is to say of the equality between men, I respect the opinion of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue) since no one has the right to thrust his opinion on someone else. But when a minority has been trying for 19 days with amendments such as today's which is a repetition of yesterday's to make its opinion prevail, I submit that those people are trying to have the minority rule the majority. And I fear the day when these disciples of Hitler and Mussolini would have the majority, for we can see how they act, although they are but a minority today.

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, you called the hon. member to order at least four times and he has overlooked your remarks. I would therefore invite you to name this member and to expel him from the house.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. There was a moment when I thought the hon. member for Matane was dealing specifically with the amendment. I would suggest, however, that his latter remarks tended to drift away from the amendment. I point out to all hon. members that the difficulty the Chair has is that we have the Standing Orders and the citations in Beauchesne, and we can only operate with the co-operation of hon. members, short of naming them. That is exactly the problem we face. I point out to the hon. member for Matane that the house proceeds best with the co-operation of hon. members; that is the only way we can really proceed. If the hon. member persists in being out of order, he puts the Chair in a very difficult position.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. De Bané:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to remind the house that it is not I, yesterday, who interrupted the Ralliement créditiste when the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) allowed himself to say that the Liberal party was made up of homosexuals. But I let them say these dirty things, Mr. Speaker, because I know that the worst thing these people can do is to underestimate the intelligence of the people. I want to come to this precise point: the amendment of the hon. member for Beauce. He knows very well—

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Caouette:** I rise on a point of order.

First I hear that the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) is now speaking without the permission of the authorities of his party. Nobody expected that.

Furthermore, as far as the point of order is concerned, we do not appeal to the intelligence of the member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) no more than we did yesterday, because we know he is deprived of any.

**Mr. De Bané:** The remarks which the member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) has just made prove that his stupidity can only be matched by his demagogy. This is what he just proved.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I would invite the hon. member to continue on the amendment specifically or I will be in a position where I must refuse to recognize him.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. De Bané:** Mr. Speaker, as I said, the bill as a whole is the first attempt to regulate a most serious act which has been carried out for the past 100 years without any regulation. The regulation found in the bill contains several checking and supervisory mechanisms, namely that of enabling the provincial department, in each province, to check whether the legislation has been enforced to the letter, and not as the member for Beauce attempted to suggest, that it would become abortion on request.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude with these words. This bill led to a referendum in the province of Quebec in the last election and the Ralliement créditiste wanted it that way. I find that the tactics used by that group at this time are absolutely unworthy of our democratic system.

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I might have been caught off my guard to speak to this amendment which is almost identical to the preceding one, I agree. Fortunately, the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) came to the rescue. (Untranslatable pun on "débaner"—(De Bané) and "dépanner" (come to the rescue.)

Mr. Speaker, it might be advisable to explain why we come back with amendments which are so similar, yet the wording of which is different. There is a very logical, very clear reason for that. We have been telling ourselves that if the government, and in particular the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) feel, for instance, that the wording of amendment 38 where the words "unanimous decision" would replace the word "a majority" is not acceptable, then we offer him an alternative through another amendment which this time the minister might find more acceptable more in conformity with legalistic terminology. That is why we return to the charge. There is nothing alarming in that. We are not trying deliberately to hold up the business of the house. We are merely trying to find a formula to help us accept more readily the legislative measure on abortion.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that there was an error at the start, when amendment No. 19, was placed at the end. Had it been studied at the beginning of the debate, all the other

amendments would have been cancelled automatically, which might have been more logical. Whereas now we are discussing small changes, to be made in the various paragraphs of clause 18, while we will soon be discussing the last amendment which proposes the deletion of clause 18. It must be understood that we are merely seeking the most suitable formula to the greatest number of members in this house. That is the only reason why we have a series of amendments the general purpose of which is the same.

An amendment on the official languages cannot be moved when we are dealing with abortion. It is obvious that all the amendments deal with abortion; and I cannot understand why some members cannot see that. It is obvious that the amendments are repetitious. We are dealing with abortion and all the amendments deal with it. One does not have to be exceptionally bright to understand these nuances.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, paragraph (c) of subsection (4) reads as follows:

(c) has by certificate in writing stated that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health,

Mr. Speaker, we have tried to get the term "likely" deleted. Since we failed, if the word "certificate", were followed by "in writing signed by the three members of the Committee, stated that in its opinion, the life of the mother cannot be kept safe from danger with the continuation of her pregnancy", as far as we are concerned, the amendment would solve the problem on abortion, and would make the law acceptable to us.

Far from being an empty measure it is something extremely specific. For someone who can read and understand, it is obvious that this amendment would provide us with all the guarantees which we are seeking, that is to prove to all Quebecers including the hon. member of Matane that this is no idle talk. If the hon. member for Matane wants to stake his seat I would be the first one to go and fight him in his constituency on that matter.

Mr. Speaker, to prove to you that we are sure of what we are saying when we maintain that we represent the public opinion and that of people we know quite well, people we took the trouble to consult, people who have responded to our calls and who have sent us loads of letters and documentation of all kinds, we take the liberty of discussing a problem which is not foreign to us but which we know quite well. This matter is so important to us that we do not think we are mistaken in defending the very right to life.

Mr. Speaker, if the minister would give serious consideration to this amendment he would realize that it summarizes the opinion of the Ralliement créditiste as a whole, which is at least the opinion of the whole province of Quebec. And when it is requested that such certificate allowing abortion be signed by the three members of the committee, this makes it slightly different. Some people may not realize it, but it is different indeed. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that through this amendment, which makes all the difference in the world, we are doing away with all the possible interpretations of the word "health". Abortion must then become justified within strictly defined limits: the danger to the mother's life. Consequently, by means of that amendment, we wish our position to be clarified as much as possible; and we are not the only ones who should show goodwill.

Goodwill should be shown by the government. Of the 44 amendments initially moved and later grouped together this amendment at least should be studied and given more consideration. If the minister were not content to kill time and wait for the end of this, we would long ago have proceeded to something else.

The decision authorizing an abortion must be reached in the most adequate manner possible, and, in this regard, even the authority of the doctors may be questioned. That is why the committee must be unanimous in its opinion that the continuation of the pregnancy would endanger the life of the mother. That gives the guarantee that we are looking for. The amendments to the Criminal Code that have been submitted would legalize abortion for various health reasons, that are not clearly defined, but that favour a wide interpretation. The effect of those amendments is to say to the medical profession: this is your problem, do what you want with it, we do not care.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the right way to deal with a problem as serious as this one. The question has been debated for a number of months, not to say a number of years, and the people appear to be bored with it. The reason is that, during the election campaign, the present Minister of Justice, as I clearly remember, had given to understand that amendments would be brought to the bill as submitted by our present Prime Minister who was then Minister of Justice. The people relied on the government to introduce the

amendments that would give the guarantees they wanted.

That is why at one time, people were not concerned with these problems of abortion and homosexuality. During the election campaign, our major issue was to object to abortion. So we are consistent with ourselves because we have been given the mandate to object to the abortion legislation. We abide by it, and we take—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Again I caution the hon. member that he is going beyond the specific amendment that is before the house. In any event, it is five o'clock.

**Mr. Gilbert:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In keeping with the wisdom and restraint of the New Democratic Party during this debate, I respectfully suggest to hon. members that we dispense with private members' hour and continue with this debate so we can finish it, complete the bill tomorrow and start with new business on Monday morning. I am sure that we have the co-operation of all members of the house.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Apparently there is no unanimous consent.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

**Mr. Deputy 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-165, an act to amend the Income Tax Act and the Estate Tax Act, without any amendment.

• (5:00 p.m.)

# PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy 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 Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Post Office Department—request for return of six-day mail delivery and counter service the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman)—Combines—failure by sugar refineries to obey court order; the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—"Don Messer's Jubilee", replacement by Canadian folklore program.

It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, private bills.

# PRIVATE BILLS

### AETNA CASUALTY COMPANY OF CANADA

The house resumed, from Friday, February 7 consideration of the motion of Mr. Wahn for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of Bill S-11, to incorporate Aetna Casualty Company of Canada.

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, I think that the position of the N.D.P. on this kind of private member's bill is well known, especially to the various sponsors of like bills on the government side of the house. This is the third time this bill has been before us for consideration and a great many of the members of our party have spoken on it at considerable length. I think that the words of the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) were certainly worthy of our consideration, and I might, with your permission, paraphrase some of them during my discussion of the bill today. Perhaps the most outstanding speech on this bill was made by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), a colleague of mine from British Columbia. His remarks have given us all a great deal of inspiration and cause to consider where this sort of activity is leading us so far as the direction of our financial institutions is concerned.

I feel that the bill before us is another example of a United States company attempting to get into that very lucrative, legalized racket, the insurance industry in Canada. This measure, which originated in the other place, is an attempt to have this company incorporated as the Aetna Casualty Company of Canada. We note with interest that it is a direct subsidiary of a United States company whose home office is in Hartford, Connecticut. It is well known that this company, under another name, has been doing business in Canada for a great number of years in the life insurance field. Now it wishes to expand into a great variety of other types of insurance coming under the heading of general insurance. I notice that the company would

like to increase its capitalization in order to enable it to take part in the general insurance business which would include among other things, fire insurance, various types of accident insurance, aircraft and automobile insurance, credit insurance, even earthquake insurance, as well as boiler insurance and falling aircraft insurance.

I do not understand the difference between aircraft insurance and the special type of insurance known as falling aircraft insurance but I am sure the company would be delighted to furnish this type of insurance if it were possible to make money for its shareholders by doing so. I notice also that the company is interested in extending its business into forgery insurance. It has taken an interest in the farm problems of this country because I notice it wishes to get into the hail insurance business. Community service clubs and similar organizations which arrange outdoor celebrations in our country and run the risk of losing money should the weather turn out to be inclement might well be interested in hail insurance.

The company is also interested in real property insurance. Again, despite the fact that we are well on the way to bringing medicare to most Canadians it wishes to become involved in sickness insurance. Apparently the company feels that coverage under the medicare plan will not be sufficient; it wants to expand its business in such a way as to bring greater security to the average Canadian. This is an altruistic move and an example of good corporate citizenship.

I see the company also wishes to provide sprinkler leakage insurance. This brings up all sorts of erotic connotations. I would be pleased if the hon. member who sponsored this bill would indicate what this type of insurance actually means. If it is needed in our country and if it provides a service which Canadians do not enjoy at the present time it would certainly be a point in favour of the bill. Theft insurance is well known to most of us; it is applicable as long as we make certain that we lock our doors. If we neglect to do so, I am told that in order to collect theft insurance the thing to do is to smash the lock with a hammer as soon as you get home in order to indicate to people in official circles that a theft has really taken place. Then there is water damage insurance. I suppose the need for that arises as a direct result of sprinkler leakage. As to insurance against wind storms, this is something in which all members of the house will be interested, judging from the debate here in recent days.

It is all very interesting and helpful but I think it begs the real question. The real question with regard to insurance in Canada, as in other parts of the world, is the influence which the insurance industry has on our financial institutions. I propose to read briefly from a book called "The Mortality Merchants" by G. Scott Reynolds, which is obtainable from the Library of Parliament. I am going to read, in fact, from the jacket. These words are presumably by the author, though I cannot be sure:

> Insurance companies today have such swollen reserves that they own or control 67 per cent of the nation's wealth—assets which are doing nothing to increase the death benefits the public is getting.

The book goes on to describe some of the things insurance companies are doing generally to mislead and rook the public.

A great many people are involved in the insurance industry and I am sure that a large number of them are providing an adequate service. I do not think we could do without various types of insurance. Certainly we have to accept some risk ourselves—and the "deductible" clause provides for this—but we cannot insure ourselves against all losses. There is a definite need for insurance in our country, and if we damn the activities of the various insurance companies this does not necessarily mean we are damning the concept of insurance in general. What is of particular concern to most people who are interested in the subject at all is the fact that insurance companies do not really provide the protection they say they do. There is very much in their selling techniques which is left to the imagination of the salesmen or may be implied by the efforts of the salesmen.

Then again, it seems to me there is almost endless duplication of the various services we have in Canada already. I cannot for the life of me understand why we should need any more of them. It is beyond my understanding that Aetna could come up with the statement that the public would benefit because competition within the industry would be increased. I have never seen this happen before, and there are a great number of insurance companies operating today. We find company after company, salesman after salesman, running around doing essentially the same things and, what is more, at the same price. I would be prepared to sit down and relinquish the floor if anyone in this house can show me how the multiplicity and variety of insurance companies has led in any meaningful way to lower rates of insurance to the general public. It seems to me it will do just the opposite. If

you have ten men running around doing what one man can do, then it seems to me that comparative costs will be somewhere in the neighbourhood of the power of ten. I do not see how this leads in any meaningful way to a reduction of costs or the provision of better protection for the Canadian public or, for that matter, the citizens of any other country.

• (5:10 p.m.)

This is not the only instance of duplication. Constantly, one company after another is vying for the consumers' dollars, and we are told that this will lead to lower prices. I do not think this is the result. When companies merge we are told it is an attempt to improve efficiency. I cannot see how one can contend on the one hand that rationalization brings about efficiency, and on the other hand that extra competition brings about efficiency. This is a contradiction in terms. You cannot have it both ways. It seems to me it has to be either one or the other

I should like to give an example of a related activity that has a great number of outlets and different brand names, namely, the gasoline industry. A great number of companies seem to feel that they should direct their best efforts to putting a gas station on every street corner in the country. This is done under the guise of competition of some sort. I think most of us here have noted that, with the exception of a few cut-rate places, most of the gas companies seem to arrive at precisely the same price for their products. As a matter of fact, it has been suggested that perhaps there really is not very much difference between their products. However, I think that marginal differences and services tend to be overemphasized in this field, as they do in the insurance field.

Another example of how the public is being misled is in the operation of the deodorant market. People seem to feel that if they buy a particular kind of deodorant they can come up smelling like a rose—no personal pun intended. There is an endless duplication of various types of deodorants on the market, and this seems to spur competition. However, I am not certain that it accomplishes much more than that, unless it is to line the pockets of the manufacturers of such commodities. Soaps are another example. Many—

**Mr. Wahn:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I would question whether the hon. member's remarks are directed to this bill, which relates to an insurance company. I realize he may be having difficulty in saying anything that has not been said before, but nevertheless we are very much interested in hearing remarks that are directed toward this particular subject matter. I submit that the hon. member's remarks about soap and deodorants are hardly relevant to the field of insurance, this type of insurance at any rate.

**Mr. Rose:** Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Wahn) that perhaps I did indulge in a mild excursion, but I felt it was necessary to do so in order to clear the air, as it were. I also felt that perhaps this was a collateral example of the kind of thing that is happening in many other industries However, let me assure the hon. member that I will desist from following this line because I certainly do not want to make him uncomfortable. I think the hon. member is entitled to hear a discussion of the merits of the particular bill he is sponsoring and therefore I will get right to the point.

What I am really trying to say is that it is very difficult in this kind of industry to justify another intrusion by a foreign-owned firm into the Canadian market on the ground that it is going to bring about better service to the insurance purchasing public of Canada. I have tried to make the point that rather than having too few insurance companies we already have too many, that this multiplicity of companies has not contributed anything in terms of efficiency of operation or reduced cost to the insurance buying public.

Instead of our approving this type of bill in this house, I am certain that Canadians would be more interested in the results of some kind of study along the lines of the Hall commission report on medicare so as to see whether or not we really do need further extensions in the general insurance field in this country. It seems to me we are always being told we do not have money to build homes, that we do not have money for schools, or that we do not have money for many of the essential services that we require in this country. Yet insurance companies are able to construct monstrous edifices to house their continually expanding office forces which, in my view, do little more than chase paper.

If such a committee of inquiry were struck to look into this field, it would probably come to the conclusion that some sort of public ownership of the general insurance field, as in the case, for instance, of the automobile insurance field in Saskatchewan, would enhance service to Canadians. This service is required. I think insurance companies tend to grow fat on the real or imagined suffering of people generally, and particularly from their need for security.

I believe I have said enough about this matter to outline to the house the point I am making in the discussion of this bill. In conclusion I suggest that what we have to do is to see to it that extensions of foreign-owned insurance companies in this country are discouraged unless they are prepared to vest at least 50 per cent of their ownership with the Canadian people. If that were the case, when legislation such as this was brought before the house I think the members of this party would be much more prepared to support a plea for incorporation.

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to carry on with the trend of thought pursued by my colleague. So far as Canadian ownership of insurance companies is concerned, I am sure that the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Wahn), who introduced this bill in the house, must feel a little ashamed when day after day he reads in the newspapers that individual companies incorporated in Canada or companies that are supposed to be good corporate citizens are not even attempting to concern themselves about Canada generally, or even to concern themselves about recognizing the laws of the land. I am sure it is only right that I should refer specifically to an analogy that I think is most pertinent in this particular case. May I refer to a Headline in today's *Globe and Mail* which reads: "Cuba To Buy Flour Worth $29 Million."

• (5:20 p.m.)

I draw to the attention of the hon. member sponsoring the bill that in the case of flour mills we have a situation that is analogous to that of insurance companies in this country. Many of our insurance companies and flour mills are controlled by United States interests. The article I have before me says that Canada sold $22 million worth of flour to Cuba. Actually, the sale was to the Soviet Union but the flour is to go to Cuba. The article says that the main mills involved are Ogilvie Flour Mills of Montreal and Maple Leaf Mills of Toronto. The order was divided among Canadian mills, each of which is to supply a share. The significant words in the article are these, and I invite the hon. member to pay attention. It says that not participating in the sale to Cuba were Canadian flour mills owned or controlled by United States interests. Those foreign controlled mills were prevented from selling to Cuba because of the provisions of the United States trading with the enemy act. The article ends by saying that 1969 sales are equivalent to about 15 million bushels of wheat.

May I also remind the hon. member for St. Paul's of what has been happening to another Canadian company, Robin Hood Flour Mills. That company is controlled by United States interests and in Moose Jaw a mill of that company was closed, resulting in lost employment for many people of the area. The Robin Hood Company is talking of closing other mills across Canada, largely because it is prevented from selling wheat to some countries by virtue of United States regulations governing its parent in the United States. Surely a company in this country should not be affected by regulations passed in another country, and here I refer specifically to the United States trading with the enemy act. Robin Hood, which is dominated by Minneapolis Milling, may have to close many Canadian mills, to the great humiliation of Canada.

The same sort of argument applies to foreign dominated insurance companies. We want to see insurance companies in this country which are owned by Canadians. We do not want to see in the case of insurance companies the situation that applies to companies such as International Petroleum, owned by Standard Oil of New Jersey. I use International Petroleum as an analogy because although it is United States owned its head office is in Toronto. Recent publications show that Canada's name is mud in Peru, largely because of the actions of this company which has its head office in Toronto.

Returning to the other part of the analogy, the insurance companies, I submit that we should not have in this country insurance companies which are subsidiaries of parent companies in the United States. I therefore suggest to the hon. member who is sponsoring this bill that he withdraw it from the order paper. Considering the lost wheat sales that affect our western farmers and considering the bad name International Petroleum has given Canada, I submit that the hon. member ought to consider withdrawing this bill from the order paper.

If an insurance company wants to do business in this country it ought to make sure that any bill to incorporate it includes a clause saying that the company is Canadian owned or very shortly after incorporation will become Canadian owned. When a bill like that came before the house recently it was passed and the members of this party did not object to it. But unless there is such a clause in such bills to incorporate this party will oppose these applications. I think we owe that to the Canadian people. I therefore suggest that hon. members sponsoring bills like the

one now before us—and I know they act in good faith—make sure that such a clause is included in their bills.

Having said that I now move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis):

That this bill be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months hence.

The record shows that when this bill first came forward the chief spokesmen for the company were from across the border. I have in my hand a copy of the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce of the other place. It is issue No. 4, dated Wednesday, October 23, 1968. I see that two individuals from Hartford, Connecticut, appeared before the committee. The general manager of the Canadian office appeared, but his origin is not indicated. Of course, the parliamentary agent also appeared before the committee. It seems that the company to be incorporated was to be a new insurance company with power to transact all classes of insurance except life insurance. On page 41 of the proceedings Mr. R. Humphrys, Superintendent of Insurance, is reported as having said in part:

If incorporated the company would be owned by the Aetna Casualty and Surety Company, a United States company that has been authorized to transact insurance in Canada over many years.

He went on to say:

Foreign companies can come into Canada and become registered under the insurance companies acts and transact business here on a branch basis if their financial condition is sound. This is a very common method of doing business in Canada.

I have already referred to our lost wheat sales and to the activities of the International Petroleum Company, with headquarters in Toronto. Flour and petroleum interests in Canada controlled from within the United States have not behaved as good corporate citizens. Mr. Humphrys went on to say:

Many of them, however, form or purchase Canadian incorporated companies and do business in Canada through the Canadian subsidiary.

I ask the hon. member sponsoring this bill whether the company wishing to be incorporated will be a good corporate citizen of this country or will it behave as other subsidiaries of United States companies have behaved? It seems that some of them do not intend to obey the laws of this country and do not intend to be good corporate citizens. In fact in many cases, as I have mentioned, they have certainly blackened the name of Canada.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

• (5:30 p.m.)

The desire here is to form a new Canadian company and direct the Canadian business of this group through a Canadian subsidiary. It might not be too bad if the subsidiary were prepared to live up to the laws of Canada and become Canadian owned within a predetermined time. But when a U.S. company bought Robin Hood Flour of Canada it was made clear there was no intention of allowing the Canadian company to export flour to the U.S.S.R. or Cuba. It is a complete disgrace that a company like Minneapolis Milling can dictate to Robin Hood Flour and so do harm to the Canadian economy. This is what will happen if we continue to allow these foreign insurance companies to be incorporated in Canada.

I believe I have laid the groundwork to which the facts of this case may be applied, Mr. Speaker. I believe that hon. members who insist on sponsoring bills such as this, with no provision for the companies concerned to become Canadian owned, will now hesitate to sponsor such bills. I have drawn the attention of the house to the fact that we must be very careful about incorporating companies that do not intend to become good corporate citizens.

We appreciate those companies that do live up to our laws and are good citizens, but there are too many that have no intention of living up to our laws. I conclude by urging hon. members to give consideration to the points I have put forward.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, the first thing I wish to do is to congratulate the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) upon moving the amendment to this bill. I would also like to compliment him on his remarks, and I wish to support them. I also wish to say the same thing with respect to the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose).

As we all know, Bill S-11, an act to incorporate Aetna Casualty Company of Canada, was introduced in the Senate, and was first discussed in this house by the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Wahn) on December 19 last. We must ask many questions when we debate a bill like this, and I would like to hear the hon. member for St. Paul's answer many of the questions that not only I but other hon. members wish to ask about bills of this sort. We have been asking questions relating to such things as foreign ownership, the control of the company, and why this company wishes to be incorporated in Canada.

## THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, it is the desire of the Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General that this Honourable House attend him immediately in the chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate Chamber.

• (5:50 p.m.)

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:

An Act to amend the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation Act.

An Act to incorporate Transcoastal Life Assurance Company.

An Act respecting The Quebec Savings Bank.

An Act to amend the Co-operative Credit Associations Act.

An Act to amend the Farm Machinery Syndicates Credit Act.

An Act to prevent the introduction or spreading of pests injurious to plants.

An Act to provide compensation to farmers whose agricultural products are contaminated by pesticide residue, and to provide for appeals from compensation awards.

An Act to amend the Income Tax Act and the Estate Tax Act.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the wish of the house that we now call it six o'clock?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

---

### AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### CRIMINAL CODE

#### REPORT STAGE

The house resumed consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 37, Mr. Rodrigue.



[*Translation*]

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, I still have five or six minutes left. I was discussing the amendment requiring that the certificate be signed by three members of the committee, when in its opinion, the life of the mother cannot be kept safe from danger with the continuation of her pregnancy.

In order to avoid any mistake or medical error, it is important to get the formal guarantee duly signed by the committee and permitting the abortion so that should one or even two of the three members of the committee be too permissive there would still be a safeguard, since all three members have to sign. It seems to us that this is a point which should be considered very seriously because should abortion ever be accepted, although we are still against it, we are trying to sensitize members and public opinion to that problem.

We realize more and more that the problem is far from being settled and that thanks to our comments, a good number of people have been aware for a while now, that the legislation which is being crammed down their throats—and I did say crammed—is not all it should be.

If people consider all the amendments which we have introduced, particularly the amendment which we are discussing now, they will easily detect the direction we want to give this legislation, so that even the most prudish, the most scrupulous people could say: "At least we know that they will not go beyond just and reasonable limits, and that all those people who would have liked to use this legislation to achieve more or less legitimate purposes, will find themselves foiled.

Mr. Speaker, our efforts to see the Minister of Justice take this into consideration are not prompted by our desire to win a battle and prove that we were right. It is not that at all. We simply want to better protect society. It is this protection that we have set our hearts on.

And if we did not have so many examples or experiences based on facts, we could perhaps be less informed on the subject and our remarks would be more or less useful.

But when we rely on the experience of all those who accepted abortion, when we consider the evidence given last year on Bill

C-195 and this year on Bill C-150, we believe that government members should set aside their pride and admit once and for all that this bill C-150 includes clauses that must definitely be reexamined, clauses the effects of which are so serious that we cannot allow ourselves to pass them without sounding a note of warning.

When we are accused of being a mere handful to maintain that certain clauses should be opposed, it is somewhat false considering the stand taken in this house, for if we applied the solution advocated by the leader of the Ralliement créditiste, the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), we would ask the people themselves, by means of a referendum, what they think about it.

And if we could say that 90 per cent of the members in this house are in favour, and 10 per cent against, we would still maintain that the people as a whole are against. This is no surprise to us, considering the many empty seats in the house.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I would ask the hon. member to limit his remarks to the amendment, which reads as follows:

—"has by certificate in writing signed by the three members of the committee, stated that in its opinion, the life of the mother cannot be kept safe from danger with the continuation of her pregnancy".

I wonder what these empty chairs have to do with this amendment.

**Mr. Matte:** The empty chairs are in perfect harmony with the empty heads which one sees on the Treasury benches—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I would like to remind the hon. member of the warning that was given to one of his colleagues this afternoon asking him to weigh his words carefully.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, the whole thing boils down to this: if the house were ever to accept section 18 of the bill concerning abortion, and if the amendment presented by the hon. member for Beauce were added to it, the minister and ourselves would have an opportunity to have section 18 adopted without offending the particular principles of the majority of the people, simply because we believe, as an important part if not an immense majority of the people, that one could think: "The guarantee is really foolproof, seeing that this certificate must be signed by the three members of the committee, when all three are fully convinced that there is no other way to preserve the life of the mother." This guarantee would make it possible to accept the legislation under certain conditions.

This is why such an amendment would enable us to agree with the minister, and to stop, once and for all, this debate which has lasted far too long.

• (8:10 p.m.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is the house ready for the question? All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** In my opinion, the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 75 (11), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford)** moved motion No. 19:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting therefrom clause 18.

Mr. Speaker, we are to study tonight the amendment which I have the honour of sponsoring, that is motion No. 19. This is the last of the amendments our party will have presented with a view to improving this famous bill.

I believe 44 amendments were introduced at the start which later on were reduced in number. Now, of those 44 amendments, some were sponsored by government members, others by Progressive Conservative members and several by Creditiste members.

The object of those amendments, Mr. Speaker, was to improve the bill now before us, although it was studied by the committee on justice and legal affairs and in this house in order to make it less nefarious and less odious to the people. After a few days of discussion in the house, we realize that the government party and more specifically the

Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) have not deemed it advisable to accept any of those amendments.

That is why we are wondering why the Minister of Justice has not given us any acceptable reasons for rejecting those amendments; why he has so stubbornly refused each and every one of those amendments that were clear, to the point, and which were intended to correct objectively the bill under study.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I should like to remind the hon. member that he may not speak on a decision or decisions already taken by the house, and not by the Minister of Justice.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your remarks. I was about to deal with the purpose of the amendment.

The house has voted against those amendments. Because the minister has given us very poor reasons, or rather no reason at all for rejecting them, we have had to bring in this amendment which I am sponsoring tonight. All the amendments we have so courageously and brilliantly fought for in this house having been rejected, we have no other choice but to present the amendment now before us, which proposes the deletion of clause 18 from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, our amendments are substantiated by strong evidence, as this bill is of general interest for all levels of our society. Our arguments were based not on feelings but on scientific and sociological facts. We have not had the opportunity as yet to put forth our objections or our views on the moral arguments which are actually indicated in the enforcement of such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, during the last few days we have brought forward arguments from skilled doctors known throughout Canada, so that we can show their value to the committee on justice and legal affairs as well as to this house.

We heard arguments and evidence given by gynaecologists, who are well-informed on that subject, and are very interested in the bill.

We also heard the views and objections from psychologists, psychiatrists and pediatrists, who stated the reasons why they unanimously object to the bill before us.

We also quoted in this house the arguments of associations, hospitals, parents, children's aid societies, and many other valid testimonies against this odious bill received from every part of Canada.

Tonight I would like to bring forward arguments, which have not yet been set forth in this house, because our amendments were not open to moral arguments against abortion.

Mr. Speaker, it is very well to tell us, at the committee on justice and legal affairs, that we should not set forth moral arguments in connection with such legislation, but I claim that morality is important in our legislation and it is important also for a nation.

Not only is morality important, but because justice, which should be part of our legislation, is the basis of our moral principles, we must bring about moral arguments against this bill.

Morality, Mr. Speaker, is the backbone of a people. It is its compass, and the peoples who gave up their moral principles are now under the sign of the hammer and the sickle. I do not believe that the Canadian people is yet ready for legislation adopted in all Communist countries of the world. In the light of public opinion, I do not believe that the Canadian people wish this bill to be passed. This is the reason why we are so strongly opposed to it, not only on moral grounds but for scientific and sociological reasons as well and for the future of our race.

As to the remarks which have been made regarding moral arguments against the omnibus bill and particularly against abortion, I would like to read an excerpt from an open letter from the Reverend Father John Moss, addressed to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) which was published in the *Canadian Register*. I quote:

• (8:20 p.m.)

The object of this article is to protest against the reintroduction in parliament of the legislation called the omnibus bill, which, in my opinion, is designed to amend the Criminal Code to such an extent that it becomes ominous and disquieting for thousands of Canadian citizens.

I am referring particularly to the sections relaxing the laws on abortion, to use the elegant expression, or on generalized infanticide, to use honest language.

These words are from the Reverend John Moss and they reflect the opinion of the Catholic Canadians, who make up half of our population. In his conclusions, he said:

The government whose policy is not to get involved in what goes on in bedrooms should not propose what should be done in delivery wards.

He asked the members of parliament who were to study the legislation not to miss the macabre humour of that American psychiatrist who, on reading a bill similar to our omnibus bill, stated that if one of his patients ever wrote such a piece of legislation, he would never allow such patient to leave the mental institution.

Obviously that is not flattering for the promoters of the bill, the Prime Minister of Canada and the present Minister of Justice.

In an editorial entitled "Abortion, from Solomon to P. E. Trudeau", which was published in the February 1, 1968, issue of the magazine *Maintenant*, two laymen, Mr. Vincent Harvey and Mrs. Hélène Pelletier-Baillargeon, answer those who, along with the promoters of that ignominious bill, allege that pluralism in our society, that is to say, a multiplicity of creeds, as well as social expediency, justify legalization of abortion. I quote:

That is an over-simple opinion. However, a country which fully adheres to the Charter of Human Rights, rehabilitates the handicapped, educates orphans, treats the retarded and abolishes the death penalty is also a country which, whenever the least doubt remains in favour of the life or the innocence of one of its members, abstains from intervening against him. In fact, such a country always requires irrefutable evidence to condemn a criminal, requires duly certified medical certificates to legally confirm a citizen's death. Now, in such a doubtful case as intra-uterine life, far from waiting until convincing evidence is available, the State legislates as if the embryo were not actually a human being, since it sometimes allows it to be destroyed.

The argument of pluralism, in our opinion, gives us food for thought. Since no civilized State can today authorize the destruction of a life considered innocent or still fully human by many . . . then such a State implicitly at least, even though it denies making any option whatever, has already made one, that is by refusing to acknowledge the human personality of a foetus and considering it a "thing" which may be disposed of in the name of alleged higher interests.

Such legislation is not requested by the people but only by a few whose true motives we cannot understand but who make such an infernal turmoil that the government has listened attentively to them.

We should perhaps find another reason which could explain such amendments respecting abortion. At least this is what Reverend Father Marcel Marcotte, Jesuit, claims in an article entitled "Abortion, morality and law", published in the February 1968 issue of *Relations*.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is what Father Marcotte said:

As things are going, we will finally think that Canada is definitely an Anglo-Saxon country whose umbilical cord has really not been cut somewhere. No sooner had Great Britain voted new laws on divorce, on homosexuality or even, these recent months, on abortion than already the Canadian government falls into step and follows close behind.

In Canada, from the ashes of political colonialism is a new colonialism, of a judicial nature . . . coming forth with new life? That is how they sometimes solve controversial questions in Ottawa.

This is how requests and protests from Quebec . . . in connection with an important and precise matter . . . and in the present case—

—from Christian Canada—

—often are received: they are hushed up, swept under the rug and altogether treated unfairly. Small wonder then, that so many Canadians are complaining about their lot and that they dream, occasionally, of autonomous political structures, thanks to which their voice will cease, at last, to be a cry in the wilderness?

We are blamed, we, the Creditistes, and Christians in general, for using moral arguments in our opposition to various sections of the omnibus bill, especially where abortion is concerned.

You must have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the supporters of the omnibus bill have also brought out moral arguments.

For instance, the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) in the speech he delivered on April 17, stated as recorded on page 7646 of the House of Commons Debates, and I quote:

—a group of theologians from Laval University—

But who are those theologians whose names have not been mentioned? Why did the hon. member for Trois-Rivières not identify the theologians who are members of the committee he mentioned?

Another hon. member whom I respect, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), as well as certain members of his party do not like to hear the Créditistes, when they discuss abortion, take into account the moral requirements and teachings of the Church to which they are proud to belong.

Nevertheless, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre did not hesitate to refer to the authority of a few Protestant denominations to assert his opposition to the clause on lotteries in Bill C-150. This is what he said in this connection, as reported in the official report of the House of Commons of April 21, on page 7776:

We have had a good deal of correspondence about Bill C-150. I should like to say that I am particularly proud of the kind of letters and submissions that have reached my desk from the churches and church organizations. The thing that interests me is the stand that most of the churches have taken on the question of lotteries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre could use the arguments of certain Protestant churches to object to lotteries and even bingos, there is all the more reason for the Créditistes and Christians

in general, to use the authority of their religious leaders as far as abortion, infanticide or the murder of innocents are concerned, because this bill, Mr. Speaker, by legalizing abortions is legalizing the murder of human beings, according to our beliefs and our religious convictions.

The testimonies I am about to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, are not those of anonymous theologians such as those whom the hon. member for Trois-Rivières quoted; they are but the highest authorities of our Church.

First, here are the rules of conduct laid down by Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical letter on Christian Marriage of December 31, 1930:

But another very grave crime is to be noted—

—the encyclical letter refers to a very grave crime—

—which regards the taking of the life of the offspring hidden in the mother's womb. Some wish it to be allowed and left to the will of the father or the mother; others say it is unlawful unless there are weighty reasons which they call by the name of medical, social, or eugenic "indications"—

—As to the "medical and therapeutic indication"

• (8:30 p.m.)

—that is the purpose of the bill—

—to which, using their own words, we have made reference, Venerable Brethren, however much we may pity the mother whose health and even life is gravely imperiled in the performance of the duty allotted to her by nature, nevertheless what could ever be a sufficient reason for excusing in any way the direct murder of the innocent?

This is what the Church thinks: therapeutic abortion is the direct murder of an innocent.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) talked about changing times, and ecuminism that would allow for new solutions.

Now, here is a text of Vatican II, entitled: "The Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Today's World" in which the council states:

Everything opposed to life itself, as well as any kind of homicide, genocide, abortion, euthanasia, all those practices and others similar are truly infamous.

The Pope and the council Vatican II took a strong stand against abortion. Canadian bishops, who are the pastors of half the people in Canada, also declared against abortion, which is advocated by this bill.

The Canadian bishops, whose voice was smothered off-handedly by the present government, when the bill was introduced, saw fit to reassert their position on December 5, 1968:

We reaffirm that it is not possible to make of abortion a purely personal question as if, in such a case, the life of another person were not involved at all.

And the cardinals, archbishops, and bishops of Canada said:

We ought to remind Catholics that they are bound to comply with the teachings the Church, regardless of a legislation intended for a pluralistic society.

When the Canadian episcopacy speaks thus, how can the Prime Minister claim to be a Roman Catholic and introduce a bill which is offensive for Roman Catholics and disapproved by his Church?

How can the Quebec Liberal members claim to voice the opinion of their Catholic electors, when they are in conflict with the most recent guidelines of the leaders of their Church? How can they prefer the guidelines of their party to those of the Canadian episcopacy, without betraying the confidence of their Catholic electors who, themselves, are going to follow the guidelines of the Roman Catholic church? This is a case of conscience for them, but the Ralliement Créditiste will also want, as a matter of conscience to recall to all Quebekers how the Liberals of that province have betrayed them, how Quebec Liberals are behaving—

**Mr. Cantin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cantin) is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Cantin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order because I think the hon. member grossly overdoes it and goes far beyond the scope of the proposed amendment. I think he should limit himself to the matter in hand, which is the repealing of clause 18. I do not see how the political behavior of Liberals or even the question of religion for that matter can be brought into the picture. Let us deal strictly with the subject matter of the debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I would therefore ask the hon. member, following that point of order, to stick to the amendment being examined.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I must say that the Parliamentary

Secretary to the Minister is completely off the track, since in the committee on Justice and Legal Affairs—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I asked the hon. member for Shefford to stick to his own amendment.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I shall do so, but I wish to say that my reasons were quite in order. If they hurt the government members, this will not prevent me from stating them in this house.

I wish to say that Quebec federal Liberal M.P.s—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order please. I suggest that the hon. member's last words are out of order.

**Mr. Caouette:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Témiscamingue on a point of order.

**Mr. Caouette:** My colleague from Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) is bringing in evidence which, it seems to me, relates directly to the amendment he is defending tonight and the other hon. member who spoke a moment ago is out of order, because his comments had nothing to do with the amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I suggest—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. May I remind the hon. member for Témiscamingue that it is incumbent upon the Chair to decide whether hon. members are out of order or not. I therefore ask the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) to restrict himself to his amendment and I remind him that his last words about some party or other have no connection whatever with the amendment moved by him.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I shall stick to the amendment which calls for the deletion of any mention of abortion in this bill. The attitude of some hon. members, in this house, is an insult to the highest moral authorities in this country. The time will come when they will be paid in kind. Why authorize abortion?

Mr. Speaker? It is to give more freedom to the depraved people in this country, and to please the easy-going women of our society who could not care less about their neighbours and our race. It is also to please credulous girls who fall easily into the gutter and also to please flighty ones who go out night after night to conquer new lovers, and also to please dissipated women—



**Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Rondeau:** —who lack foresight—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Cantin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cantin).

**Mr. Cantin:** One only has to listen to the hon. member to realize he is out of order. He can keep his own morality to himself, but he should have regard for the morality of others. We are here only as legislators, and not as moralists. We are here to legislate.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

• (8:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) rising on the same point of order?

**Mr. Woolliams:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I do not see how anyone can object to anything the members of the Creditiste Party are saying. Although I do not endorse the delay in proceeding with this bill, I do not see how members on the government side of the house can object. After all, if the Creditiste amendment to delete clause 18 is accepted, it will be just about the only change to our abortion law.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I wonder whether the consciences of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and his parliamentary secretary are uneasy tonight? After all, on an earlier occasion we had the solemn promise that this bill would be divided. Perhaps the conscience of the Minister of Justice is sensitive. We ought to let members of the Creditiste Party continue their speeches.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I agree with part of the hon. member's remarks. The latter part of his remarks were out of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rondeau:** Thank you again, Mr. Speaker.

I shall try to collect my thoughts. My thinking is clear but I think the interruptions aim only at causing us to lose the thread of our speech.

I was saying that if abortion is accepted it is only in order to please.

I was talking about the unforeseeing dissipated women who act first and think afterwards, those who are unrepentant lovers and cannot tell right from wrong any more, and about the too obliging married women, still unaware that life is a serious business.

Mr. Speaker, a people always like to find and to recognize itself in its laws. The laws are the image of a nation. But the bill before us, and especially abortion, does not reflect the way of thinking of the Canadian people. And if we fought so fiercely against the bill, in this house, especially against abortion, it is because we know—and we are convinced of that—that such a legislation is not a true image of the Canadian nation.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Our statutes give us an idea of Canadian morals, of Canadian traditions, of the Canadian way of thinking and of Canadian history, but the bill we have been discussing for some weeks is altogether inconsistent with Canadian ways of thinking. When, for instance, we pass in parliament a bill that runs counter to the views of a nation, we sow the seeds of anarchy in the midst of that nation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to deal with this amendment too long but it is vitally important for the Canadian people. And that is the reason why we want it to be passed in the house. And we ask all the members, for whom conscience still has a meaning, to kindly vote according to their conscience and to pass this amendment so that we shall not be ashamed before the Canadian people and so that our children also will not be ashamed of the hon. members and heads of family in this house.

If, unfortunately this confounded bill were to be passed by this house, the blood of millions of foetuses which will be assassinated in the future, be upon the Liberal party and upon the Minister of Justice and their issue.

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, the amendment which is now before us requires that the part of Bill C-150 relating to abortion, that is to say clause 18 of the bill concerned, be completely repealed, entirely removed.

But we are accused of being demagogues, of wanting to make political capital out of our stand on abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that any member of the house could have shouldered the same responsibilities on clause 18 as the members of the Ralliement créditiste. And we were not motivated by demagoguery. As leader of the Ralliement créditiste, I have observed the conscientious job which has been done by each of the members of the Ralliement in the house. Be it the member for Champlain (Mr. Matte), the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), or any of their colleagues, they were earnest, well informed, cognizant of authoritative sources, and what they told the house was full of common sense. They certainly did not play politics.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I received a letter which cannot be suspected of partisanship, as it could have been sent to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). It comes from the Sanctuary of the Sacred Heart in Pointe-aux-Trembles, Montreal—I am not quite sure of it, but I think it must be in the constituency of Mercier. It reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Caouette,

At our regular meeting—

The letter is dated May 6.

—the Capuchin Fathers of the sanctuary of the Sacred Heart of the Reparation, in Pointe-aux-Trembles, unanimously agreed on a special resolution to send their warmest congratulations for the humanitarian and Christian stand you and your group have taken in fighting the omnibus bill on matters dealing with abortion and homosexuality.

Together with all those who believe in the dignity of man and the greatness involved in being a Christian, we wish to pay a tribute to you and encourage you in—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I wish to kindly remind the hon. member for Témiscamingue that all he has said up to this point has nothing to do with the amendment before us and moved by his colleague from Shefford.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, this is a letter regarding abortion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I remind the hon. member that the house is not the right place to read all the congratulations that the Ralliment créditiste or any other party has received from all over the province.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, in this case I shall keep on quoting accurately the representations I get regarding abortion. I will go further than that. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the Chair, but if I am pushed too far, I shall get myself named and expelled from the house, in the name of human dignity. It seems to me the rules should be the same for everyone and applied in the same way.

I am quoting evidences concerning abortion. We moved a clear and precise amendment, in order to remove abortion issues from the bill. I am quoting excerpts which are not of a political nature but which express a feeling of human dignity.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I understand very well the hon. member, but the rules of the house apply to all, including the hon. member for Témiscamingue. A specific amendment has been moved by his colleague, the hon. member for Shefford, which reads as follows:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting therefrom clause 18.

I see that the hon. member understands very clearly what it is all about and I should like to remind him to keep to the amendment under consideration.

• (8:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Woolliams:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and with the greatest respect, this amendment to clause 18 gives any member, the opportunity to discuss any phase of the matter before us, which is abortion. There is nothing in the rules of which I am aware which prohibits an hon. member from reading a letter from someone saying the government is making the right choice or the wrong choice, taking the right course or the wrong course. I think the hon. member is in order.

This is an open debate. It is being held under the new rules. We are debating an amendment to delete clause 18, dealing with abortion, and with the greatest respect to your ruling, sir, I feel that the hon. member is on solid ground and can make his speech accordingly.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. Perhaps it is the opinion of the hon. member that he is on solid ground, but I would remind him that there is somebody who is responsible for the application of the rules of this house. There is a specific amendment before the house and I ask the hon. member to direct his remarks to the specific amendment, not to third reading of the bill.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I am not at all at the third reading stage of this bill, I am dealing with the amendment and I quote:

—be amended by deleting clause 18 from the bill.

I am giving the reasons why I approve this amendment that clause 18 be entirely deleted, as far as abortion is concerned. I am using evidence coming to me to explain the reasons why I approve this amendment and also to establish the unreasonable attitude of those who are against it, those who want to maintain in the bill clause 18 which we want to see eliminated, deleted. That is why I am stating here the congratulations we have received for our stand on abortion—not with regard to customs tariffs or even to homosexuality or to bingoes—but abortion.

I am unaware of any standing order that forbids me to quote evidence in support of my assertions about abortion, which we would like to see deleted from the bill.

Here we are encouraged and commended for the energy with which we defend the rights of the human being and the unerring teachings of the Vatican II council in this matter of abortion.

Yours truly,
The Capuchin Fathers of the Sacred Heart Sanctuary
Pointe-aux-Trembles, Montreal

Mr. Speaker, we have a great deal of evidence. I could go on quoting for 20 minutes tonight, all the time at my disposal. I would have enough to last two or three hours on third reading, because we intend to deal with the bill as a whole at that time. But tonight we are discussing the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) to delete from the bill the clause on abortion.

Besides representations from parish priests and mayors, I have the letters of two priests who congratulate us for our stand on the matter of abortion and our efforts to remove it from Canadian statutes.

We take examples in England where the system was established a year ago. Today they are sorry they have done so. In Canada, the Minister of Justice himself deep down is against the measure on abortion. I am convinced of that.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of a letter addressed to the Minister of Justice by Mrs. Claire Campbell, of Montreal. The minister has read the following part of her letter:

[*English*]

A vote for the Liberals last June was not a vote for the liberalization of abortion. The Campbell family ... voted for your party but it did not vote for the liberalization of abortion.

[*Translation*]

The Minister of Justice has that letter. Mr. Speaker, there are, of course, some people who are not pleased with the position we have adopted. But it is not the people of Canada who have asked the government for the bill on abortion. Who was it that urged the government to introduce this legislative proposal? Who is interested in having abortion legalized in Canada? The Minister of Justice is unable to tell us. Yet, he must know who is pushing the government to adopt such a measure. Others attack us by saying that we are trying to make political capital out of this. That is not our intention. The Liberals could say the same.

I am deeply convinced that the great majority of the Liberal members think exactly as we do, but partisanship prevents them from rising and saying so straight out.

One can detect a certain support on the government side as regards this bill. The Créditiste members are blamed, for instance, for delaying the work of the house on account of abortion. It is said that they are wasting the time of the house which is valuable.

This bill on abortion will not be with us for two days only once it is passed by the House of Commons. Once the principle underlying the legalization of abortion is established, future generations, in 50 or 100 years from now, will have to put up with its consequences.

The danger will not be felt tomorrow, but in 5 or 10 years from now. The impending downfall of a people through abortion will soon be legalized.

I have in my hand an article published in the Monday May 5 edition of the newspaper *Le Droit*, and written by Mr. Marcel Gingras:

The Omnibus Bill and the Créditistes.

Mr. Gingras said a while ago that this has nothing to do with morals. Mr. Gingras takes it upon himself to lecture us by saying that we are delaying the work of the house, that we are repeating the same things with respect to abortion, that we are fighting in vain, that we should allow the whole thing to be passed at full speed and enable the government to introduce other measures.

Mr. Speaker, we would see no objection to the government postponing consideration of Bill C-150 to six months from now and introducing a new piece of legislation tomorrow in order to help the unemployed and the unfortunate families in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gingras accuses us of wasting the time of the house and we hear commentators on the C.B.C. who blame us. However, they do not think of the future generations. They look at the tip of their noses and they can hardly see as far as that.

Fellows like Marcel Gingras and others like him will not prevent us, Mr. Speaker, from taking a stand, whether they like it or not. We have a duty to perform, as federal members, and we do perform it conscientiously, with conviction and with determination, and nobody will prevent us from doing our duty.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) said: You object to abortion because you are not doctors. We know we are not doctors, but we are intelligent enough to use documents supplied to us by doctors to appeal to the Minister of Justice and we have not only, as I said before, testimonies from religious organizations. I have here a text from the "Centre de liaison des Équipes Serena" written by two doctors, Mr. and Mrs. Serge and Suzanne Carreau, where it is said, and I quote:

Abortion is a direct aggression against the life of a human being which is developing—

The problem of abortion has not been studied with the seriousness it deserves by the government of Canada—

This was said by doctors and we have the right to repeat it in the house, to fight against the provisions of clause 18 in Bill C-150. I continue the quotation:

—that the members are placed in an unacceptable situation since they are refused a free vote on this question.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that members are not free to vote according to their conscience. To hell with the country as long as the party is safe, that is their guiding principle.

We will again be called demagogues. But they are the demagogues, Mr. Speaker, those who want to impose abortion upon the Canadian people, even if Canadians do not want it and have never asked for it from any government.

Mr. Speaker, the 250 Serena monitors who held their convention in Sherbrooke on May 3, 1969—just three days ago—urged the Canadian government to withdraw clause 18 of Bill C-150 on abortion and to establish a Royal commission to study this important matter.

That is a responsible organization. It is not a Créditiste, a Conservative, an N.D.P. or a Liberal organization. It is an honest, non-partisan, separate organization which has considered this question seriously before making its recommendations to the government.

The Minister of Justice sits unconcerned when some of his colleagues are calling us demagogues because we do not want to modernize Christian morality in Canada, by allowing our women to be aborted.

Mr. Speaker, here is a letter from an Englishman, it comes from Ottawa, Ontario—Harding Road—and deals with abortion; those people oppose abortion vehemently.

Mr. Speaker, here is a letter from the Alliance for Life, 13, Boulay St., Hull—in the riding of my hon. friend from Hull (Mr. Isabelle), also on abortion and I quote:

In Poland too abortion was legalized first of all for vague "medical" reasons—

—exactly what is going on in this house.

In 1956, those reasons were extended to include social reasons; to-day Polish laws on abortion are amongst the most permissive in the world.

They made a fiasco of it; so, apparently, it would seem that we in Canada must walk in the footsteps of those who led their nation to the most total and complete fiasco.

Mr. Speaker, here is a letter from Oshawa—I do not even know in which federal riding Oshawa is located—

• (9:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Dear Sir,

I have read your comments, along with others pro and con about this abominable omnibus bill now before Parliament, and admire your stand re the abortion section but add to it the other revolting sections.

Mr. & Mrs. D. F. Douglas,
Oshawa, Ontario.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we have dozens of ways.

I have another one here that comes from Vancouver and says:

[*English*]

Congratulations indeed on your fine fight in Commons against the disgraceful Trudeau government abortion bill.

[Mr. Caouette.]

It is at least a little consoling that we have at least one party in the House fearless enough to stand up for Christian principles which, despite all the cheap manoeuvring of "just society" politicians, never change.

Abortion, camouflage it as they will, is still just plain, cold child murder.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, to come back to the province of Quebec here is a letter from the Sacré-Cœur presbytery of McMasterville near Montreal:

A humble parish-priest wishes to express his profound admiration for the exceptional courage you showed with your 14 Créditistes members in your fight to the finish against the abortion bill.

You are not afraid to take a stand. Congratulations! It is all too rare nowadays.

Sincerely,

Pierre Paul Mongeau,
parish-priest, McMasterville.

He is not a Créditiste, Mr. Speaker, but a man who would like Christian principles to be respected.

A Christian from another parish in Saint-Léonard de Port-Maurice in Montreal—I do not even know in which federal county this parish is located—sent us the following letter, and I quote:

Though I do not share at all your opinions on monetary reform, let me congratulate you and your gallant colleagues on your magnificent fight to save the honour of Canada and the rights of God in the matter of abortion. Rest assured that many people back you and would like to join you in protest against this manipulation of public opinion and of the vote of the members in order to legalize crime. Stand fast and may the Lord protect you.

J. Parenteau, priest,
Saint-Léonard de Port-Maurice.

Mr. Speaker, similar messages have been pouring in from all parts of Canada. The minister also gets his share of representations and I want to repeat what I said a while ago: I am strongly convinced that the Minister of Justice, who is a Catholic as well as a christian, knows that we are right, but all sort of schemes and intrigues political or otherwise, compel him to remain seated and to try and defend that infamous abortion bill.

Mr. Speaker, nobody has asked that such a legislation on abortion or section 18 of the bill be introduced in the house. Let the government assume its own responsibilities.

A while ago, my colleague from Shefford stated so rightly, that once that bill is passed and becomes law, once abortion is legalized, its sponsors would incur the odium of it for the rest of their lives. Even within a few years, they might be cursed by the following

generations. Why? Because then people will witness a definite, complete and evident deterioration of the Canadian population. We should encourage a high birth rate instead of advocating abortion, as proposed in clause 18 of Bill C-150.

• (9:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Badanai):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

**Some hon. Members:** Carry on.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Badanai):** Has the hon. member the consent of the house to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Yes.

**Mr. Caouette:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall not abuse the generosity of my hon. colleagues on both sides of the house who are giving me the opportunity to conclude my remarks.

[*Translation*]

The stand we shall continue to take on this bill is well understood, I think, and I hope it will be by the Minister of Justice, the government and members of all parties. We have at heart the people's well-being.

Before you interrupt me, Mr. Speaker, to tell me that my time has expired, I should like to say that instead of bringing in legislation to legalize abortion, the minister should introduce a measure to encourage births in Canada and create economic conditions which would enable parents to raise their children properly, make families happy rather than disrupt them, since abortion will have positive effects once it is legalized and within the reach of the whole population.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak any longer tonight on this matter, but I am appealing to the minister before this bill or this clause 18 is passed. Let the minister discuss with the Prime Minister and the cabinet the wording of clause 18.

Up to now, nothing prevented a doctor from resorting to such a method if a mother was going to die. But today, they want to legalize it without reservations, not only if her life is in danger, but even when her health may be impaired. I say that this bill does not serve the best interests of the Canadian nation. This clause 18 runs counter to the rights of the human being. It does not respect the identity of the human being.

We ask parliament to delete it. I appeal to all members of other parties, so that we all assume our responsibilities as members of parliament, and not as servants of a political party, whichever it is. Let us have at least a free vote with respect to this clause 18. The vote being free for all members, I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members have enough morals to fight this clause 18, and delete it forever from bill C-150.

Mr. Speaker, we are not being discriminating. We merely ask that morality be respected, even if some hon. members believe that we should not attach any importance to morals when it comes to passing a clause like this one, dealing directly with abortion. We fight against this principle. We are against legalized abortion in Canada, because other countries that made the experiment bitterly repented it. Today, in our so-called civilized countries, our civilization rather prompts us to destroy the nation. It is not civilization any more, it is extreme barbarity.

Before concluding my comments, I say that our position as federal members was aimed at drawing the attention of the government and enlightening the Minister of Justice on several points of which he was perhaps unaware. My colleagues have quoted profound and responsible testimonies. The Minister of Justice learned something from my colleagues of the Ralliement créditiste when they spoke of that very thorny and serious question of abortion.

I am asking parliament to authorize a free vote and to let each member deal with abortion as it must be dealt with, in order to get rid of abortion.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*English*]

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief, as I was last evening. I should like to make sure that the house understands the mood of what is before it. Basically, this motion would wipe out the amendments in respect of abortion which are included in the bill. We have read in the newspapers that the passage of this bill has been delayed. We have read in the newspapers that this delay is preventing the house from considering those matters which I believe the government should be dealing with at this time, namely, coming to grips with the most important economic problems which this country has ever faced.

It is most relevant at this time to discuss for a few moments exactly what has happened. Tonight, a great nation is bleeding. It

is bleeding because the government insisted, because of the antagonism of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), on bringing in this bill, no matter what other important questions were facing the nation, and ramming it through the house. I am not one of those who are critical of my hon. friends to the left. That little group has fought and stood for the principles in which it believes. These hon. members are content to have their names publicized and to be accused of filibustering. They feel deeply about this question. The minister knew this when he introduced the bill. The Prime Minister knew it. We are now engaged in a debate on this contentious issue. The bill contains many worth-while amendments. The minister knows how I and my party feel about amendments to the Criminal Code.

When we rose in our places almost a month ago we asked the minister to divide this bill so that the consciences of members of parliament and of Canadians could better be expressed. However, the minister expressed the antagonism of the Prime Minister and would not divide the bill. The minister knows that the promise was made, without any equivocation, that the bill would be divided. The president of the Liberal Association of the minister's own constituency has resigned because he believes, as do many of us, that the minister promised the bill would be divided. The only reason the bill was not divided—and the minister knows this—is the fact that he is a member of a tight cabinet, in which one minister has already resigned, and which is getting pretty shaky.

As one hon. member said the other night, the minister is a man of integrity. If he had kept his promise and that of his party, he would have divided this bill. If that had been done, we would not be having this kind of debate that has been criticized, and properly so, by the newspapers. The criticism should not be directed toward the Ralliement Créditiste, because they are men who believe they are expressing the will and the conscience of the people who elected them. The onus is strictly on the government because they intend to ram this bill through, irrespective of the consequences. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) can shake his head. He cannot sell wheat but he agrees with the fact that when this bill goes through we will have another confrontation in respect of the language bill.

• (9:20 p.m.)

This nation is crying for action on economic matters. Canadians are looking for direction and leadership from a government which they thought would give them a "just society". Today, I asked a question of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) which was relevant to this subject. I asked the Prime Minister what he intends to do for the old age pensioners who now have to live on less than $80 a month. He is doing nothing, so he would not get up and answer my question. Yet we are now engaged in this debate, and the onus for this situation lies directly on the minister, the Prime Minister and the whole cabinet.

I do not think for one moment that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) really endorses this debate or this filibuster, but he knew it was going to come. As a great trial lawyer, as the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada he has sufficient intelligence that he must have known this would happen. A month ago he said this bill should be divided so that Canadians could speak as their consciences dictate. Tomorrow morning, when the press and all the communication media that form public opinion in this nation inform the Canadian people of the filibuster that is taking place in parliament, I will remind the minister that the onus is not on those members who are carrying on the debate because of their deep religious conviction and the dictates not only of their consciences but of the consciences of Canadians throughout the land, including Canadians in the area which I represent.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I say to the Ralliement Créditiste that they can be a proud little group. Whether or not I agree with their methods, they have stood for what they believe. But I ask the minister in all sincerity this question: Is he standing for what he believes and did he do so when he told the Liberal party in his own riding that he would divide this bill? Was he standing for what he believed when he said to his own executive "this party should have a free vote"? Where is the free vote? The fact is that we are now tied up in a debate which I described the other night as nonsense, because the minister will not measure up to his responsibility and the Prime Minister's ego is being expressed through the minister. The minister has become a slave of the Prime Minister. He knows the Prime Minister is wrong. Why does he not stand up in the House of Commons tonight and say he will delete this section from the bill and allow the rest of this reform bill to be passed? If he does this, at 9.30 tonight we will be able to get back to serious business.

This small group which is keeping the debate going is expressing the conviction of the people of this nation. They are right and the government is wrong. I ask the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, to tell the government to take their responsibility seriously. What is that responsibility? As a Canadian from western Canada, I think of our wheat sales which do not amount to anything. I do not know what the Minister of Agriculture really feels about that situation, but I feel sorry for him. There are no petroleum sales to speak of, or at least they are being cut back. The cost of living is rising constantly. All these things are eating into the heart of the nation. And what do we do? We spend our time debating.

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Yes, order. I hope the nation will be brought to order and the cabinet members brought to their senses. Clause 18 is the cause of the delay in the passage of this bill. Why does the minister not agree to divide the bill? Why does he not agree to set that clause apart for debate in the future? Let us allow the rest of the bill, with its many good reforms, to go through. The only reason homosexuality and abortion were wrapped up in the whole package of other reforms was to permit those provisions to be passed along with the others and also to bring together the whole Liberal party. That is why we are now engaged in what I say is the most useless debate that ever took place in this nation. It is not useless in the sence that these people are not expressing their convictions, but because the minister knew such a debate was inevitable. He might be able to control his own people who have the same religious background and the same convictions, but he cannot control all the people all the time. This is the reason we have an opposition.

Finally, I should like to plead with the minister to take a realistic look at the situation. This group of people who have been debating the issue are serious. We are all part of our environment, whether it is a spiritual environment or a sociological environment. Basically, this group of people feel strongly on this issue. I am sure the minister has in his own midst many people who feel just as deeply about this subject as members on this side of the house do. As the legal spokesman for my party on this bill, may I ask the minister to consider the fact that if he had accepted the recommendation of the Conservative party and of the opposition as a whole to divide this bill, which he promised the nation he would do, we would not be wasting the time of parliament. We might now be engaged in a meaningful debate on matters of importance to this nation.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I say to you, Mr. Speaker—and I hope that tomorrow it is reported correctly—that surely the people who should be taking the blame for this debate in the House of Commons are the government. They should take the blame for wasting time and for trying to thrust something on a group of people who do not want it.

**Mr. Gundlock:** Dear John.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I do not know what the hon. member means by "Dear John" but I do know that what is happening is the result of the Prime Minister's egotism expressed through the minister.

• (9:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also warmly and sincerely thank the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) for his eloquent and courageous comments. He is one of the most brilliant members of this house who is not ashamed of his convictions and who can say what makes common sense and what issues should be fought against.

I would like to congratulate him and tell him that we appreciate his testimony.

We are glad to fight for those principles, not beside him or behind him, but with him, hand in hand, to show clearly to this government, during this debate which has been dragging on and on through its own fault, that this is a serious matter which is worth looking into and that, therefore, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) certainly deserves to be seriously considered by my colleagues and by every member.

The hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), the devoted head of the Ralliement créditiste, has just set forth with eloquence some of the reasons why we want clause 18 of the omnibus bill to be deleted to permit a referendum and a fuller study, because we sincerely feel that clause 18 is not valid and is not in accordance with the wishes of the Canadian people. It does not meet a need of the Canadian population and, therefore, it is not fair to introduce it in the house, thus delaying uselessly the business of the house,

whereas several other matters and problems command our attention. It would be pointless to list them here but we all know what they are anyway.

The purpose of the amendment is to amend Bill C-150 and, more particularly to delete clause 18 therefrom. And clause 18 says, first that medical practitioners should perform abortions in an accredited hospital. Clause 18 would permit doctors in general to receive the patients and carry out abortions without any consideration as to the consequences of that act which I think is despicable.

Secondly, clause 18 would enable a pregnant woman to get an abortion. If we allow abortion in all cases, for any given reason, serious or not, we are not being wise because, and we have said it time and again in this house, it is not giving security to the person involved, to the therapeutic committee and to the legislators.

Thirdly, this same clause 18 provides for a therapeutic committee to approve cases that are submitted to it and, consequently, tends to the establishment of such therapeutic abortion committees. Well, Mr. Speaker, on what criteria will the doctors base their recommendation to carry out an abortion? On what criteria do pregnant women base their requests for abortion?

On what serious and precise criteria will the therapeutic abortion committee provided for in clause 18 base itself to allow an abortion to be carried out? The answer to these vital questions, having regard to doctors, women and the therapeutic abortion committee, lies in this sentence, a short one but heavy with consequences, which reads as follows in clause 18:

> —the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health—

Immediately, we see that the serious criteria on which doctors will have to base themselves, on which cases will be examined and on which the committees will have to reach a decision, are too broad, that they will give rise to every abuses, under all pretences, and abortion will be granted in all cases. Therefore, if we adopt this clause, instead of deleting it from the bill, we are opening the door to homicides, to murders, because it is an established fact that the living thing which is in the mother's womb is a human being and tomorrow maybe it will develop into a person, like everyone of us. We must have reverence for life. This is a basic principle and the speeches made a little while ago by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the hon. member for Témiscamingue prove beyond doubt that there is life in the woman's womb, that the foetus is a human being, and this legislation is solely aimed at killing that life.

[Mr. Fortin.]

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are fighting against, and we have no electoral or other axe to grind.

As for the rest of clause 18, an odious one in our opinion, it defines the word "board", the words "Minister of Health, as if we did not know what is meant by a minister of Health, that is, a man paid $18,000 a year and more to do absolutely nothing for the people of Canada.

It defines also a "qualified medical practitioner" and a "therapeutic abortion committee", and all that is said about the latter, is that it will have three members. But the essential words that should be defined to allow for valid criteria that will enable the committee to arrive at a serious and intelligent decisions, words such as "likely", and "health", are not defined in clause 18.

Not only that, but the Minister of Justice himself (the hon. Mr. Turner), his parliamentary secretary (Mr. Cantin) and his colleagues are unable to give us a definition of those words, those crucial and fundamental words that will allow abortions, tens and hundreds of abortions, that will allow murders. Why? Because those words are too evasive, too vague, and the government refuses to clarify them. Those words are criminal and if they are not clarified, if they are left in the bill, those who let this happen will themselves be criminals.

The words "likely" and "health" must be defined if the legislation is to be applied in a proper manner—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member will agree with me, I think, that the house has already dealt with the question that the hon. member is discussing. As for the terms "likely" and "would" the house has already decided on those amendments, and I ask him to kindly limit himself to the amendment now before us.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I accept your remarks gladly.

However, I would point out that in clause 18, on page 42 of the omnibus bill, amended version—clause to amend section 237 of the Criminal Code—"health" is mentioned and

also "likely", as well as the following terms, on page 43, paragraph (c), subsection (4):

(c) has by certificate in writing stated that in its opinion the continuation of the pregnancy of such female person would or would be likely to endanger her life or health,

This is the most important phrase of the whole clause, those are precisely the most important and the most far-reaching words of the whole bill; the words "likely", "health" and "would" are the words who will allow abortions by the hundred, without reason, and I am perfectly in order when I deal with them.

This clause means legalization of abortion. I am against abortion, AGAINST in capital letters—and I am going to tell you why.

My first reason is not stated for election purposes: legalization of therapeutic abortion, in my humble opinion, did not bring about a decrease in the number of criminal and illegal abortions in any of the countries who adopted this type of legislation. Absolutely nothing is being proposed in this bill to control clandestine abortions, which are most nefarious and dangerous.

• (9:40 p.m.)

That is the main reason why I oppose to the inclusion of clause 18 in the bill. It opens the door to all kind of abuses, while the hon. Minister of Justice knows very well that, after the bill has become law, in Canada, as in all other countries where such legislation was adopted, the number of illegal abortions will not diminish but keep on increasing. The hon. Minister and the government party are aware of that, but they do not submit any positive measure to check this rising tide, this problem of illegal or clandestine abortions, which have nefarious and highly dangerous consequences for the woman to whom incompetent people procure abortion by inadequate and mechanical means.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no provision in this bill to stop this curse, this problem of clandestine abortions. Not only does the bill provide nothing offers nothing to solve the problem of clandestine abortions but more than that it is precisely designed to open the doors even wider to legalize illegal abortions to increase ten fold, a hundredfold the killings of human beings like you and me.

The second reason why I am—AGAINST—in capital letters, is that the doctor often feels embarrassed; and this is not stated by the Ralliement créditiste, nor by the Progressive Conservatives, nor by the Liberals nor by the members of the N.D.P. It is the doctors, themselves who say they are embarrassed by having to apply this legislation, which is absolutely inadequate to the needs, thoroughly incomplete and quite insufficient.

The doctor is embarrassed in a role which gives him too much freedom. He said it himself: the Medical association say it and there a flood of evidence shows us that this bill brings too much freedom, and this is why the doctors will be embarrassed to apply this legislation, to interpret it, since these physicians feel that the medical science is progressing on this question and that the decisions of the medical group will often be linked to a system of strictly personal values.

This legislation, is so loose precisely because of the words "health" and likely that the doctors themselves admit they are incapable to apply it intelligently and in accordance with the code of professional ethics. But it is precisely the doctors who will have to apply this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that these are interesting and plausible arguments that may weigh heavily in the balance and on the vote on this question.

Here is the third reason for which I oppose clause 18 of the bill and support the motion of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) to delete clause 18. Abortion, is a crime that does not solve in any way the problems of the patients who request it; on the contrary it compounds these problems. If at least statistics could prove that legalizing abortion would solve the problem of the patients, we might be concerned about our stand; we might then admit that it is a solution to the problem.

But, according to the testimony of various medical boards in the province of Quebec, of specialists in that field, gynaecologists, pediatrists, and others, in short, according to all the testimonies we were able to gather, it is proved beyond a doubt, with self-explanatory figures—not only for Canada, but also for all those countries where this type of legislation was passed—that the abortion of a pregnant woman does not solve her problems but compounds them instead.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of such regressive legislation, we quite honestly cannot allow ourselves to be drawn into this nasty business, just to please the government, for if we gave in, we would condone heinous crimes and encourage the legalization of abortion.

There is another reason why I am opposed to keeping clause 18 in the bill. Abortion is not a solution.

It is only a small part of the population which is asking for abortion. The majority of women who ask for an abortion are doing so because their contraceptive means have failed them. One day they find themselves with a human being on their hands—or rather in their belly, and they want to get rid of it.

So, for such women abortion becomes the 100 per cent effective last resort contraceptive means but they do not know that the government will be their accomplice, that they are themselves being the accomplices of a murder, and that they are only compounding their problems.

Abortion is not a contraceptive method. Abortion can be a solution in the case where the life of a woman is undoubtedly in danger, but certainly not in the case where her health is only likely to be endangered.

This is why in all cases where abortion could be considered permissible if her health is likely to be danger, the therapeutic abortion committee, the doctors and the patient want an abortion, because in their eyes it is the best means of contraception.

Mr. Speaker, such sex education is unbalanced, evil. It is not on such wrong values that we are going to build a society and give good examples to our children.

Mr. Speaker, as legislators, we have the responsibility to build a country on solid grounds or on solid values, not only moral but human values. I think that to respect the life of others is basically a question of humanity.

That is why we must respect the life of the tiny being who is in the mother's womb, who has no means of defending himself, who is absolutely innocent, who has committed no crime and who has not asked to be born, and whom some would be ready to kill.

Mr. Speaker, if the government members persist in their untenable position, they will become accomplices in all such murders committed in Canada. Let them rise and say that it is not so, let them prove that it is not so. Abortion is truly murder, murder of a poor and innocent victim who has not asked to be there. Mr. Speaker, we have some responsibilities, let us discharge them.

There is another reason why I am in favour of deleting this clause, this stupid clause 18, and it is as follows: Abortion is an indication of a deep-rooted problem, it results from a lack of understanding of sexuality. Used more as a last resort where contraceptives have failed, abortion, in my humble opinion, belongs to the socialist and communist theories favouring such extremes as birth-control, the killing of the disabled and euthanasia.



If one investigates and reads up, as I have done, about the different problems facing the socialist countries that have adopted similar measures, one finds that one thing inevitably leads to the other in such socialist and communist theories. This action is based on the opinions of extremists who support it and whose basic values are contraception, elimination of the disabled and euthanasia.

Any member willing to deny this is invited to do so, but I would not like to be in his shoes and to have to defend that position, because we have not only historical but also scientific evidence from the testimonies and books at our disposal.

Another reason why I object to maintaining clause 18 in the bill and why I am 100 per cent for deleting clause 18 from the bill, is the following, and this is quite an important one:

• (9:50 p.m.)

The whole world is making an all-out effort to bring down the infantile mortality rate and the mortality rate in general. Tremendous efforts are being made all over the world to achieve heart transplants, to fight cancer—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the bill, I should like to give my opinion and to show what kind of bill this is. I should like to demonstrate that this is an anti-social, anti-human, anti-respectable and anti-responsible bill.

Mr. Speaker, under no consideration can we accept this bill. I do not see why the government, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), have introduced such a bill, in a country like Canada, in a developing country in search of a growing and homogeneous population.

I should like to endeavor to argue that the bill that has been presented is anti-moral, unthinkable, criminal, unjustifiable, incompatible, inconceivable and mortal, for the people.

This is a fatal measure for citizens to be, because, with its infamous rules, it is imposed upon the nation despite their will and good intentions. The bill that is imposed is anti-conceptional, anti-moral, anti-Canadian—I would say—anti-medical, anti-Christian, anti-Democratic, anti-legal, anti-infanticide, anti-

fundamental, anti-doctrinal, anti-political, anti-parliamentary, anti-legislative, anti-theological, anti-respectful, anti-spiritual, anti-common, anti-protective, anti-dialogue, anti-understanding, anti-educational, anti-press, anti-pagan, anti-majority, anti-scientific, anti-biological, anti-individualist, anti-personalist, anti-vital, anti-clandestine, anti-professional, anti-pedagogical. In fact, no words are big or eloquent enough to describe the misdeeds of this bill.

At the same time, the bill is anti-historical, anti-proportioned, anti-imperative, anti-relative, anti-myth.

Mr. Speaker, I would have much more to say, because there is an endless stock of words to qualify the bill. It could be said it is anti-infamous, anti-immoral, anti-Christian and anti-anything-you-can-think-of, to indicate it is not presentable to the nation.

Mr. Speaker, faced with this bill and with a civilization that honours and despises man, our most urgent and imperative task is to defend man in order to save him. Such a bill is not a means of defending man, of saving the nation, of saving mankind. It is anti-respectful of the nation, and it will also raise fundamental problems to our generation. On account of this bill, man is denied all his rights.

The birth of a human being is not allowed, because infamous laws are passed to prevent the reproduction of our citizens. The right to be born is denied, because there will be a direct interference with the life and conception of human beings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Justice should look and listen. I think that he is a conscientious and logical man who should rise and tell us immediately that he is withdrawing that infamous negative and anti-social bill.

Mr. Speaker, it rests with society to change that larva in a man, because an unborn child is simply a larva.

It is the duty and the obligation of society to make a human being out of this larva. This is a primordial obligation, because the question of man's survival in society is raised much later when he has become an adult.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, some fanatics are allowing themselves free scope, they are unconvinced and without remit; as violence breeds violence, fanaticism aggravates fanaticism. It is a terrible spirituous which leads mankind and nations to extremes. It kills the soul, before killing their body, because the unborn child has a soul. It is not yet a human being, it is a living soul to which the breath of life has been given by divine Providence and we have no right to attack it.

Thus, the two great modern philosophies have only brought new myths to man. What have we, what are we getting from man since the last century, in Canada as well as in other countries? Only myths. For three centuries now, humanity has been fighting for myths. Millions are suffering and dying in every generation for myths.

Then, they are imposing a myth even at birth, even in the life of society and this bill, Mr. Speaker—clause 18 particularly that we want to delete—is anti-mystic, anti-fanatic, anti-mental, anti-liberal, anti-suicide, anti-executive, anti-preventive, anti-contemporary, anti-philosophical, anti-characteristic, anti-new-born—I would say—anti-maternal, anti-significant and ironical.

Then, Mr. Speaker—

**An hon. Member:** Ten o'clock.

**Mr. Latulippe:** May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

[*English*]

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—REQUEST FOR RETURN OF SIX DAY MAIL DELIVERY AND COUNTER SERVICE

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I had planned to open my remarks this evening by saying that there is one thing I like about the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans). He is always here at this time, but tonight—oh, he is now entering the house.

**An hon. Member:** He is late but he is here.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It will now be possible to begin my remarks as I had intended. One of the things I like about the Minister of Communications—and he will be glad to know there are some things we like about him, few though they may be—is that he is always here when questions addressed to him are posted for the late show. I am glad to see him here tonight. That is a reasonable beginning to my remarks and I intend to stay in that frame of mind for these

few minutes because I wish to address my appeal to the minister as seriously and earnestly as I can in the hope that he will consider it.

I have the floor tonight because on Thursday, April 24, as recorded in *Hansard* on page 7900 I addressed this question to the Minister of Communications:

> Since there are now only three days in the week, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, when we can mail letters with any assurance they will be delivered promptly, will the minister take a new look at the entire question of the five-day delivery week and review the possibility of re-establishing a six-day delivery?

• (10:00 p.m.)

*Hansard* reports some hon. members as saying, "Hear, hear." Then, there is this entry:

> Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

That was quite definite and I suppose I will not fare much better tonight because, after all, this is a brand new idea in Canadian life as we know it to have postal delivery only five days a week. I assume it is the idea of the minister, and since it has been in effect for only a few weeks or few months at most, he will say that it should have a longer period of trial before any consideration is given to altering it. But even while he is asking the country to try out this system, I hope he will keep a close watch on what is happening.

I submit that the premise which I used for my question on April 24 is a correct one, namely, that there are now only three days of the week, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, when we can mail first class letters with any assurance that they will be delivered promptly that week. When we mail letters on Thursday their chances of being delivered on Friday are not good. There is no delivery on Saturday and Sunday, so it is Monday at the earliest when they are delivered. Of course letters mailed on Friday and Saturday are not delivered until the next week in any case, and when Monday is a holiday the situation is that much worse.

I have noticed with my own correspondence—and like all of us in this place correspondence is a major part of our life—that it has definitely slowed down. One receives a letter on Monday that was written the previous Tuesday. If you do not get the answer away for a couple of days the net result is that it can be two weeks between the time a person sends a letter and gets a reply.

I have the notion, and I suspect I am right, that this pile up over the week end is slowing



the mail down generally. Many hon. members have already brought experiences of theirs, to the attention of the Postmaster General. I have in my hand an envelope that contained a rather important letter which was sent to me from Winnipeg. When the person who sent it did not hear from me within a few days the result was a long distance phone call to find out why I had not answered. The only reply I could make was that I had not received the letter. It came a day or two later and, as I say, I have the envelope in my hand. It is postmarked Winnipeg, 9.30 p.m., on April 30. It is correctly addressed to me as a member of parliament at the House of Commons, and on the reverse is the cancellation of the House of Commons Post Office, and the date is May 6.

In this modern age of communication satellites, speed and explosions, with everything being instantaneous, it is pretty hard to comprehend why it takes six days for a letter to come by air mail from Winnipeg to Ottawa. In fact I could have gone out by train, got the letter, and come back in less time than that.

I have had many complaints from people who send me their own envelopes showing the extra time taken. I submit that the effect of this is not good. It is slowing down the service. It is taking away the concept of service altogether. The minister is engaged in other activities, in satellite communications, in computerization and so on, and he contends that we have got to speed up life in many respects. But what is the good of getting instant communication with a man on the moon when we get one there if we cannot get a letter from Winnipeg to Ottawa in less than six days? What is the use of air mail service, if the time saved in transit is lost in delivery?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I regret I have to interrupt the hon. member son temps de parole est expiré.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** That is fine, Mr. Speaker. I hope I get a reasonable reply.

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I realize that my original answer was too abrupt, but the hon. member ended on a note about the word service. I would like to emphasize that all of the 48,000 people who work for the Post Office are loyal employees determined to give the very best service they possibly can. However, I think we must look at the word "service" in its largest aspect. One can often compare the productivity of a large supermarket and say

it is very much more productive than the general store, but this is by no means proven. What happens is that when a person goes to a supermarket he gives up many services. He gives up the credit that was furnished to him by the general store and the personal attention that was furnished him. Why? Because service as we have traditionally considered it has become too expensive and people are now going without service in order to reduce their cost.

I say to you frankly that if we continue to handle five billion pieces of mail in the same way we handled one billion pieces of mail, the burden on the taxpayers of this country will be such they will revolt against it. So, they did ask us to measure just what service they could do without to reduce the tax burden.

The Saturday delivery is not the necessary service it once was. We are sensitive to what Canada is today. Canada is working on the basis of a five day week. The Edmonton Chamber of Commerce polled its members. I may be out four or five, but the order is correct. Three hundred and two seem to be satisfied and have no objection whatsoever to the five day week. Fourteen said they did. It did not seem proper, at a cost of between $10 million and $13 million, to provide service for something in the order of roughly less than 4 per cent of the total population of Canada. With all the rearrangements, the walk evaluation, the rezoning, the settling down process and I am certain with the devotion of the young people in the post office, we will come out with a better service at lower cost to all.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Finish the sentence.

## COMBINES—FAILURE BY SUGAR REFINERIES TO OBEY COURT ORDER

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, on April 23 I directed a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford). I asked him whether he had received a formal complaint charging Canada's big three sugar refineries with failure to obey a court order restricting them from monopolistic practices and, if so, what action the government proposed to take. In my opinion the minister evaded the question. He said it was not the practice to reveal names of those who lodged complaints with the department. This, of course, was not an answer to the question I put to him. I pointed that out to the minister but I received no satisfaction.

The situation in respect of the three major sugar refineries in Canada is one of long standing. They have been accused of monopolistic practices. They have been taken to court and orders have been issued against them. The minister, in my opinion, does not seem to be taking this matter seriously. What is involved here is the whole question of the Combines legislation in Canada and the attitude of the government toward this legislation. If the minister is reluctant to indicate that he does not think these companies should be prosecuted or that this collusion represents a threat to the country, then he should say so. If he thinks it does represent a threat, then he should also say so and indicate that he intends to take some significant action.

I suggest that the Combines legislation in this country has become futile and phony; it just is not working. We are pretending there is some protection when in reality there is not. First of all, the prosecutions which have taken place have been inconclusive. There is no evidence that after an action the situation has improved in the least. Secondly, in order to get action under this legislation one virtually has to put the evidence in the hands of the government. It is rather instructive to look at some of the recent cases which have come before the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission.

• (10:10 p.m.)

With regard to the street paving tenders for the city of Hull, a slip of paper fell out of the tender sheets which indicated that collusion had taken place. This information is contained in a booklet issued by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. In the case of ready-mix concrete, the companies had their accountants sitting in at the meetings. These cases seem to be the only type brought before the Combines Investigation Branch.

The evil of the present situation is simply that if these companies are going to collude and pretend on the surface that there is competition, we will be getting the worst of all worlds. If there is collusion, I think the time has come to take action other than that taken under the combines legislation. I suggest the type of action which should be taken is strict regulation and the removal of tariff protection in these areas. Certainly, we should enact legislation which has teeth in it, something which has not been the case for a long time.

It may be that in some industries a monopoly situation is inevitable. If this is the

case, let us face up to it and do something about it rather than pretend we have an act that is effective in avoiding the worst effects of collusion and the phony competition which exists in this and other industries.

**Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to assure the hon. member that there is no reluctance on the part of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) to take whatever action is necessary under his jurisdiction. Since the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) raised this question in the house on April 23, which question my minister answered immediately in the light of the information he had available, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) put a similar question on the order paper. This question was duly answered on April 30, and the answer can be found in *Hansard* at page 8162.

The minister then stated that an application had been received under section 7 of the Combines Investigation Act, signed by Roberta Gray and others. He also stated that the general practice with regard to inquiries under the act is that no information is given out as to whether a particular inquiry is being pursued, unless and until a report is published, or as the act may require. This policy is adopted because section 28 of the act states that all inquiries shall be conducted in private unless the chairman of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission orders that any or all portions shall be conducted in public.

My minister, nevertheless, acknowledged that the application to investigate sugar companies had been received, because a Montreal counsel having knowledge of the application wrote to some members of parliament informing them about it. With respect to all other aspects of the inquiry, however, the minister's reply of April 30 indicated the necessity of observing the privacy provision of the statute.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—SUGGESTED REPLACEMENT FOR "DON MESSER'S JUBILEE"—

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, on April 29, as reported at page 8101, I asked a question in the house regarding the discontinuation of the program "Don Messer's Jubilee".

I am happy to note tonight the presence in the house of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) and I shall begin by thanking and congratulating him for the work he has done to promote culture throughout Canada.

I am convinced that had he been called upon to make a decision regarding the discontinuation of that program, his decision would have been different from that of the C.B.C.

I should like to thank him tonight—because this is the first opportunity I have of doing so—for the very generous grant he has awarded to the *Petits Chanteurs de Granby* who are part of our culture, because tonight the subject under consideration is also related to culture.

I also know the minister understands that Canadian culture is not only popular music, or opera. I like opera, personally, and I believe the minister appreciates it too. I also have a taste for classical music.

On the other hand, the purpose of my intervention is to know from the minister who made the decision within the CBC to cancel this program so popular with millions of Canadians. I do not consider folklore as the only means of Canadian culture, but it is part of it. If we take into account the numerous letters and representations received by hon. members generally, we should recognize that the arbitrary decision made, not by the minister but by the C.B.C., was a thoughtless one which is arousing protests from all quarters across the country at the present time.

Now, I believe that the minister is well placed to realize that the program has been very popular in the past and still is with millions of Canadians. And that is why, tonight, I would like to know from the minister whether the C.B.C. could not earnestly reconsider its decision. In various circumstances, he showed that he wanted a sound culture for Canada. We do not want a culture based on folklore exclusively. On the other hand, folklore is part and parcel of our culture. In fact, that program was authentically Canadian and contained no element imported from the United States or other countries. It faithfully reflected the culture prevailing in our rural areas and appealed to millions of Canadians.

That is why the minister understands our representations, I believe, and why we do not intend to blame or raise a general outcry. Instead, we would like to get a decision more logical than that which was made by the C.B.C., and I rely entirely on the minister's good judgment.

[Mr. Saltsman.]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, I believe everything has been said on the abolition of that program.

I should simply like to remind the hon. member, who is perfectly aware of it since he mentioned it—that the minister, qualified as responsible for the C.B.C., is not responsible for its programming; he is merely a spokesman for the C.B.C. in Parliament.

Therefore, he does not have to pass judgments and still less to interfere with the programming. The C.B.C.'s reply, which was given after due consideration by the Corporation of the numerous protests received, is to the effect that this program had lost a great part of its audience, having been listed for 11 years on the schedule and that, so as to ensure a living programming, one must change programs from time to time.

Finally, I should like to say that the hon. member would be wrong to get worried about the folkloric point of view, because on the English national network, the program he and several other members referred to has been replaced by another which is also of a folkloric character, but on the value of which I do not believe it appropriate to pass personal judgment.

**Mr. Speaker:** It being past ten o'clock, the house stands adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.22 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Friday, May 9, 1969**

The house met at 11 a.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Third report of Standing Committee on Regional Development—Mr. Morison.

### INCOME TAX

TABLING OF DRAFT REGULATIONS AFFECTING INSURANCE INDUSTRY

**Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2) I propose to lay upon the table of the house draft income tax regulations affecting the taxation of the insurance industry. The regulations set out details of the computations of deductible policy reserves, of the portion of the investment income of companies with international operations which is to be attributed to Canada, and of the portion of the assets of companies with international operations which is to be considered Canadian.

As indicated earlier by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), the regulations are being made public in draft form to facilitate parliamentary and public consideration of Bill C-191.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF EXPENDITURE CUTS ANNOUNCED BY PRIME MINISTER

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. In order to clear up any possible ambiguities arising out of the Prime Minister's statement yesterday about further "expenditure cuts", would the right hon. gentleman advise the house whether such cuts are to apply to the current estimates or are they to be for the 1970-71 fiscal year, as suggested by officials of the Department of Finance?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, they will be for 1970-71 and future years. It is a matter of cutting into expenditures and programs which are now in existence and which will have to be curtailed. I have alluded to them at other times in discussing with the house the need to discuss with the provinces, for instance, the necessity to curtail spending in shared-cost programs and so on. There will be a definite program of expenditure cuts which will have to be discussed with the provinces in order that they realize that some of the important programs will have to be curtailed.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Then we are to take it that the answer given by the Prime Minister is not as to action for immediately dealing with the problem of inflation, which was the question yesterday?

**Mr. Trudeau:** On the contrary, Mr. Speaker; it is a very important aspect. One of the reasons for inflation is that in many cases these expenditure programs are rising at a rate faster than the revenue expected by the governments of the provinces and the federal government. It is necessary, in order to curtail inflation, to make sure that expenditures do not exceed the revenues in a consistent way. This is one of the basic tools for hitting at inflation.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Prime Minister could advise the house as to what he means by the phrase "certain vested interests in the country". Do these vested interests include old age pensioners, farmers and others who are beneficiaries under government programs?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Perhaps vested interests can define themselves. But I am prepared to indicate that one vested interest I had in my mind was the opposition parties who were constantly asking for greater expenditures in every area.

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Prime Minister whether, in his proposal to effect these drastic cuts he can assure us that the very modest assistance given to agriculture will not be reduced and

that the program does not preclude some assistance to western Canada, in view of the very serious situation that exists there?

**Mr. Trudeau:** When I said that we would have to make cuts in various programs I did not indicate which programs would be affected. Of course I will announce this publicly in due course. However I think we just received an example of what I said previously. If we want to make cuts everywhere except where farmers, fishermen, urban dwellers and old age pensioners are affected, it will be difficult to fight inflation; this is a perfect example of the vested interests in the opposition.

**Mr. Gleave:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Prime Minister, in his approach to the economy in this respect, to have regard for the fact that there are certain sectors which are not contributing to inflation and which at this time are actually depressed.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Yes, Mr. Speaker,—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. I should like to ask him whether these drastic cuts will affect his personal staff, which has recently been increased.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. I asked him yesterday, as may be seen at page 8466 of *Hansard*, if he was considering the suggestions made by the Ralliement créditiste, and his reply was, and I quote:

—that all those who know about such things agree that the suggestions coming from the creditiste system are, essentially, of an inflationary nature—

In view of the fact that he has just said that we are in an inflationary period, is the Prime Minister suggesting that what we have now in Canada is a creditiste system?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I do not think that this question is in order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Barney Danson (York North):** Will the Prime Minister assure the house that no reduction will be proposed in the estimates for the office of the Leader of the Opposition who, according to news stories, even now is having trouble in retaining his staff?

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** In view of the Prime Minister's announcement of the urgent need for cuts in spending, will consideration be given to the possibility of cutting back the purchase of CF 5's for which the Minister of National Defence has found it difficult to find a useful role in Canada's defence plan?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest to hon. members that perhaps we have reached the moment at which we might go on to another subject. The hon. member for Greenwood must realize, or at least this is my understanding of what we are discussing now, that this is a situation which will apply in 1970-71, so perhaps questions on this could be put by hon. members in the course of the next year.

## WATER RESOURCES

### POLLUTION OF LAKE ERIE FROM UNITED STATES SOURCES

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Before doing so, Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to say how delighted we are to see him back in the house and in good health. We trust he will continue to progress and will be with us for a long time.

My question arises from a statement made by an official of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources regarding the deterioration of the pollution situation on the Great Lakes, particularly Lake Erie, and a statement to the effect that more than half the pollutants are coming from firms on the United States side of the line. I want to ask the minister whether his department or any other department of the government is making representations to the United States authorities in an attempt to stop this very great pollution that is taking place, before the situation gets completely out of hand.

**Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** First of all, Mr. Speaker, may I thank the hon. member and all members of the house for their kind welcome back. Now that Canada has a team in the major leagues I think it would behoove me

not to emulate the mighty Casey, and take that third strike. I will try not to do this.

With respect to the hon. member's question, there is continuing negotiation by the International Joint Commission at the International Joint Commission level in respect of pollution emanating from either side of the border. Whether or not my own department at the present time is taking special steps in view of the situation in regard to Lake Erie I am unable to say, but I will take note of the question. Certainly we hope to have the new water act before parliament this session, and I think this will take a very considerable step in the direction of controlling pollution, water pollution in particular, and may give us new tools with which to deal with this matter internationally as well as domestically.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that Mr. J. Bruce of the minister's department, speaking in the United States, said that the situation is so serious that it warrants a crash program to deal with it, does the government intend to introduce some crash program in the immediate future or does it intend to wait until the International Joint Commission has dealt further with this matter?

**Mr. Greene:** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any crash program, so-called, at the international level at the present time, but certainly I do think the new water act will indicate a very positive and strong approach to the question of pollution. I quite concur that the problem is extremely grave and serious, inasmuch as it affects future generations as well as our own. Certainly the government will take every possible step to see to it that the problem is met; and at the international level we will continue the most forceful negotiations possible, I am sure, under the aegis of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, as well as having meetings with the United States cabinet, which I understand will take place a little later this year, at which the international aspects of pollution will be discussed.

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can we assume from the minister's presence in the house today that he has now resumed his departmental duties?

**Mr. Greene:** To the best of my ability, yes, Mr. Speaker.



## OIL

### EXPRESSION OF CANADIAN VIEWS TO U.S. CABINET COMMITTEE

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, I want to direct this question to the Prime Minister in view of the fact that he recently had talks with the President of the United States on the subject of petroleum. The President of the United States set up a cabinet task force on March 26, 1969 to conduct a comprehensive review of the mandatory oil import program, and the task force was headed by George P. Schultz and composed of Rogers, Hickle et al. Would the Prime Minister assure us today that Canada's views on oil exports will be made known to this special U.S. cabinet committee, that we will be formally represented at the hearings to be held and will present a formal submission at that time?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I would not go so far as to talk about formal representations; but as to submissions, informal and otherwise, there have already been exchanges of views between officials of both governments and there will be continuing meetings of officials, to be followed up late in June, as the minister has said, by meetings at the ministerial level to discuss important problems, including this one.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Would the Prime Minister assure us that Canada's views will be made known to the people who are on this special cabinet committee, whose membership includes some of the most important ministers of the United States?

**Mr. Trudeau:** The opposition usually scoffs when we set up task forces; I do not know why the hon. member should attach such significance to a task force in the United States when we can make our representations in other ways.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I do not wish to get into an argument with the Prime Minister, but I have never scoffed at anything which leads to action.

### REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON CUTBACKS AND TRADE LOSS

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** In view of the fact that oil cutbacks now amount to $60,000 a day, will the Prime Minister make a statement soon, taking industry, the house and the country into his

confidence, with regard to the program in connection with such a serious loss of trade, the restoration of which would lead to the revenue about which he spoke so eloquently earlier on?

**Mr. Trudeau:** No, Mr. Speaker. If a statement is to be made it will be made by the appropriate minister.

**Mr. Woolliams:** May I direct a supplementary question to the minister? I wish to join with other hon. members in welcoming him back. When the hon. gentleman gets back to his desk, and in the near future, will he be prepared to make a statement on this serious problem, one which is causing anxiety to the industry in Canada, particularly in western Canada?

**Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** We shall be in constant touch with the industry. I believe we are in continuing consultation with Washington with respect to their current review of policy. As the hon. member knows, a good deal of the future well-being of the oil industry in Canada depends on United States policy and the attitude they take toward the present quota system. In these circumstances I believe the best service we can do the Canadian industry is to make sure that our views are made known in Washington as strongly and as effectively as possible, and this we certainly intend to continue to do.

[*Translation*]

## SPORTS

INQUIRY AS TO SUBSIDIZATION OF AMATEUR PROGRAM

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I wished to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare; I trust that, in his absence, the Prime Minister will be happy to answer it.

As in the last few days the minister met with the Quebec Minister of Tourism with regard to financial assistance to amateur sports in the province of Quebec, would the Prime Minister tell us if they agreed on the terms of such assistance, and what the amount of the grant will be?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I would respectfully remind the hon. member that today is not one of those when the Minister of National Health and Welfare is required to answer questions.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** Could the Prime Minister tell us exactly who is answering for that department today, so that we could at least know who will take questions as notice? Or are we to continue this constipation of thought and diarrhoea of words?

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

NORAD—OPPORTUNITY FOR DEBATE OF AND CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN AIRBORNE WARNING

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** That last remark inhibits me somewhat, Mr. Speaker, since I cannot do other than use words in phrasing my question.

I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he would give assurance to the house that the government will not enter into any arrangement with regard to participation in the air warning and control system without first having the matter debated in parliament?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we have taken the position that further progress toward the definition of defence policy will be announced in due course, and of course members of the house will have an occasion to discuss it.

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** Mr. Speaker, in light of the widespread press interpretation of the remarks of the Minister of National Defence and of the Secretary of State for External Affairs last night, may I ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether the government has now concluded in its defence policy review the necessity for some form of continual role in NORAD, and particularly in the U.S. proposals for airborne warning and control through the 1970's?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on the press interpretations that the hon. member refers to, not having been made aware of them and not having read them, but I can say that the policy has not yet been finally decided by the government.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR WHITE PAPER FOLLOWING REVIEW

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Prime Minister assure the house that the white paper on the conclusions following the

review of defence and foreign policy will be presented to the house before the summer adjournment?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there will necessarily be a white paper on this aspect of it. We have talked about a white paper on our foreign policy, but on the matter of defence it will not necessarily be in the form of a white paper. It might well be by way of a statement by the minister, which he will make as soon as the decision is reached.

**Mr. Lewis:** As a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the white paper on foreign policy will be presented to the house before the summer adjournment, and whether the statement by the minister on defence policy will be made before the summer adjournment?

**Mr. Trudeau:** I am afraid we would have to ask the two ministers about the timing they have in mind.

## GRAIN

### WHEAT—ASSISTANCE TO CANADIAN FARMERS TO REDUCE ACREAGE

**Mr. George Muir (Lisgar):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Yesterday the minister stated that the western farmers were contemplating a 12 per cent reduction in their wheat acreage. Is the minister now in a position to assure the farmers that the government is giving consideration to giving them some assistance to achieve this objective?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, I answered this question yesterday. I have nothing to add.

## TRADE

### WHEAT—DELIVERY UNDER U.S.S.R. AGREEMENT

**Mr. George Muir (Lisgar):** In his reply yesterday the minister did not give any assurance that the farmers would have any assistance. Since the government apparently does not intend to assist the farmers in reducing the wheat acreage can the minister assure the house that the Canadian Wheat Board and his department are in a position to load and deliver the 135 million bushel balance of wheat sales under the three year sales agreement with Russia which expires July 31?



**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** I cannot give an assurance, for the very simple reason that these problems are studied by the cabinet, and I can only announce policy when policy is formulated by the cabinet. With respect to the sale to Russia, however, we have the quantities of wheat for delivery to Russia and when the contract is signed the Wheat Board will see to it that the quantities are delivered.

### BARLEY—LOSS TO FRANCE OF JAPANESE MARKET

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. On his recent visit to Japan did he seize the opportunity to discuss with the Japanese government the loss of the Canadian barley market to heavily subsidized barley from France and, if so, with what result?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Yes, Mr. Speaker; we brought up this problem in the conversations. I tried to convince the Japanese buyers, in this instance the Japanese government, that they should also look to the long term. We have protested formally to the E.E.C. and to the French government on the extreme subsidization of these sales.

### ADHERENCE BY AUSTRALIA TO INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether in his discussions with the representatives of the government of Australia he succeeded in getting any firm commitments to the effect that Australia would adhere to the price levels set out in the International Grains Arrangement?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, every country is full of good intentions. The Australian government has made some offers that would tend to renounce some marketing advantages. These offers were made on April 27 at the prices review committee in London, if my memory is good. The United States representatives also indicated they are willing to make some changes in their present practices. All exporters are looking at each other to see who will move first. Of course sales like the one made by France to China, at reduced prices, will not induce other exporters to step into line and to return to the pricing schedule of the I.G.A.

I am being very frank: we have difficulty in getting the unanimous support of exporters and importers. The tendency of importers of course is to take immediate advantages whenever possible of current price levels, and to forget the long-term considerations and their importance. Importers may not realize clearly enough the long-term consequences of their action and the results they will have on the future marketing of the commodity in question in the world.

Although the difficulties are great I hope that importers and exporters alike will realize the importance of the International Grains Arrangement and bring their policies into line with that agreement very soon.

WHEAT—INQUIRY AS TO PRESENCE IN CANADA OF U.S.S.R. MISSION

**Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that, as reported in some quarters, a trade mission from Soviet Russia is presently in Ottawa in order to negotiate the remainder of the three year contract for the 135 million bushel balance of Canadian wheat.

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, if my information is good, and I think it is, that is unfortunately not true.

WHEAT—REASONS FOR LOSS OF MARKETS

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday when I wished to question the minister about discussions he has had regarding wheat sales, so that he could explain to the house why Canada has lost about 33 per cent of her former world market, you refused to allow me to ask the question. Yet when a similar question was directed to the minister today, the minister was permitted to answer without being ruled out of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Will the hon. member kindly resume his seat? The hon. member should note that the Chair made the same ruling today as yesterday, when the question referred to was ruled out of order. I am therefore pleased to see that the hon. member has reminded the Chair that I was consistent in rulings today and yesterday. Unfortunately the minister found a way to go beyond the ruling of the Chair, and that is why I interrupted him. I wanted to suggest to him that he was actually ignoring the ruling of the Chair, and that the type of question being asked ought normally to be placed on the order paper.



**Mr. McIntosh:** I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. The question I asked yesterday was of national importance and urgency. It was not argumentative and I fail to see why it was ruled out of order without any explanation for that having been given.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member has no right to ask for an explanation from the Chair as to why a ruling was made. The rules provide that when there is a matter of urgency to be discussed opportunity is given for a discussion to be held at the time of adjournment.

GREECE—LOSS OF SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. This question relates to lost Canadian sales. Considering the great value of the potential sale I am about to mention, will the minister explain the reasons for our losing the contract to supply a $75 million nuclear power station to Greece?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder whether it is in order to ask the minister to give an explanation of this kind. I think this type of question ought to be placed on the order paper.

**Mr. Crouse:** May I ask another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since Canada lost the sale of a $75 million nuclear power station to Greece, did this country make any offer to arrange for credits for such sale through our Export Credits Insurance Corporation?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Well, Mr. Speaker, the opposition speaks very freely these days about "lost sales", but there is nothing in Adam's will to say that Canada will make sales of this or of that to Greece, to Japan or to China. We are competitors, we are bidding for these sales. Sometimes we win and sometimes we lose.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** This time we lost.

**Mr. Pepin:** We made a bid. We made an offer. The offer was backed by our Export Credits Insurance Corporation but the Greek government did not accept our offer, seeming to prefer the British offer because of general trade considerations. It seems that the British government offered to buy Greek tobacco. Apparently the British do

not want to smoke Greek tobacco; but that is another subject—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Pepin:** Personally—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## SHIPPING

SALVAGE OF TUG "EMERALD STRAITS"—FORMAL INQUIRY UNDER ACT

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday of this week I and others directed questions to the Minister of Transport about a matter of concern to the Pacific coast. It had to do with a certain type of tug, its sinking, and death. I understand the minister promised to reply today. If he is now prepared to reply may I ask him to make the comments that he promised to make on this matter.

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, immediately after the sinking of the tug *Emerald Straits* a preliminary inquiry was undertaken. As a result of the work of the inquiry photographs and observations were taken at the site of the wreck. The vessel was located. No structural damage was found. However it is now felt that there ought to be a formal inquiry under the Canada Shipping Act.

It is my view that the inquiry can only succeed if the vessel is brought to the surface to be examined thoroughly. Consequently, tenders to recover the tug will be called within the next few days and the formal inquiry will have the opportunity to get under way very shortly.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TEMPORARY PASSPORTS ON STRENGTH OF BRITISH BIRTH CERTIFICATES

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In his absence may I direct it to the Prime Minister, and I do so without making any apology because the question relates to the passports of several hundred people who are trying to get away next week on charter tours. They are having difficulty. My question arises from the difficulties of Canadians born in Britain who need their birth certificates for proof of citizenship with the Department of the Secretary of State, after having filed such birth certificates in support of a passport application. Will the minister or the Prime Minister issue instructions for the use of temporary passports on the strength of the British birth certificates, in all proper cases.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I believe this possibility is being looked into by the minister and his department. But I will recall it to his attention immediately, Mr. Speaker.

## FARM MACHINERY

ACTION FOLLOWING FINDINGS OF PRICE DIFFERENTIALS

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. On April 1 the minister told the house that within a few days he would receive a recommendation paper from the royal commission on farm machinery prices. Has he now received that policy paper? If so, is he prepared to make a statement about it soon?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I will check into this.

[*Translation*]

## INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

In view of the fact that the St. Jean Baptiste Society of Montreal and the University of Sherbrooke refuse to receive the Prime Minister on St. Jean Baptiste Day, does the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce intend to commemorate the anniversary of that society, together with that of his election in the constituency of Drummond, where the Prime Minister saved him just in time?

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Calgary Centre.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

CO-OPERATION WITH UNITED KINGDOM IN RESEARCH

**Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. In view of the recent recommendation of a British parliamentary committee that British international co-operative defence projects should be extended to include countries such as Canada, and that joint efforts should be made on the basis of programs developed by countries with plants

in several countries, has the minister any immediate plans for co-operation with the United Kingdom in defence research?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It seems to me this question is of a type which normally should be answered by way of a statement on motions.

## AIR CANADA

STRIKE OF MECHANICS—AIRCRAFT FOR USE OF MEMBERS—PROGRESS IN NEGOTIATIONS

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** My question is directed to the Prime Minister. In view of the continuing Air Canada strike, will the Prime Minister give consideration to providing government aircraft next week so that members of parliament can attend to their constituency problems?

While the Prime Minister is on his feet, perhaps he can tell the house and the country if there is any sign of a settlement in this strike which is causing so much concern and hardship to the people of this country, notwithstanding the good work being done by regional air carriers.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** On the first point, Mr. Speaker, I first need an opinion as to whether the hon. member is suggesting he act as a strikebreaker.

**Mr. McGrath:** I made no such suggestion, Mr. Speaker. My suggestion was serious. I want the Prime Minister, because this is Friday and the beginning of a weekend, to give some ray of hope to this house and the country that there is perhaps some sign of settlement. If there is no sign of settlement, will he give consideration to making government aircraft available so that members of parliament may enjoy the same privileges that ministers enjoy in getting back to their constituencies?

[*Later:*]

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** A supplementary to the question asked by the hon. member for St. John's East. With regard to the matter of strikebreaking, does the Prime Minister consider the Department of Transport was strikebreaking when they extended privileges to other airlines to service our air traffic?

## AGRICULTURE

CORN—ACTION TO SUPPORT DOMESTIC PRICE

**Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Because of the time necessary to implement such a policy, may I ask him if the government has any plan under consideration with regard to excessively low priced imports to prevent the collapse of the price of domestic commercial corn, as was experienced in the last two harvest seasons?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, there were a lot of suggestions and considerations discussed between the federal Department of Agriculture and the provincial Department of Agriculture, bearing in mind some of the responsibility as to where jurisdiction lies for providing legislation toward a solution to these problems. We do not have a specific proposal now to deal with this. As I said on a number of occasions, the major part of the problem arises because of the competition for space during the harvest season.

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** A further question to the Minister of Agriculture. Since much of the problem is storage, would the minister give consideration to the request of the National Farmers Union in their brief that a storage policy be established by the government which would assist farmers in this area?

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance announced several months ago there would be accelerated depreciation of additional storage. Therefore there is part of a policy involved there now, with regard to storage.

**Mr. Gleave:** If there is part of a policy, Mr. Speaker, could the minister consider establishing a full policy?

## TRANSPORT

CHAPLEAU, ONT.—CLOSING OF PART OF C.P.R. SHOPS

**Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Will the minister consider intervening in a crisis which suddenly developed in Chapleau, Ontario, where the C.P.R. yesterday announced a decision to close a large portion of the shops, thereby giving notice to 66 families that they will have to move to another area? Could the minister ask the C.P.R. to reconsider this decision?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has made a representation which I must assume has been noticed.

BORDEN-TORMENTINE FERRY RATES

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** My question is for my fellow Burnsophile, the new and still unspoiled Minister of Transport. Has the minister yet had time to take steps to dissuade the C.N.R. from their deplorable efforts toward infiltrating the rates on the Borden-Tormentine ferry service?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** The position is not directly that of the C.N.R. I have been making some inquiries with regard to that matter, and I hope to have some information for the house in a few days.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Would the new Minister of Transport make some inquiries of the C.N.R. with regard to saving the "Bullett"?

## AIR TRANSPORT

CANADIAN PACIFIC AIRLINES AUCKLAND-VANCOUVER CONTRACT

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Will the government be assisting Canadian Pacific Airlines in their efforts to obtain renewal of their contract between Auckland and Vancouver? If so, in what respect?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** I will have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker. As far as I am aware, we will do anything we can to maintain our service in the Pacific. I will try to obtain a more specific answer.

**Mr. Bell:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since the New Zealand government is involved in this refusal and since Canadian Pacific Airlines are going to cause another application to go forward, will the minister consider backing them fully in this effort, and report to the house?

## PENITENTIARIES

TECHNIQUES IN DEALING WITH PRISONERS

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** My question is for the Solicitor General. Is his department giving consideration to implementing in some of our correctional institutions the new techniques for dealing with prisoners developed by members of the department of psychiatry at McGill University and presently being implemented in the New York prisons?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I saw the item in yesterday's paper on which the hon. member has based his question. Parts of that practice are in operation in Canadian penitentiaries now. Perhaps I should not comment more fully on the newspaper story.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE OF MINISTERS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** Before asking my question, I think it is a legitimate point to ask the house leader who is receiving questions for the Department of National Health and Welfare? Who is acting in the capacity of this minister today?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, there is no one acting for the Department of National Health and Welfare today. That is not in the roster for Friday.

**Mr. Lundrigan:** In that respect, I have no question. This is becoming a real farce. Yesterday I could not ask questions because time would not permit. Today I cannot ask questions because the minister is not here. The situation is hopeless.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC EXCHANGE WITH THE VATICAN

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** My question is for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Vatican's announcement that a number of saints are to be taken off the official list, will this affect the government's decision to consider establishing diplomatic relations with that body?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## AGRICULTURE

IMPORTS OF VEGETABLE OIL SEEDS

**Mr. George Muir (Lisgar):** My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. When giving consideration to the importation of cheap corn, will he take some action on the importation of cheap vegetable oil seeds, and oil? He has been considering this for the past year and it is ruining our industries in that regard.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, it is true that we have been giving serious and active consideration to this for a very long time. We hope to be able to find some basis for preventing this problem. I

have to advise the hon. member that the considerations involved in these two commodities are not the same.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

POSSIBLE PRESENTATION OF STATEMENT BEFORE SUMMER RECESS

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** At the invitation of the Prime Minister, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. It is supplementary to earlier questions regarding the statement on defence policy and/or the white paper on foreign policy. Is the minister in a position to say if that statement is going to be made before the summer recess?

**Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure I will not be able to resist the invitation, when I come back from the May meeting in Brussels, to make a statement to the house.

## WATER RESOURCES

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—COMPENSATION TO FISHERMEN FOR LOSS THROUGH POLLUTION

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** My question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, however I notice neither he nor his parliamentary secretary is here. I hope the absence of the hon. member is not caused by having acquired a taste for red herring. Is the acting minister in a position to inform the house if a decision has been made to assist the fishermen of Placentia Bay and St. Marys Bay which have been affected by pollution?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, the matter of the terms of the formula we might apply is under active consideration. As I assured the house earlier, there is a disposition to help these fishermen. For obvious reasons their inability to earn a living is beyond their control. As I am sure all hon. members will appreciate, it is difficult to find a formula to do this. I propose to meet with some of the fishermen during the weekend and hope we can come up with some of the answers at that time.

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the acting minister whether yesterday's reports in the press and on TV regarding animal experimentation by the Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare, and other related matters connected with the Department of Fisheries, were precipitated by a public relations effort on the part of these departments.

**Mr. Jamieson:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Transport. He mentioned meetings to be held in Newfoundland during the weekend. In view of the Air Canada strike and my inability to get home to my constituents, would he consider taking me along with him?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I assume the question has been heard and will be considered.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I assume the question period is over.

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the day. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) on a point of order.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** My point of order relates to the business of the house. I am sure it was an oversight, but yesterday we were not given our usual Thursday statement concerning the business for the ensuing week. I wonder if we might be given this statement at this time by the Minister of Agriculture, in his capacity as acting house leader. I am assuming that the debate on Bill C-150 will not last much longer and we would like to know what will follow that business. In giving the order of business I hope the minister will bear in mind the desirability of our giving our attention first of all to matters such as housing, veterans affairs and various other important issues.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, it has been difficult to outline a program of the business that would be called in the ensuing days, because of the length of time that has been taken on Bill C-150. If the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is correct in his assumption that we are approaching the end of that debate and the disposal of all the stages of Bill C-150, then of course if that were to happen today we are prepared to call Bill C-157 which is item No. 43, then Bill C-153 in respect of the Historic

Sites and Monuments Act which is item No. 17, and perhaps item No. 36, Bill S-15 in respect of the Food and Drugs Act. However if it should take all of today to complete the report stage of Bill C-150, we would call third reading of that bill for Monday.

It is not completely clear at this point in time, because we do not know when third reading will be finished, whether immediately following that we will be calling the bill in respect of the status of the official languages of Canada or the bill in respect of the National Housing Act. This will depend on how much time is required for Bill C-150.

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether there are other interim items which might be called. It has been suggested that item No. 68 in respect of the report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications might come up for debate.

**Mr. Olson:** Perhaps we should have a brief meeting of the house leaders to discuss matters of this nature.

[*Translation*]

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Thursday, May 8, consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penintentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 19, Mr. Rondeau.

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, at the time of adjournment last night, I was reciting the litany of the economic disorders generated by the present situation.

Mr. Speaker, when confronted with economic chaos, man should always get priority, for the very existence of the world is at stake and we have to defend it. The present chaos, slowly but surely, will lead us to the worst calamities and at last into a death whirl, thereby disturbing the very essence of human life.

At the present time, we have before us the bill on abortion. We are discussing an amendment moved by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), for deletion of clause 18 from bill C-150, and I should state, in the light of abortion, that never has human folly reached such a peak by way of cruelty, barbarity, cowardice and stupidity.

None can doubt that this world is hurling itself into the abyss, except those which have eyes and see not.

Instead of seeking negative measures we had better imagine positive, vital, constructive and moral ones. At the moment, we are thinking about economic measures, about man's requirements which are not adequately met. These requirements are the continuance of the human race and to continue, that race needs favourable economic conditions.

• (12 noon)

We are thus led to study documents and methods from other countries which went through the same alternatives as we do and were subject to conditions similar to ours.

Abortion in our society does not only involve morals and ethics but also peoples' health. There are medical and social factors involved, as is the case for venereal diseases.

This bill on abortion is not essentially meant to deal with the woman who cannot be aborted and dare not have an abortion, but with the mother who does not want to have one.

In France, Mr. Speaker, some steps have been taken to improve the economic conditions of the mother who is often led to ask for an abortion, because the economic conditions do not allow her to cope with that situation and to pass through that stage.

In France, family allowances are three times higher than those in Canada. Allowances for single salaries have been established and are paid beginning at the first child if there is only one professional salary in a home.

We have established the housing allowance. Housing allowances are paid to pregnant and, married women or unmarried mothers who do not have the means to lodge themselves properly. Then the State intervenes and sounder economic conditions are offered to those persons.

The rates of the S.N.C.F. and the principal transportation companies have also been substantially reduced. When a pregnant woman or her husband use those means of transportation, they enjoy special rates to protect the family and expectant mothers.

Abatements have been granted according to the number of children in the assessment of taxes.

In Canada, we also have tax assessments but they are not high enough to enable families to live decently as human beings.

Mr. Speaker, several measures, before and at the time of birth, have been enacted to help women carry through their pregnancy.

Further provisions have been made, including three free consultations during the third, sixth and eighth month of pregnancy. In the course of the first month, a complete check-up must be made free of charge by the physician. If the husband or wife works, prenatal allowances are granted after each medical examination.

Mr. Speaker, Canada has no such plan. This is one of the reasons for today's complications. One of the reasons why the famous Bill C-150, and particularly clause 18, have been introduced is that we are unable to provide the people with sound economic conditions.

Such a situation would call logically for the deletion of clause 18 from the bill. It is logical, Mr. Speaker, that we take the time required to adopt economic, social and humanitarian measures for the benefit of our Canadian families to whom our country owes its greatness and its splendour.

So, Mr. Speaker, about first child allowances in France, it is said, and I quote:

—are paid only if the birth occurs in the first two years of marriage or before the future mother is 25 years old. So a single woman who becomes pregnant after the age of 25 does not receive this allowance. It would seem desirable, on the contrary, that she benefit from this allowance even if she is above the age limit, to encourage her to keep a child of whom she will be the sole supporter.

A nursing bonus is payable from the thirtieth day following birth; it is equal to two thirds of the amount of the monthly allowance.

What special steps are taken for single women? In order to increase the marriage rate, some countries have established a marriage loan—

—in Sweden.

It is a loan bearing current interest but requiring no guarantee. The marriage loan with partial refund at each birth promotes the regularization of common law marriages and early procreation.

A preventive allowance for desertion. But the payment of a small amount is an inadequate palliative, and is therefore ineffective.

Maternity homes provide free care. Women can stay there up to three months after delivery. (At Fontenay-les-Roses, women can remain there up to a year after their delivery; during the day, they look after their child and do housework.)

Therefore, the principle is excellent. Unfortunately, there is not a sufficient number of those maternity homes. In France—

—and in many other countries—

—the homes are financed by the state in a proportion of 20 per cent and social welfare provides the remaining 80 per cent. In that area, the Salvation Army is very efficient—

[Mr. Latulippe.]

—and plays a very important and productive role.

Mr. Speaker, faced with all those possibilities, once again we must logically and seriously think about what we are doing. The changes we are bringing to the Criminal Code will not be useful to Canadian society. The measures contemplated provide for the legalization of atrocities which are absurd—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Latulippe:** —terrible—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment would be to wipe out the proposed new section 18 which seeks to broaden in some measure Canadian abortion legislation. For this reason I and the party with which I am associated must oppose it as we have opposed many other amendments which have sought to prevent any modernization of our abortion laws.

For many days now a number of us have sat quietly while a minority of members of the house have voiced their opinions, often in very passionate opposition to what they believe to be wrong. That is their right. They have exercised it to the full, and those of us who believe in civil liberties have been glad to let them exercise it to the full. But now, Mr. Speaker, it is time that the majority should be heard. It is time that something should be said in support of the opinions of the majority of people not only in this house but across Canada.

Less than a month ago a Gallup poll was taken in this country and this question was asked:

It has been suggested that abortion be legalized as well, to preserve a mother's physical or mental health. Would you approve or disapprove of such a step?

Some 73 per cent said yes. Nearly three-quarters of those polled were in favour of legalizing abortion to preserve a mother's physical or mental health. That is exactly what the amendment that the government has put before us in this omnibus bill proposes.

I feel that this legislation does not go far enough, and I shall explain in what regard it falls short in a moment. However, I believe that the significance of this legislation lies not

so much in its provisions as in the fact that the government recognizes that the majority of the Canadian people definitely want to come to grips with the problem of abortion.

• (12:10 p.m.)

I have been appalled, but not too much surprised, at the number of the members of this house who have absolutely refused to recognize that there is an abortion problem, a problem that exists in real life. Yes, it exists in their philosophies and in the particular religious and moral convictions they have cited. It is real there, but they have refused to recognize it is a real thing in the lives of thousands of Canadian women today. They have refused to see the problem that exists. They have refused to recognize that thousands of Canadian women every year are getting abortions, most of which are illegal under the present law. They have refused to realize that those women who can pay are able to get an abortion abroad or right here in Canada; and these abortions are carried out carefully and safely in all respects. As I have said, this applies to those women who can pay. Those women who cannot pay are being butchered, mutilated and tortured by people who are often quacks and unfitted for the job. Often well-intentioned neighbours attempt abortions with barbarous instruments. Some women have to resort to people of this type because they have no other way of securing an abortion.

Many women are having to bear the burden of pregnancies which they do not want and cannot cope with at all. We have been told over and over again in this house that women ought to be able to bear the consequences of their act, just as though the act were not participated in by others. Here I refer to the male half of the team, which very often gets off scot-free and has no difficulty at all. This hideous discrimination is continuing. We have the disgusting hypocrisy of seeing this kind of thing going on and the law doing nothing to grapple with the problem. The choice we in Canada face today is not whether we shall have abortions or no abortions, because we will have abortions and they are being performed now. The choice is, shall we have legal, safe abortions regardless of whether people are wealthy or not or shall we continue with the backroom, butcher system of abortion which we have had to date? This is the choice before us.

We in this party wanted it declared legally that abortion is not a crime. We wanted to do what we are proposing to do with respect to birth control legislation, that is, remove it from the Criminal Code altogether and put it where it belongs, under the heading of a medical and social problem. We wanted to leave the question of abortion to the decision of the pregnant woman, her doctor and those people directly concerned on either side of the partnership. That is what we wanted, Mr. Speaker, but you, quite rightly, found this was not possible in the way in which our amendment had to be drafted. Therefore we shall have to continue to press as best we can for the enlargement of the legislation introduced by the government. We shall support this legislation until we get something better.

This is a 4 per cent law. A similar law was passed recently in Colorado and it is called just that, the 4 per cent law, because it affords relief and help to about 4 per cent of the women who need it. I talked recently with Dr. Alan Guttmacher of Mount Sinai Hospital in New York, and he tells me it is true that the Colorado law will minister to about 4 per cent of the women who need this help. We shall support the government legislation because it is an improvement over the present law even though it falls very far short of what is necessary. This legislation does not touch the question of illegal abortion, which is the most serious aspect of the problem for those women in the low income groups.

I should like to tell the house one or two things in which I believe. I believe that the state has no right to compel a woman to continue a pregnancy which she feels unable to cope with, whether for reasons of physical, mental, or emotional health or of economic circumstances. I believe the state has no right to compel an unwanted child to be born.

We have been told by speakers to my left that women want abortions for reasons which are often not at all serious. We have been told that it is not a serious reason for a woman to want an abortion when she already has a number of children and feels that for health or economic reasons, she cannot cope with any more. In my view it is the responsibility of parents to have only the number of children they can afford. It is the responsibility of parents to have only the number of children they can afford to raise properly as Canadian citizens in good health, well educated and well aware of their responsibilities. This is the responsibility of parenthood. To go ahead and have all the children that arrive is in my view the height of irresponsibility in today's world. I believe that, Mr. Speaker, from the very depths of my being.

In the old days the world needed all the people it could get in order to carry out the work of the world, which often had to be done by brute force and ignorance because they did not have all the mechanical aids that we have today. In those days there was a great deal of disease and maternal and infant mortality. There had to be many more children if there was to be any hope that enough of them would survive in order to carry out the work of the world and continue the human race. However, Mr. Speaker, I say with all the force at my command that today the world needs an increasing population in exactly the same way that we need the nuclear bomb.

Responsible legislators who are grappling with today's problems and Canada's share of world problems would not make the kind of irresponsible statements that we have heard in the last few days, namely, that we should continue indefinitely increasing the population even of this country which is not yet overcrowded. These are irresponsible statements in a world where the population explosion is menacing certain areas now. We also shall have to take the consequences of the population explosion in those areas.

One feature of this debate which has alarmed, saddened and, I may say, made me feel very indignant, is the attitude toward women which has been displayed by some hon. members. It is quite an unconscious attitude; I am not saying it is deliberate. It is an inborn, inbred, uneducated attitude, an unconscious attitude on the part of many people in this country toward women. I could read letters to the house too. The leader of the Creditistes read a letter last night. I have received letters from the same type of people, although not the same type of letter.

The letters I have received are from people in despair, social workers and pregnant women. These are not young girls who go out for an evening and get into trouble; they are women who have had three or four pregnancies, are in poor health and financial circumstances, often with an ill husband at home, and who do not know how they will raise their existing children physically, emotionally and financially. They do not want to be forced to have indefinite numbers of children. They do not want this situation to continue with nothing being done about it and no recourse at all available to them. These are women who have tried birth control methods conscientiously and honestly, and those methods have failed. These are not frivolous, light-hearted women who want an abortion so they can get into a size 10 dress when at the moment they are wearing a size 16.



I think some hon. members who have taken this attitude have done so because they do not know any better. This is the kind of attitude I have been listening to for many days. They have treated women purely as baby machines, without minds, feelings or rights of their own. They have suggested that it is the duty of women to have any number of children without complaint. They have suggested that therapeutic abortion boards should include a psychiatrist for the purpose of telling women that maternity under any circumstances is good for them. They have suggested that spiritual advisers be appointed to therapeutic abortion boards for the same purpose.

As George Bain said in his column in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* the other day, the boards they suggest might include just about everybody but the T.V. repair man, and it might be a good idea to put him on the board because he might show more compassion than the people who have been suggested as members. Members of this house have argued that pregnancy reduces even an intelligent woman to a state of mindlessness where she needs a man to tell her what is good for her, and that, of course, is always that she must continue her pregnancy regardless of the effect upon her or the child or society.

• (12:20 p.m.)

The great majority of people believe that this attitude is completely wrong. No one denies the right to anyone to hold such beliefs or express such opinions as the ones to which we have been listening for the last two weeks, and we have proven this by sitting quietly while they expressed them. But I will not permit the impression to be left by them that this legislation will in any way force abortions on people who do not want abortions and who do not believe that they are right. This legislation will apply only to those who want and who believe in the necessity of abortions.

In spite of much that has been said and implied, no one will force an abortion on any woman who does not want one. No one is going to force a doctor to perform an abortion if he does not want to perform it. Let me assure hon. gentlemen that no one has the slightest intention of aborting them, even if such a procedure were desirable—and who is not tempted at times? I am afraid that no therapeutic abortion board would be willing to do the job even if it included psychiatrists, spiritual advisers and TV repair men.

For far too long the minority in this country has held back the majority in this matter. Certainly during past weeks we have seen a demonstration of how the minority in this house has held back the majority. Now it is time that the majority be allowed the right to act according to their conscience, while respecting the right of the minority to continue in their own way according to their own conscience. The other night I heard the Creditiste leader say on television in loud and clear tones, "They must respect us as we respect them." We intend to respect them and we have proven that respect. This legislation will show respect for people who do not believe in abortions. On the other hand, those of us who believe in the modernization of abortion laws are not going to allow any minority in this country to hold back measures which are needed by the citizens of Canada.

**Mr. Caouette:** Would the hon. lady permit a question? I agree that the minority should not impose its views upon the majority, but would the hon. lady not admit that a referendum should be held across the country on this very matter so that we can determine the views of the majority and of the minority?

**Mrs. MacInnis:** I believe it is the job of the government to govern, and once that government has implemented its policies in legislation the referendum will come at the next election. If these people can prove that they are the majority, then we shall have a referendum in the right way, at the right time, and in the right place.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Loiselle:** The hon. member is speaking like a Liberal now.

**Mr. Lewis:** Do not insult her. She is doing well.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** I should like to say a word now about clause 18 and the premises where abortions are to be permitted. I am very glad to see that since this legislation was introduced the government has added approved hospitals to the former provision which simply said that accredited hospitals would be the only places where abortions could be performed. I think this is a very wise change because accredited hospitals are far too narrow a base for the operation of the new legislation. If the clause had not been changed, the result might well have contributed to the pile-up of abortions such as we have seen in other countries. Second, some districts have no accredited hospitals, and consequently abortions should be allowed to be performed in approved hospitals, which means approved under the laws of the province wherein they are situated. Third, some accredited hospitals will not want to perform abortions anyway. So in order to allow an opportunity for necessary abortions to be performed, even where there are several hospitals available in our cities, we are very glad that the government has added "approved hospitals" to "accredited hospitals" as places where abortions can be performed. Eventually—and this would help in more scattered areas—I believe abortions should be allowed to be performed legally in well equipped and approved medical clinics and even in well equipped and approved doctor's offices. We are not ready for that at the present time but eventually this should be done.

The facts about abortion are shrouded in an emotional fog which it has been very difficult to penetrate even in the long investigation that has been carried out. Recently I witnessed a film which showed an eight-month foetus which was almost a completed human being. It was very recognizably human. In that film the impression was given that this almost completed human being was a fit subject for abortion. I raged when I saw it because there was no opportunity to say anything about it then. This impression is all wrong. Abortions could and should be performed before the end of the third month of pregnancy. The safe limit is the twelfth week of pregnancy. This has been brought out in evidence over and over again. The knife is not the only way. We have been told over and over again by some witnesses before the committee that an abortion is a dreadful thing, that it involves the loss of vast quantitities of blood, haemorrhaging, mutilation, and all kinds of other complications. This is a great exaggeration. For example, the new suction or vacuum method is in wide use in countries behind the iron curtain as well as in other countries, notably Japan and Israel. I myself have witnessed such an abortion which was performed on a two-month foetus. It required only a local anaesthetic, took 15 minutes to perform, and was carried out by a regular qualified doctor in Canada. It caused practically no bleeding—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member. Has the hon. member the unanimous agreement of the house to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This operation relieved a woman in her late thirties who had several children. She had health problems which her doctor had told her were serious. Her income was very modest and her husband had refused to consider any sterilization of himself even though he was in sympathy with what she was doing and in full knowledge of it. I may say that I witnessed this operation with her permission. This woman had conscientiously but unsuccessfully tried birth control methods, with the acquiescence and co-operation of her husband. The operation brought about relief from a situation with which neither she nor her husband felt able to cope. Within 15 minutes of the operation being performed the woman got up from the table, had a cup of coffee and on the arm of her young daughter went home and has been perfectly well ever since.

This is the truth about most abortions, and I wish it was better known. Those people who are keeping this truth shrouded in an emotional fog and who are using the ideas of the middle ages to prevent us from entering into the 20th century are not doing a service to the Canadian population. Let them leave these ideas back in the middle ages together with the torture chamber, the rack, the thumbscrew and those other things which belong to a less enlightened age and which are not in accordance with the needs of today.

The whole subject of abortion should not be treated as a criminal matter but as the medical, personal and social matter which it is. It should be dealt with in such a manner as to provide justice to every citizen regardless of his or her income. It should be dealt with in such a manner as to provide flexibility for individual cases and for different schools of thought in Canada; there should be flexibility to accept new methods and techniques. The only way to meet these requirements is to remove the subject of abortion completely from the Criminal Code and leave it to those directly concerned, namely, pregnant women, their doctors and those members of the medical profession required. The bill now before us does not do this, but pending the introduction of such legislation I serve notice that while I am in health I shall present proposals for such legislation until we get it. Meanwhile, we in this group are glad to go on supporting this bill right through to the end of this debate, and we hope that the end will not be far off.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*Translation*]

• (12:30 p.m.)

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) for having readily participated in this extremely important debate, and at long last, the minister was seen to smile.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, after such an extended debate on the question, the only remarks made in this house were against abortion; because of this, we are pleased with the contribution of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway.

However, throughout her speech, one could perceive the main reason why she is in favour of such a legislation. Of course, we had foreseen it, since we have been denouncing it since the very beginning of this debate. And all the sentimental and social arguments put forward by the hon. member are precisely those that have been ascribed to us, and that is the reason why we continually wandered during this debate from considerations entirely unrelated to the subject matter, that is whether abortion is a murder or not, whether it should be allowed for health reasons or what is the nature of the abortion.

Scientifically and medically speaking, what is abortion? The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway was entirely off the track in this regard.

Why are we told about illegal abortion? There is nothing in this clause that will control illegal abortion. On the contrary, clause 18 will promote illegal abortion and I want to substantiate my statement with very specific arguments.

In those countries where abortions were authorized, on the ground that there were too many illegal ones, what happened? Illegal abortions quadrupled after the legislation authorizing abortions was passed.

It is very easy to understand. Why? What happens? Let us suppose this bill is passed and abortion is legalized according to the provisions of clause 18. What will happen to all those women and young girls who are just waiting for abortion to be legalized to resort to the provisions of the law? In those extremely numerous cases, these young girls or women will come before the hospital therapeutic abortion committee to ask for an abortion. The doctors will discuss the case, consider whether it is justifiable or not and after having studied the condition of the patient, will decide against an abortion because the life of the mother is certainly not in danger nor is her health affected. What will happen?

The young girl or woman who asked for an abortion will get it anyway, but who will she go to then? After meeting with a refusal from the advisory committee, she will consult illegal abortionists. There will be plenty of such cases.

That is why such legislation, in all the countries where it was adopted, caused increase in the number of illegal abortions. We shall not be shocked by the haemorrhages brought on by the use of knitting needles, or of any kind of contraption.

Why do we not need this legislation? Because present statistics, at least those relating to Quebec, prove that the number of illegal abortions is decreasing to a very great extent. We are about to reach the zero point on this subject. Why? Because there are some misgivings. Since people are better educated, they know better how to manage. So abortion becomes useless.

Why then authorize abortions for quite sentimental and emotional reasons?

The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway brought in the argument of "the population explosion", which makes me laugh because, nowadays, at least in our region, large areas are abandoned and an increasing number of our rural parishes are deserted. There is an increasing shortage of manpower to the extent that it is impossible to step up the development of our immense country. The expression "population explosion" makes me laugh.

But, as the hon. member comes from Vancouver, perhaps she fears the yellow peril and in view of the great number of Chinese and Japanese people who are faced with a population explosion problem, I do understand her point.

• (12:40 p.m.)

Perhaps the hon. member is being influenced by the problems faced by Japan, India and China. But, what has that got to do with Canada, a country larger than the United States, almost as large as the Soviet Union with her 225 million people? It is absolutely inconceivable to talk of a population explosion in Canada, a country of 22 million people. This is something unbelievable, especially for us Quebecers and French-Canadians who can perpetuate our race only through childbirth, because we cannot rely on immigration to increase the population of our country.

For us, the best kind of immigration is made up by the children coming from the wombs of our women, and we want to look at the problem more positively and encourage the raising of families, because we need them.

This argument about the population explosion is ridiculous, in my opinion, and it should be dropped, either in the Atlantic or in the Pacific, or in both.

Mr. Speaker, it is also regrettable that the only feminine voice we hear in this house—a charming voice which we love to hear as a rule—should express ideas which, in my opinion, are in opposition to those of the great majority of the population.

We said that we represented our areas, that we reflected the opinions of our people, but we become more and more aware that people think like that throughout Canada.

In support of this statement, I will recall the wonderful speech made by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) last night. His intervention was worthwhile, in my opinion, and set the record straight.

The hon. member said, and I quote:

> —I will remind the minister that the onus is not on those members who are carrying on the debate because of their deep religious conviction and the dictates not only of their consciences but of the consciences of Canadians throughout the land, including Canadians in the area which I represent.

Mr. Speaker, Calgary is far from Quebec, far from Trois-Rivières, far from my constituency. But I realize that over there they have the same problem; most Canadians are opposed to abortion, just like the majority we are representing here as a minority. This is what the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway was saying earlier.

We are told that we are standing in the way of freedom, of democracy, that we are hindering the house. This is a manner of speech which to me does not reflect reality, since many members have been elected by a narrow margin.

And when two, three or four parties have put up candidates, the member elected by the people may get only 20 or 25 per cent of the votes in his riding. Therefore, we must conclude that 75 per cent of the people did not vote for the government. Thus the government is elected by about 35 or 40 per cent of the voters, which means that 55 per cent of the people were against the present government.

When we speak of majority, we should take this factor into account in the political system we have at this time. It is an anti-democratic system to the extent that it was said that the Pearson government was ruling with 37 per

cent of the votes. Even if 63 per cent were against it, that did not prevent the government from holding office.

In such circumstances, we do not hold a majority. And yet a majority is against the present administration. That is why to say that a minority holds back the majority is a ridiculous statement. On what grounds can one be prevented from taking the floor in the house? Will such a practice be used to undermine a sound democracy?

I shall quote but one paragraph of a letter sent by Mrs. Marie-Paule Doyle to Mr. Marcel Gingras, editorial writer of *Le Droit*, who in his lucubrations decided to write an article on the Créditistes' stand against the omnibus bill.

Mrs. Doyle concludes her letter as follows:

> Our democracy is a pitiful one and I am very disappointed to find that the media, which in my opinion should ensure that democracy operates as well as possible, are so willing to flatter a government whose members are mere puppets.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) admits it sometimes most candidly, he tells us that he cannot do anything, because he has some commitments.

It is too bad, because the Minister for whom we have a high regard and who moreover we find much more handsome than the Prime Minister—

**Some hon. Members:** Attention, attention!

**Mr. Matte:** —on account of all those stories has unfortunately become a mere puppet. His features, his attitude, his fine bearing, in fact everything in him are not consistent with the word puppet and I am sorry to say that he is one, because it is true.

Therefore, the argument, according to which a minority delays the proceedings of the house—an argument which they are starting to hurl at us—is untrue. When we maintain that a majority of Canadians are against abortion, we are absolutely convinced. And the intervention of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway has all the less surprised us, because I remember that at the beginning of the discussion on the bill we had told the house that the bill, especially as far as homosexuality and abortion were concerned, actually originated from the New Democratic Party and we still have again another proof thereof.

People say that we are going back to the Dark Ages, that we express ideas that are as dead as the dodo. In barbarian times, such actions were common. They were perpetrated in primitive tribes, where the mother or the father had a right of life or death over their children. Abortion was performed, not only when the child was in its mother's womb, but at the time of birth, so that girls were killed with impunity, but boys were safe. Those things happened in barbarian times, during the Dark Ages.

Today, we live in a modern world where the right to freedom comes first. The most valuable right to freedom is the right to live and this is the one we defend. This is the very right we are defending today from a position of strength, since we got the support of a great number of Progressive Conservative members and here again I would like to quote what the hon. member for Calgary North said yesterday:

> Tonight, a great nation is bleeding. It is bleeding because the government insisted, because of the antagonism of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), on bringing in this bill, no matter what other important questions were facing the nation, and ramming it through the house. I am not one of those who are critical of my hon. friends to the left.

He should have said to the extreme left.

> That little group has fought and stood for the principles in which it believes. These hon. members are content to have their names publicized and to be accused of filibustering. They feel deeply about this question. The minister knew this when he introduced the bill. The Prime Minister knew it. We are now engaged in a debate on this contentious issue. The bill contains many worth while amendments. The minister knows how I and my party feel about amendments to the Criminal Code.

We are not alone, Mr. Speaker, but we have been alone unfortunately, in discharging our true responsibilities, we have been alone in stirring up public opinion and in awakening somewhat the conscience of hon. members. We are going on today with determination, all the more so as we find that others now share our views, that others have finally understood that our fight is not a useless one. Whether this bill is adopted or not, whether these clauses are adopted or not, when the people learn of the consequences which we have stressed, they will recognize those who have fought for a just cause.

• (12:50 p.m.)

Those who were not swayed by emotions or blood, realize that the only possible attitude is to preserve the privileges attached to the indefeasible right to live, and that this indefeasible right also belongs to a human being still in the mother's womb.

What is the value of human life? I could say that a building has a certain value, and the same thing goes for human life, but the building has value only in relation to human

beings and to their needs but human life has intrinsic value. These two values come into play for human beings; they have value for others, and an intrinsic value as human beings. It would be dangerous to confuse the two, for we might then be tempted to look upon individuals as upon instruments to be used by others, or even by the state. That is just about the philosophy of the N.D.P. in this regard.

This same faulty reasoning would allow the killing of the unborn child for the sake of family well-being. If we consider, the value of a human being only in his relations to others, any human life becomes expendable.

A cripple, a homeless or abandoned tramp may not seem to have any value for others. If this were the only valid criterion we could eliminate people in cold blood. It is forbidden because we recognize the intrinsic value of human life.

Never mind the circumstantial concepts surrounding the fundamental right to live; we must not be influenced by such considerations. We must safeguard the paramount principle, the right to life, which we have fought for.

Yesterday we had the chance to hear two magnificent speeches by the hon. members for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) and for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette)—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Does the hon. member have the consent of the house to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Agreed. The hon. member for Champlain.

**Mr. Matte:** I wish to thank sincerely all the members, particularly since it is the first time such a privilege is given me.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**An hon. Member:** You are getting better all the time!

**Mr. Matte:** Here is how we must consider the question of abortion.

From the beginning, we have spoken to all the amendments only from a scientific and medical point of view. But yesterday, in order to prove that we were not repeating ourselves, and to show that we had studied the question from all angles, we heard the two speeches of the hon. members for Shefford and Témiscamingue, who stressed the moral and religious aspects. It was the first time we put those arguments forward, because we wanted to be taken seriously.

We wanted to extend our full co-operation to the government and to clarify the matter.

Everyone knew that the matter was controversial, from the very moment the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) introduced this famous bill, and since the election campaign which all the members of our party waged on that issue in their respective ridings.

Therefore, the government knew that that was an extremely complex matter which would give rise to doubts and would lead to this opposition.

That is why today, Mr. Speaker, the odium of this endless debate should be imputed to those who are actually responsible because they had been warned that we would not let such a matter pass without opposition. Even if this could harm us politically, we had taken for granted that we had the right and the obligation to reassert here, in the house, the truly human stands which are imperative with regard to such a vital and important matter.

If we were the only ones, Mr. Speaker, to think like that, if we had been the only ones to advocate such a thing, I can assure you that we would have realized a long time ago the mistake we were making in trying to extend the debate. But we were sure of having a full and unconditional support. I have not received a single letter telling me to stop. I am still waiting for a telephone call of someone who will tell me: "What are you doing? Enough of that. What are you trying to do?" I am still waiting.

Then, Mr. Speaker, why is it that all the representations we are receiving urge us to carry on and to try and convince the government?

It is a very sad thing indeed—I said so before in my first speech on the subject—to find that this house is often nothing more than a school of verbosity. That was one of the most unpleasant surprises I had since I came here. We realize that all our arguments are only intended for posterity. Luckily, we can at least count on that. When our grandchildren will read those speeches, they will say that there were at least a few who had common sense at that time.

What is disappointing is that we know it is useless to bring forward any argument or to consider the question from every angle, since we know perfectly well that the decision is

already made. There is nothing more discouraging for a young member who wishes his country well and who would like that all legislation considered beneficial to the entire population. I am still waiting for an answer to the question I asked the minister. I am insisting on this for the last time, as we are now studying the last amendment regarding abortion.

Mr. Speaker, about three months ago, I put a question on the order paper. I asked whether some organizations were advocating the passage of the bill on abortion and homosexuality and, if so, which ones. The minister himself told me by a curt "no" that there were none.

On the other hand, he mentioned some 50 to 60 organizations which had sent their opinions on the subject. As he said "no" and as 50 to 60 organizations had sent briefs on the subject, that meant that all those organizations were totally in favour of the bill, or at least had strong doubts about it.

I would like the minister to tell us who are those people, apart from the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway and other hon. members of the New Democratic Party. Who are those people who want the passage of the bill on abortion? Who are those people? We should know that.

Are there people other than a certain Lyse Payette who, on the C.B.C., said that she wants to be the sole master of her body, and that it should be so with all women, and that it is as simple to undergo abortion as to have a tooth out? Who absolutely wants—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. It being one o'clock, I must now leave the chair until two o'clock.

[*English*]

At one o'clock the house took recess.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, in order not to hold up the debate, I should simply like to close my remarks on these words: I should like all the considerations we have brought up on the amendments concerning abortion to be summarized by the last amendment we have introduced proposing the deletion of clause 18. If that amendment were passed, any debate on the omnibus bill would automatically be brought to an end and this house would have proved to the people that it could take into consideration all opinions, regardless of whose they are. It would give the government the opportunity to prove its fair play, its understanding, and to prove that all the members really participate in the shaping of our legislation; in short, that together we strive towards the goal of giving our country adequate laws, with a view to helping not only a very limited number of individuals but, generally, the whole population for the common good of all. That was the purpose of all our interventions.



**Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova):** Mr. Speaker, it is the first time that I speak on this bill. I would have liked to speak several times but I hesitated for various reasons. First, I am not a lawyer. Therefore, I do not understand all the legal terminology.

Second, I am neither a doctor nor a psychologist. Therefore, I do not understand all the complexities that might present themselves, either on the side of the doctor in relation to the legislation on abortion, or on the side of the woman in relation to her health.

Moreover, I do not have statistics to prove my point, but I wish to say a few words because I am concerned as a legislator, and especially as an individual, by the way in which society is governed.

I might say that I do not speak for all my constituents, because opinions differ in my constituency, as everywhere in the country. I sincerely think that most Canadians are opposed to this part of the bill.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Many government members are opposed to motion of the hon. member for Notre Dame de Grace (Mr. Allmand).

I have, myself, as a representative or simply as an individual, discussed the proposed legislation with my colleagues who are lawyers.

The present legislation authorizes abortion if life is endangered. I discussed this problem with several colleagues of mine and all of them had the same answer. This is perhaps why I have not intervened so far: I was worried. If to procure abortion is a crime—though I know abortion is sometimes necessary—we must do away with all this.

On the other hand, if the legislation or the clause we have at present allow abortion when life is endangered and it is not a crime, I am satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why people want to go farther. And who wants it? What actually can endanger health? A nervous break-down? A headache? What does it mean? I do not quite understand.

This debate has not really answered that question. The word "health" was not defined clearly enough for me to accept clause 18.

The decision will be made by a committee of medical practitioners. Why not by one doctor only, who would bring common sense into play? If it is now a crime for a doctor to procure abortion, let us simply amend that part of the law.

Abortion should not be allowed for whichever reason comes to mind. That is why the word "health" has not yet been defined, in my opinion. I do not know what is meant by the word "health". It is that part of the law that worries me.

I object to the bandying about of all-too-handy reasons to justify the plucking of the infant from his mother's womb, and thus his murder.

As I said, there are reasons. If there are sufficient and serious reasons, let abortion be performed. This bill is a little too permissive, in my opinion.

Nobody said anything about the father of the child. I think that is also very important.

Clause 18 of the bill, in my opinion, is too liberal with a small "l" or perhaps with a capital "L".

At any rate, in allowing such things to take place, society urges us forward. It becomes too liberal for me. They want to change everything. Universities are a good illustration of that. Nothing is worth-while anymore. And so, down with everything.

No Mr. Speaker, there are still some things we should preserve; we could improve them perhaps, but let us not be too selfish and only think of number one, without giving a thought to anybody else.

Time has come to assume our responsibilities and, above all, to make our country a place in which it is good to be born.

We must and we can create a society which will care for unwanted children, but—and this is very important—before passing such a legislation, we should educate the mothers so that they and their children, might have a place in this world of ours.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are given too much licence. This bill is pushing us even further. As far as I am concerned, suffice it to say that if a doctor feels that an abortion is necessary, let him procure it out without committing legally a crime. In my view, the present law says so. That is why I am in favour of the amendment, or against clause 18.

A free vote has been called for. I submit that if the majority of Canadians wanted such a legislation, there would be no problem, even if we were allowed to vote freely on the matter, because the bill would be passed anyhow.

**Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska):** Mr. Speaker, it should not prove difficult to justify my intervention in this debate, considering the great number of representations we have received and also some facts that I shall have the opportunity of bringing to light during my speech.

I felt the government would give a great deal more attention to the numerous representations made by various important and impartial organizations on behalf of thousands of citizens. I have tried to understand the reasons that might justify the government in taking such action.

I listened to and read the speeches of the supporters of this bill and I also took into account the valid arguments of those who oppose it. I have done a great deal of reading which enabled me to judge the situation better: the ideas and principles expressed by ancient and modern thinkers, that required at times more than a superficial look.

We cannot always make decisions that meet our wishes. The main point in making a decision is that it be supported by facts. Any man is entitled to his own opinion, but no one is allowed to be mistaken as regards evidence. I think that you will agree with me that these two things are quite different from one another: the facts are controllable and remain unchanged, whoever refers to them, whereas each individual has his opinion. Let us beware of a false objectivity seeking only the happy medium between two divergent opinions, no matter where the truth lies.

I have before me an article entitled "The English people are worried about their abortion legislation", which appeared in the newspaper *L'Action* on April 15, 1969, and I quote:

The way the legislation permitting abortion under certain circumstances is now applied arouses "serious concern, even among its supporters", said

Mr. Richard Crossman, the British Minister of Social Services on Monday afternoon in the House of Commons.

That is to say, in Great Britain.

That legislation passed by parliament in October 1967 and which came into force in April 1968, authorized the termination of pregnancy when it involves a risk or endangers the physical or moral health of the mother, the unborn child, or the other children the mother already has.

Mr. Crossman stated that he was particularly displeased by the way the act was interpreted and applied in the private sector. Since June 1968, 22,000 abortions have been performed, more than a third in private clinics. The others were performed in government hospitals under the social security scheme.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Such matters should be considered before passing too readily an abortion bill.

These facts, Mr. Speaker, should bring our friends who support the legislation under consideration to pause over the consequences of the decision they are getting ready to make.

This is happening in Great Britain where the government reacts favourably to the socializing ideas of our N.D.P. friends.

**An hon. Member:** That is right.

**Mr. Dionne:** In the March 1968 issue of *Relations* I found an article which I will quote to support my argument. It deals with the Vatican II council.

God, master of life, has entrusted to man the noble ministry of life, and man must fulfil such a task in a manner worthy of him. Life must therefore be protected with extreme care as soon as there is conception. Abortion and infanticide are horrible crimes.

The right to live involves the duty to maintain it. The right to decent living involves the duty to behave with dignity in a civilized world. The right to search for truth involves also the duty to get to the core of such search within the limits of legality.

Men being what they are, it is natural that morals and politics seem sometimes to disagree, but it is also natural that we tend to reach an agreement in that field.

With a certain astonishment, I have observed the rather loose wording of the various clauses of that famous bill which has to date given rise to so much comments and which has shown that such legislation cannot be passed lightly. After all, it is a rather complicated document of more than 125 pages.

The amendment under consideration affects a clause which has considerable scope. However, we think that we are justified. Nobody can accuse us of delaying the discussion of the clauses of the bill, especially on this one.

In the first place, we did not ask for it and to judge by the considerable number of protests which we receive, it does not seem that the people want it either. To please the advocates of a new morality, should we allow, without discussion, the passage of a bill which include peculiar provisions inconsistent with the natural order?

We do not believe that we hold the monopoly of virtue, but we are not ready either to assume the responsibility of having contributed to destroy the authority of law. This authority is visibly challenged at every stage of this debate.

Is not law itself undermined by the increase of criminal abortion cases?

I think it is in order to re-establish its rights that many people, in various ways, favour more liberal legislation. We know the facts give the lie to that.

The extension of legal abortion does not reduce the incidence of illegal abortions. The purpose of the amendment is precisely to prevent decisions being made without thorough consideration.

I have here an article from the newspaper *La Liberté et le Patriote*, of St. Boniface, Manitoba, and I shall quote some excerpts referring to abortion:

It is quite obvious that the Criminal Code, as all other human legislation, must be revised from time to time. The complexity of modern social life can no longer be regulated according to rules established at a time when conditions and mentality were entirely different.

That does not mean we should proceed in a simplistic or absolute way, without allowing for a trial period in the administration of the law and without considering the deeper values that are involved.

It is particularly the case regarding the new provisions on abortion. The murder of a child in the womb of its mother or the provoked expulsion of a foetus not yet viable have always been considered, in any civilized society, as an abominable crime, as were the murders of children already born.

The real moral principles of mankind must be deeply buried if a society, our middle-class society, has become unable to see the murderous aggression against a viable foetus as the result of a criminal mentality, as in the case of any homicide.

Is the expansion of abortion laws a sign of greater civilization? Let us read what a famous historian, Daniel-Rops, indicates among the causes of the decline of the Roman Empire.

"The other threat the Roman society is faced with has always had something to do with over-indulgence in lucre and luxury. It has become so easy to get a divorce that public authorities have

become worried. Two legislations were passed, one in 19 B.C. and the other in 9 A.D., in an attempt to limit the damage, to fight adultery and to encourage births. Abortion and exhibition of children are not crimes and are common practice". (Jésus en son temps", p. 172)

One would think this is a description of a segment of our society. Does that not leave us a little perplexed? Would we want legislation that would lead us to the same fate as ancient Rome?

On page 107 of the *Relations* magazine, which is published by a group of Jesuits widely known for their competence, one can read about the attitude of Catholics and non-Catholics with regard to abortion, in a well-researched article written by Father Marcel Marcotte. This article, from beginning to end, reflects so much understanding and wisdom that I feel compelled to apologize to the author for extracting some excerpts. The whole is a masterpiece reflecting with impartiality Christian thinking on the very serious problem now under discussion, after having set forth the problem conscienciously and having clearly explained that the Catholics are not trying to impose on the non-Catholics their religious and moral views on abortion, but to express democratically their particular opinions on what the common good entails.

Father Marcotte writes, and I quote:

One must insist on this point, because certain reactions in the public and even in the parliamentary committee and the government seem to indicate that the intentions of the Episcopate have not been understood and occasionally have even been grossly misrepresented.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Further on, in the text, we find the following, and I quote:

Should a biologist, a medical doctor, a jurist, a Catholic moralist uphold the views of his Church on the problem of legal abortion, he is immediately accused of wanting to transpose in the legislation irrational prejudices related to his religious belief.

We can read also, in the same article, the following:

The same objection crops up again in discussions and lingers in the press under all kinds of forms; the members of the parliamentary committee are sick of hearing it. In short, it could be summarized this way: Since the legislation does not oblige Catholics to practise abortion, why would Catholics want to force non-Catholics not to practise it? We have just shown the lack of foundation for such serious charges, in the case of the official Canadian Church. Catholicism has, of course, maintained more strongly than most of the other religious groups, the traditional assertion which, up to recently was practically unquestioned, whereby the foetus from the first moment of pregnancy has a human character; it has therefore brought in sharper focus the immoral character of abortion. But it would be wrong to think that non-Catholics —mainly those with Christian roots—are on the subject as tolerant as they are believed to be. It is not the Canadian bishops but the Anglican Conference of Lambeth which stated in 1958:—In the strongest terms, Christians reject the practise of induced abortion or infanticide which implies the murder of a life already conceived (as a violation of the mother's personality) except in case of precise and unquestionable medical necessity. The condition of families or even governments which are desperately confronted with poverty and population explosion, can help us understand why, in their opinion, abortion is not as cruel as the slow starvation to which they are doomed. However, in the eyes of the Christian people, the sacred value of life is an absolute notion which admits of no violation.

And it is not a Catholic theologian but two of the most eminent theologians of the modern Protestant doctrine who wrote in turn:

The unborn child is, from the outset, a child. It is in a developing state and does not possess an independent life. But it is a human being and not a thing, not just a part of the mother's body. Whoever destroys a life in its germ, kills a human being—

Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics.

The destruction of the embryo in a mother's womb is a violation of the right to live granted by God to this new life. To ask if, in such a case, one is dealing with a human being or not is merely to confuse the issue. The obvious fact is that God surely intended to create a human being and that this embryo of a human being has been deliberately dispossessed of his life. It is nothing else but murder.

Dietrich Bonheffer, Ethics.

Closer to us, Professor Paul Ramsey, from Princeton University, expressed equally definite opinions in a recent article in the *Dublin Review* and in a paper read at the International Conference on abortion held in Washington in 1967, under the auspices of the Kennedy Foundation. Foeticide, he said, does not differ in any way from infanticide; an argument that can justify abortion could equally be of value to justify infanticide; as such an argument does not exist, one must conclude that abortion can never be justified.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief in my remarks. I think it is becoming obvious that the abortion section of this bill is very controversial and is causing a great deal of distress among some members of the house as well as many people in Canada. I do not think I need elaborate on the fact that the government has a responsibility to govern this country. I do not think there is any denying the fact that the country is facing many serious problems at this time. I am sure government members are of the opinion that the Creditistes are carrying out a filibuster. I would point out that I do not necessarily agree with them. A filibuster

works two ways. It takes two parties to disagree; one party proposes something and another party agrees or disagrees with it. In this case the Creditistes happen to disagree with a measure proposed by the government. The government has a perfect right to withdraw this section of the bill, and if this were done the debate would end very quickly.

**An hon. Member:** Stick to medicine.

**Mr. Yewchuk:** I stick to medicine on weekends, but at the present time I have to stick to philosophy. Turning from medicine to philosophy, Mr. Speaker, I point out that one of the problems facing the farmers of the west is that they cannot sell their wheat. The government is either unable or unwilling to market their wheat. Therefore, why are we in the House of Commons talking about legalizing abortions and homosexuality? How will this help sell wheat? We have a housing crisis in this country; more than half of the work force of Canada cannot afford to buy, a house in which to live. I ask again, why are we talking in the House of Commons about legalizing abortions and homosexuality? How will this solve the housing crisis? I do not think it will. I believe we are wasting time.

This government has a responsibility to govern, to deal with the serious problems facing the country. Yet here we are wasting time talking about a controversial matter which will have no bearing on the economic problems facing us and will in no way alleviate those problems.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I would ask the hon. member how he relates the sale of wheat to the amendment that is before us.

**Mr. Yewchuk:** I apologize, Mr. Speaker, and will try to keep to the amendment under discussion, but I think these are related questions. Solutions of the problems I am discussing are being delayed by talking about the abortion question, which as far as I am concerned is simply too controversial to proceed with at this time. I am sure that every member on the government side who has read his correspondence dealing with the question of abortion will admit that most of it has been against the bill.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Yewchuk:** Pushing forward with this legislation to legalize abortions and homosexuality has bogged down the government so much that the business of the country is being seriously neglected. I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is aware that this is an unpalatable section of the omnibus Criminal Code bill. We have reached the point where the minister should withdraw this section, but he will not do so. I wonder whether this debate will be referred to on a later occasion when rule 16A again comes before the house and whether the government will say: We told you so; we have to set time limits on debates to prevent this happening in the future. I can see this coming. I shall not accept that argument if it is raised in support of rule 16A which was discussed before Christmas.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** We aborted it!

**Mr. Yewchuk:** I should like to ask the Minister of Justice a question which I hope he will answer. Why was it so important to deal at this time with the sections of the bill concerning abortion and homosexuality? Canada is 102 years old. We have been getting along just fine with things the way they were. Therefore, why is this issue so important at the present time? Why are we taking up the time of the house talking about this question when we face so many serious problems in the country? Why, in view of this, are we discussing these two controversial issues?

I conclude by saying that I hope the government will reconsider its position and live up to its responsibility to deal with the important economic problems facing the country. I have mentioned a couple of those problems but there are others such as the spiralling cost of living, high interest rates and poverty. Twenty-five per cent of our people are living under conditions of poverty. How will legalizing abortion and homosexuality solve the problem of poverty? I do not think it will. I believe we are wasting time. I think it is shameful that we have spent so many days discussing this bill, thus delaying the honest to goodness business of the house about which we should be talking at the present time.

• (2:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in my turn in order to strongly support the amendment No. 19 moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), and tending to delete clause 18 of Bill C-150.

I do not intend, as usual, to speak too long. Many things have been said on the subject,

but there are still many things to be said, and certain statements, I think, deserve to be taken up.

The members of the house must make a decision heavy with consequences because, by broadening the legislation on abortion, people will be allowed to play with lives which do not belong to them.

The broadening of the legislation on abortion is construed by the public, at least by some people, in very different ways. Many people send us comments, letters, petitions or newspapers clippings to express their opposition to this abortion law. Some people through the party in office, have spread the word, that the government law on abortion would allow abortions on request.

This is why I think that we must act, as legislators, with all possible care, in order to avoid all the mistakes that could be made in relation to the legislation on abortion.

We believe that every human being has the right to live, unless he loses it through his behaviour, but I do not feel the foetus is an aggressor. It is possible to plead self-defence at times, but in the case of the foetus, this does not apply; to my mind, there is no question of the foetus, on his own, attacking the life of the one who carries it.

Others have proved before me, in spite of the faulty interpretation given in the Criminal Code, that life starts at the time of conception.

According to the evidence given, both before the committee of justice and legal affairs and the committee on health, welfare and social affairs, highly qualified doctors have proved, beyond doubt, that life starts upon conception.

God has willed that two human beings unite to perpetuate creation, and whether or not there will be life is decided at the time of this union. As Pope John XXIII said, and I quote:

—that human life is sacred ... from its very start, it directly involves the creative action of God.

Life is sacred and must be respected from the start, from conception on.

Dr. Houdré states, and I quote:

—man and woman create the child; one and the other provide, at the start, a very small mass of protoplasm that contains the potential of a being perpetuating the species and is endowed with the particular characteristics inherited from the father and mother.

This is further proof that life starts upon conception, that from that moment on, it must be respected.

Clause 18 of Bill C-150, wants to add to the act " .. endanger her life or health"; abortion would then be permitted. That is the vexing point, for the "health" of an unmarried or married mother can be construed in a very broad manner, and this could lead to all sort of abuses. Should we kill a living being, even if it is still in the womb of his mother, when very often it would only meet the whims of a woman for whom pleasure is the sole rule of conduct?

In the report of the debate of the committee of health and welfare page 867, No. 24, we can find the evidence of the President of the society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Man; Mrs. Sally-Ann Kerman. We know that unfortunately, all too often, in the case of mothers who are asking for abortion, the child is unwanted. This is what Mrs. Sally-Ann Kerman had to say in that connection:

As for the unwanted children of women who feel they must have the "right" to their body—

—as was saying, a few months ago, Lise Payette, on C.B.C., as she claimed a right to the free use of her body, we must understand however that another being has some rights too.

To come back to the quotation:

—I can only say that precious few of us here today did not become conceived because of planned parenthood. We all sort of "grew" on our parents as the first nine months of our development took place and by the time we arrived, everyone was adjusted to our existence. As a woman, I resent the use of the "right" when describing my body. I have the right to be my body unless I wish to destroy it, or tell someone how to dispose of it before or after death, or sell it for material gain. Now unless you propose to legalize suicide, euthanasia, or prostitution, do not tell me legalized abortion will give a woman the "right" to her body. I do not have to have unwanted children because in the affluent society I live in, birth control is my answer. I pay for my birth control methods, but the welfare recipients do not, and so even the non-affluent in our society do not have to have unwanted children.

Should birth control fail—and it is now 98 per cent effective—I do not think that legalizing abortion for the failures is enough reason to liberally destroy many humans, some of whom will benefit society. I do not want to go into the discussion of some of the world's famous "bastards" or people who have come up from the most impossible environments. We all know they exist, just as we all know there are hundreds that do not do anything but remain a blight to our society. Unless we are willing to murder the ones we have already established as "unnecessary" or "criminal", why pick on innocent unborn ones. I don't think we would have much use for social workers if we could solve all the world's problems with legalized abortion.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, that is undeniable evidence against the reasons a woman can set forth, in various instances, to secure an abortion.

This clause is intended to allow therapeutic abortion. But are we sure that only true therapeutic abortions will be performed? There is room for doubt. Let us listen to what Dr. Marcel Boisvert, a Montreal psychiatrist, said on February 5 last, at an information meeting held at the Plateau auditorium in Montreal. I would like to put on record once again that brief testimony which shows beyond doubt the uselessness of therapeutic abortion:

> As a psychiatrist... I believe that the present bill on abortion is not likely to help promote health, but, on the contrary, it could be prejudicial to the health of individuals and of society.

This is the conclusion reached by a reputable psychiatrist, after lengthy studies and a long professional experience. It is another evidence coming from an authorized person, who is forewarning us against the bill the government is now asking us to approve.

The reasons some people put forward when they ask that the legislation on abortion be broadened, are smack of hedonism. These people lust for the pleasures, the pleasant things in life, but reject duties and responsibilities.

It is sad to think that all children being both are not welcomed by hearts full of joy and hope.

Mr. Speaker, the person addressing you is the father of ten children. Well, every time there was a new birth in the family, my wife and myself, and later, the oldest children, have always rejoiced immensely in welcoming the new born baby.

Poverty and complex social situations sometimes create a painful atmosphere when a child is born, and that is mostly what prompts some women to refuse motherhood. We have failed to provide living standards that would allow families and individuals to develop fully. There is rather a tendency to restrict life opportunities. It is our duty to establish living standards suitable for human beings.

God has endowed the world with enough riches for all mankind. There are no poor countries but, in my opinion, only idiots who do not know how to use that wealth.

To respect life does not only mean not to kill. It means that life should be allowed to produce to full capacity, that the human being should be able to develop freely and harmoniously under proper conditions. Instead of legalizing the killing of innocent beings, let us rather make it possible to live, and we shall then fulfill the wishes of the Creator.



That is our duty, Mr. Speaker, and what is expected of us. I urge all members to follow the dictates of their conscience, and to be strong enough to have them respected.

In the course of this debate, and during the discussions in the various committees, especially since 1967, it was sought to find out the reasons why some people were demanding that the abortion legislation be extended. We came up with all kinds of reasons, and to show quite clearly how far some persons can go when they ask that the abortion legislation be extended, it has been demonstrated through the experience of every country in the world, that every time some latitude was allowed, the door was opened to abuses.

We know what happened in some countries, particularly in Germany, during the evil period of Nazism. We know how lightly the leaders of the German people valued the human being, with what carelessness and what contempt of human dignity they treated their disadvantaged citizens.

Some months ago, one of those leaders, Dr. Hefelmann, was located and arrested. And this is what Dr. Hefelmann, who was accused, as well as three other ex-nazis, of having taken part in 73,000 mercy murders under Hilter, had to say at his trial and I quote:

> We needed space for the wounded. The heads of the Third Reich were expecting the Allied raids and wanted to be ready to take care of the wounded, whether civilian or military.
>
> Long before war started, Hitler was contemplating a radical solution to dispose of mental and physical deficients and there was no doubt whatever as to what Hitler meant by "radical solution".

Then, the various testimonies, the various bills moved by the members of the house were intended to ask for what Hitler was doing in Germany before and during the second world war.

And I should like, before concluding my remarks, to recall the evidence given by a member on October 3, 1967, as is indicated in No. 1 of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the health, welfare and social affairs committee.

An hon. member, and I am talking of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), advocated the passing of an abortion bill. She stated three reasons in support

of her stand and explained the fourth as follows:

—and this is the positive side—I think it is time that we began to work toward quality population in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I understand that statement and may take the liberty of commenting it, this means that mis-shapen or mentally retarded children should suffer the same fate as in Germany.

The quotation continues as follows:

We are beginning to hear about the need for improving population and certainly to have children born into a country as the result of rape or incest is not going to be too helpful when one considers the environment that they are likely to encounter.

—were are not sure—

Also, I want to say that if some conditions are foreseen, such as in the case of thalidomide babies or congenital diseases, I do not think it would be advisable for Canada to allow such beings to be born.

In my opinion, this is going much too far in a society where there is room for all those who are allowed to be born.

Such considerations should prompt us to be very careful and to ask all hon. members to think twice before doing anything to make abortion available upon request.

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I had prepared a 20-minute speech, but, so as not to delay the business of the house and to allow members to enjoy a longer week-end—they all have a lot to do during the week-end—I shall refrain from making this speech.

However, before resuming my seat I want to congratulate my hon. colleagues for having so ably shown that the object of this amendment was to delete clause 18 from the bill. I am in favour of the suppression of clause 18 and I shall vote accordingly.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is on motion No. 38 (Mr. Rodrigue) which reads:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 18 the words "a majority" in lines 38 and 39 on page 42 and substituting therefor the words: "unanimous decision".

The house divided on motion No. 38 (Mr. Rodrigue) which was negatived on the following division:

*Division*

YEAS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack
Beaudoin
Bell
Bigg
Burton
Caouette
Carter
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Forrestall
Gundlock
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
Latulippe
Lundrigan
MacInnis
McGrath
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Paproski
Peddle
Reid
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Scott
Southam
Woolliams
Yewchuk—35.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Allmand
Anderson
Béchard
Beer
Benjamin
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cantin
Clermont
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Fairweather
Forest
Forget
Gibson
Gillespie
Gleave
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guilbault
Harkness
Hellyer
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Isabelle
Jamieson
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Laing
Lang
Laniel
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Loiselle
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Macquarrie
McCleave
McIlraith
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mather
Morison
Nowlan
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Orlikow
Pelletier
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Ritchie
Roberts
Rochon
Rock
Rose
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman

*Division*

Schreyer
Serré
Sharp
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whiting
Winch—108.

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

The question is on motion No. 37 (Mr. Rodrigue) which reads:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting paragraph (c) of subsection 4 in clause 18 on page 43 and substituting therefor:

"(c) has by certificate in writing signed by the three members of the Committee, stated that in its opinion, the life of the mother cannot be kept safe from danger with the continuation of her pregnancy."

The house divided on motion No. 37 (Mr. Rodrigue) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack
Beaudoin
Bell
Bigg
Burton
Caouette
Carter
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Forrestall
Gundlock
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
Latulippe
Lundrigan
MacInnis
McGrath
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Paproski
Peddle
Reid
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Scott
Southam
Woolliams
Yewchuk—35.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Allmand
Anderson
Béchard
Beer
Benjamin
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cantin
Clermont
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Fairweather
Forest
Forget
Gibson
Gillespie
Gleave
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guilbault
Harkness
Hellyer
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Isabelle
Jamieson
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Laing
Lang
Laniel
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Loiselle
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.) (Vancouver-Kingsway)
Macquarrie
McCleave
McIlraith
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mather
Morison
Nowlan
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Orlikow
Pelletier
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Ritchie
Roberts
Rochon
Rock
Rose
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Schreyer
Serré
Sharp
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whiting
Winch—108.

• (3:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

The house will now proceed to the question on motion No. 19, Mr. Rondeau, which reads as follows:

That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting therefrom clause 18.

The house divided on Motion No. 19 (Mr. Rondeau) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack
Beaudoin
Bell
Bigg
Burton
Caouette
Carter
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Forrestall
Gundlock
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise

Latulippe
Lundrigan
MacInnis
McGrath
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Paproski
Peddle
Reid
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Scott
Southam
Stewart (Cochrane)
Woolliams
Yewchuk—36.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Allmand
Anderson
Béchard
Beer
Benjamin
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cantin
Clermont
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Fairweather
Forest
Forget
Gibson
Gillespie
Gleave
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guilbault
Harkness
Hellyer
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Isabelle
Jamieson
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Laing
Lang
Laniel
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Loiselle
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Macquarrie
McCleave
McIlraith
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mather
Morison
Nowlan
Nystrom
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Orlikow
Pelletier
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Ritchie
Roberts
Rochon
Rock
Rose
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Saltsman
Schreyer
Serré
Sharp
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whiting
Winch—107.



**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion through the usual channels and I believe there is general agreement that for the balance of the consideration of those matters that are still outstanding in respect of Bill C-150 we might have an order that the house proceed to third reading of Bill C-150 on Monday after completion of the report stage of the said bill.

• (3:40 p.m.)

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, there is agreement to this order, that if the report stage is completed on Monday we can then proceed to third reading without the one day delay.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the agreement if we do not manage to finish in the next 17 minutes.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** We have also agreed Mr. Speaker, that the study of the motion for third reading of this bill should be undertaken as soon as possible.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** It is so ordered. The house will now proceed to the consideration of motion No. 42.

**Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre (for Mr. Gilbert)** moved:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by inserting therein clause 75A as follows:

"75A. Section 641 of the said Act is repealed."

**Mr. Speaker:** As has been indicated to hon. members there is some question as to whether this amendment is in order, is procedurally correct, and if hon. members have views to express for the guidance of the Chair I would be pleased to hear such views at the present time.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief and I shall do what I feel I must do as graciously as I can. On behalf of my colleague, the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), may I say that we feel the subject matter of amendment 42

is one that it would be desirable to discuss while we are debating the Criminal Code. What the amendment proposes is the abolition of whipping, or corporal punishment as we usually call it. However, one has to admit that your rulings, sir, which you gave on April 25, respecting amendments Nos. 17, 18, 20 and 32 would make it very difficult for one to argue that this amendment is in order.

The rulings that I refer to were based on the fact that in your view those amendments sought to go behind the present bill, to make changes in the act itself. One has to admit that that is what this amendment would do, and therefore I am afraid I would be damaging my reputation if I tried to argue it was any more in order than the other ones were. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if you rule it out of order we will understand, but we hope that the government will deal with this matter at an early date.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps it is not necessary to consider the matter further. I would be tempted to say I concur in the judgment rendered by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). This motion to delete section 641 of the Criminal Code would go beyond the amendments now before the house and because of this, concurring in the arguments put forth by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I rule that the amendment cannot be put to the house.

The house will now proceed to the consideration of motion No. 43.

**Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre (for Mr. Gilbert)** moved:

(43) April 15, 1969—That Bill C-150, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by inserting therein clause 75B as follows:

"75B. The said Act is further amended by adding thereto, immediately after section 655 thereof, the following section:

655A. (1) Subject to the provisions of subsections (3) and (4), everyone convicted of an offence punishable on summary conviction under this act, who, for a period of three years after he has served the sentence imposed or has paid the fine imposed as a result of this sole offence, has not been convicted of any offence under this act, shall, for all purposes including those of this act be deemed not to have committed the offence for which he was convicted.

(2) Subject to the provisions of sub-sections (3) and (4), everyone convicted of an indictable offence under this act, who, for a period of five years after he has served the sentence imposed or has paid the fine imposed as a result of this sole offence, has not been convicted of any offence under this act, shall, for all purposes including those of this act be deemed not to have committed the offence for which he was convicted.

(3) A Board of Convictions Review shall be established by the Attorney General for Canada and upon the expiration of the periods in subsections (1) and (2) as the case may be a person may apply in writing to the board to have his adjudication of guilt expunged.

(4) Upon receiving the application provided for in subsection (3), the Board of Convictions Review may, where the person has not been convicted of any offence under this act within the period of three or five years as the case may be, make an order that his adjudication of guilt be expunged.

(5) Where the Board of Convictions Review denies the application it shall give written reasons and, the person may, within ten days after receiving such notice, appeal the decision to a superior court judge by notice of motion upon two days written notice to the board.

(6) Where an order has been made by the Board of Convictions Review to expunge a person's adjudication of guilt, all documentation relating to his arrest and conviction shall be extracted from the files of all law enforcement agencies over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction and shall be sealed and kept separately under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General for Canada.

(7) In all matters over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction, a person may not be questioned with respect to arrests or acquittals which have been deemed not to have taken place pursuant to subsection (8) or with respect to convictions which have been expunged pursuant to the provisions of this section.

(8) Anyone arrested for the commission of an offence under this act and subsequently released without further proceedings and, anyone receiving a verdict of acquittal, who has not been arrested or acquitted for a period of one year following the date of his arrest or acquittal as the case may be, shall, for all purposes including the purposes of this act, be deemed not to have been arrested or acquitted.

(9) Nothing in this Act prohibits the reference, in any proceeding under this act, to a person having been arrested, acquitted or convicted where such arrest, acquittal or conviction represents a subsequent arrest, acquittal or conviction, as the case may be."

**Mr. Speaker:** The Chair has misgivings about the procedural aspect of this motion, and I would be pleased to hear the views of hon. members.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, after my remarks of a few moments ago I was told by my colleagues that I would never get a job as a defence lawyer. But there is such a thing as consistency, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Fairweather:** Not in this place; maybe in paradise.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** This seems to be an attempt to get me off the track, Mr. Speaker. In any event, this amendment in our view is a very important one. Its subject matter has to do with the desirability, in certain cases, of expunging criminal records after a reasonable period of time. We felt that this subject formed part of a discussion of the Criminal Code and should have been in order at this time. However, in view of the rulings you have already given in respect of the amendments I cited a moment ago, I realize that if I tried to argue that this one was in order it would probably be in vain.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. member would not be a good defence lawyer he would be a splendid Speaker.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think my ruling on this amendment has to be considered with previous rulings to the effect that the proposed motion does go beyond the terms of the bill. For this reason it is irrelevant and cannot be properly put.

We will now proceed to motion No. 44.

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East)** moved:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 110 the words "and for a limited period not exceeding fifteen days" in lines 10 and 11 on page 120.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I hope all hon. members of the house have noted that, as usual, I am in order and, as has been drawn to my attention by comments I hear, that this is the last amendment on this omnibus bill. It does not deal with abortion or homosexuality. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is a new concept because my amendment deals with rehabilitation of those who are living. There are some interruptions, Mr. Speaker, and I have been asked by some Conservatives if I would not take them into consideration, too. May I answer, sir, that so far as I am concerned anyone who is mentally atrophied is dead.

For the benefit of those who have not had time to go into the implications of the section which I hope to have amended, may I point out that it does not deal with the Parole Board nor does it deal with any inmate of a penitentiary. This section deals wholly and solely with certain authority to be given through the medium of the Lieutenant-Governor of a province to a specified officer in dealing, under certain circumstances, with boys and girls in provincial reformatories or with those who have received a sentence of one day less than two years and are therefore in a provincial jail.

In order to make the situation amply clear, and since the proposed new section is brief, may I read it as it appears on page 119 of the omnibus bill. The clause is No. 110 and it refers to a proposed new section 37A, headed "Temporary Absence" which reads as follows:

• (3:50 p.m.)

Where, in the opinion of an official designated by the Lieutenant-Governor of the province in which a prisoner is confined in a place other than a penitentiary, it is necessary or desirable that the prisoner should be absent, with or without escort, for medical or humanitarian reasons or to assist in the rehabilitation of the prisoner at any time during his period of imprisonment, the absence of the prisoner may be authorized from time to time by such official for an unlimited period for medical reasons and for a period not exceeding fifteen days for humanitarian reasons or to assist in the rehabilitation of the prisoner.

In view of the wording of this clause, I ask the consideration of the house in respect of my amendment. May I say very briefly that for a great many years I have had great interest in penology. It has always been my hope that we in Canada would reach an understanding in respect of those who are anti-social and break the law. It has been my hope that our approach would not be that of punishment but of the rehabilitation of offenders.

May I make it clear, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying I believe in molly-coddling those who break the law laid down by parliament and enforced by the judiciary of the country and who are sentenced to reformatory, jail or penitentiary. Having paid the price for the offence committed, these people should be rehabilitated so they can become useful members of our society.

I was most happy to note the recent public remarks of the chairman of the Parole Board of our country, who stressed that we have many people in jail in Canada who should be on probation or parole. It costs the taxpayers of this country much less to have them on probation or parole than it does to have them in jails or penitentiaries. The experience in recent years in Canada is that when offenders are released on parole the majority of them can be rehabilitated. We have had over 80 per cent success in this regard.

With that very brief background, Mr. Speaker, I shall deal with my amendment to this clause. I can well understand the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith), the minister in charge of our penitentiaries and responsible for reporting on the parole system, including in this omnibus bill introduced by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) authority for the Lieutenant Governor of a province to designate authority to a responsible official to grant leave to a person in a reformatory or provincial jail, without limit, for medical reasons. However, I say that from the viewpoint of rehabilitation, philosophy and policy I am absolutely stumped by the reasoning behind the wording of this clause. It provides that if a person is to be released by the responsible official designated by the Lieutenant Governor for humanitarian or rehabilitative purposes, the release shall be limited to a period of 15 days. In my opinion, this does not make any sense whatsoever.

If the Criminal Code enacted by the parliament of Canada contains authority to release a prisoner for 15 days for humanitarian purposes, why in the name of heaven cannot this release be for 16 days, three weeks or a month if the humanitarian reason is still present and if the prisoner is not breaking the rules laid down when he was granted that release for humanitarian purposes?

I should now like to say a few words with regard to rehabilitation. There must have been not only a cloudiness but a complete blank in the mind of the Solicitor General and his advisers when they included in this clause the limitation of 15 days for one released for rehabilitation purposes. Although a prisoner may have proved that he is a top-notch and should be released, at the end of 15 days the authorities will say: Boy, you will now come back to jail.

I think I know the argument that will be advanced by the Solicitor General for the inclusion of this provision in the bill. Unless I am wrong—and if I am, the minister will say so—the only reason is that there is no limitation upon the release of a boy or girl from a reformatory or provincial jail who may be a good subject for rehabilitation. The authorities concerned are exercising the power of the Parole Board of Canada. I do not know of any other reason, because only the Parole Board has the power to parole.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Who drafted this clause?

**Mr. Winch:** I do not know, but they certainly did not know what the devil they had in mind, and they did not know anything about modern penology. Mr. Speaker, since the time for private member's hour has arrived, may I call it four o'clock?



## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. 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 the following bills to which the concurrence of this House is desired:

Bill S-31, an act respecting Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Bill S-32, an act respecting the Canada North-west Land Company (Limited).

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** 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, private bills.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, like the acting house leader for the government, I commence these few remarks by saying there have been some discussions and I think it will be found that there is general agreement to deal with the first bill under this category, namely, Bill S-6, and that when the consideration of this bill has been concluded, the house might adjourn. I think that is a general understanding. If this can be agreed to, I think hon. members will find that the consideration of Bill S-6 will not take very long.

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, my understanding also is that there is a general disposition that Bill S-33 might be dealt with in the same way.

• (4:00 p.m.)

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out, there have been some discussions, and if we can dispose very quickly of item No. 1 on page 31 of the order paper and perhaps refer item No. 10 to the committee without debate, there would be agreement to this.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## PRIVATE BILLS

### CANADA TRUST COMPANY—REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Thursday, February 13, consideration of Bill S-6, respecting

the Canada Trust Company, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, and the amendment of Mr. Saltsman.

**Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo):** Mr. Speaker, it has been the long standing position of the New Democratic party to support and encourage Canadian ownership in all industries of this country. Our reason for wanting this bill passed expenditiously at this time is that we feel there may be a danger of hurting this particular company if the debate were prolonged. I should like to quote from the text of an address by the chairman of the board and president of the Canada Trust Huron and Erie Company:

> We are hopeful that the bills will be passed, but understand there is a possibility that they may be talked out and thereby fall to the bottom of the list under procedure relating to private bills. This of course would effectively prevent the granting of the authorization for increased capital for the time being, and it would cause delay and consequent expense in completing the Waterloo Trust and Halton and Peel Trust mergers.

This is certainly not the intention of the New Democratic Party, and for that reason I ask the consent of the house to withdraw the amendment.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton)** moved:

> That Bill S-6, an act respecting the Canada Trust Company as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs be concurred in.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** When shall the said bill be read the third time, by leave now?

**Some hon. Members:** By leave, now.

**Mr. Blair** moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

## ATLANTIC MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants)** moved that Bill S-33, to incorporate Atlantic Mutual Life Assurance Company be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to the special order agreed to on this day, this house stands adjourned until Monday at 2 p.m.

At 4.05 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, May 12, 1969

The house met at 2 p.m.

## 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 S-34, an act respecting Nova Scotia Savings and Loan Company to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

[*Translation*]

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### HEALTH, WELFARE AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

Eighth report of Standing Committee on Health, Welfare, and Social Affairs.

[*Note: Text of above report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

### SPORTS

#### REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON SPORTS FOR CANADIANS

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table in both French and English the report of the Task Force on Sports for Canadians, and I might take the liberty to make a short comment in respect of it. I have read this report. I think all members of the house will find it very provocative. It questions the attitude of all Canadians in both the public and private sector toward efforts made in this regard. It questions what it calls the intellectual arrogance of many of Canada's opinion leaders and refers to what it terms the great potential for mass involvement and mass participation and what they can contribute to national unity.

Many of its recommendations flow from this type of approach throughout the report. I think I can assure the house that the government will take into very serious consideration many of its recommendations, and is aware of what is involved in this respect.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the chairman of the task force, Dr. Harold Rea, who is in the Speaker's gallery, Dr. Paul DesRuisseaux, also of the task force. Nancy Greene, the other member, unfortunately could not be with us today. I would like to compliment them on behalf of all hon. members for what I consider the very excellent job they have done. They worked hard in a very compressed period of time trying to adhere—and they did so—to the time limit involved. Because of their efforts in this area we have their report, and it has given us something very constructive to work on in the near future. I wish to thank them again, Mr. Speaker.

• (2:10 p.m.)

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, as the minister just said, the task force has just completed its work and presented its report. Unfortunately, we in the opposition have not had the opportunity to examine it and therefore I am not in a position to comment on it. I hope that the task force has done a constructive piece of work, as I am sure they have, and I look forward with great interest to studying the report in detail, now that it has been made available to us.

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone in the house and many people in the country will be very interested to read the report of the task force on sport. This is partly because Canadians are a sport minded people and also partly because we do not think that we have done well enough in world tournaments. We find the findings and recommendations of the task force to be excellent. We note with approval one finding which is to the effect that the government is going to be asked to take a greater interest in the matter of national hockey league contracts. We are all in favour of that, if this is the case.

Without wishing to prejudge the report, I think that it is important to keep in mind that no matter what good recommendations may have come from this task force, money is still the name of the game, ironic as that may seem with regard to amateur fitness. For example, it is a fact that the track and field people of Canada and their associations are so hard up for money that they are reported to be currently running a national draw,

offering trips to Europe, give-away cars and other inducements for the purpose of raising $75,000.

We wish the task force report well and we hope the government will take action on the undoubtedly good sections of it. I should like to make a suggestion with regard to the raising of money. We approve the holding of a national lottery. If such a lottery is ever held we might consider gearing it to the production of extra funds for the promotion and training of Canadian athletes.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, regardless of the value of the report submitted by the task force, I believe that, as the previous speaker just pointed out, the whole question is of a financial nature, since it is actually a levy of funds. At a time when restrictions and all such things are being announced, the task force should make a special effort to find the shortcomings of our financial system and to submit to the government more concrete proposals than those submitted now.

[*English*]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

TEMPERANCE ACT REPEAL

Question No. 1,270—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Is repeal of the Canada Temperance Act being considered by the government?
2. Have any provincial governments requested the repeal of the Canada Temperance Act and, if so, which governments and on what occasions?
3. In the Province of Quebec, which are the municipal governments taking advantage of the provisions of the Temperance Act?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):**

1. No.
2. No.
3. The Canada Temperance Act is not in force in any locality in the province of Quebec.

SUBSIDIES TO COAL PRODUCERS

Question No. 1,432—**Mr. Anderson:**

1. What is the total amount of the federal subsidies paid to British Columbia and Alberta coal producers to assist them in competing on the Japanese market?
2. What companies received these subsidies and how much did each receive?
3. Are all of these companies Canadian owned?
4. If not, what percentage of the ownership is non-Canadian?
5. What is the per-ton subsidy at present?

[Mr. Mather.]

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Dominion Coal Board and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as follows:

1. Increased subventions or subsidies, specifically designed to assist in the development of an export market in Japan for British Columbia and Alberta coals, began on August 1, 1957. Over the eleven fiscal years, 1957-58 to 1967-68 inclusive, the total amount expended on export subventions for this purpose was $24,935,963.05.

2. Alberta Coal Limited, Luscar, Alta., $2,724.00; The Canmore Mines Limited, Canmore, Alta., $5,191,976.80; Coleman Collieries Limited, Coleman, Alta., $8,523,815.31; West Canadian Collieries Limited, Blairmore, Alta., $637,473.00; Crow's Nest Pass Coal Company Limited, Fernie, B.C., $7,389,532.86; Crows Nest Industries Limited, Fernie, B.C., $3,061,-877.20; Kaiser Coal Limited, Fernie, B.C., $128,563.88.

(N.B. The name of Crow's Nest Pass Coal Company Limited was changed in 1965 to Crows Nest Industries Limited and coal interests of the latter were acquired by Kaiser Coal Limited in 1968.)

3. All are Canadian companies incorporated under federal or provincial statutes but details of shareholder ownership and nationality have not been required by the Dominion Coal Board as matters of record.

4. The information filed by these companies under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act indicates that the legal ownership of these corporations, as maintained in their respective share registers, varies from wholly Canadian to wholly foreign-owned.

5. $2.73 per net ton for much of the tonnage and $2.55 for the balance. The range is largely a reflection of differences in mining, transportation and other cost factors for different mines in Canada and differences in the competitive position of different types of coal in Japan.

FOREIGN STUDENTS IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

Question No. 1,699—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. How many foreign students in receipt of either allowances or free tuition are in the universities of Canada during the current college year?
2. How much does each of said students receive?
3. What is the total expenditure by the Government of Canada under the student plan?
4. How many Canadian students are studying abroad under exchange or other student plans?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1. Students sponsored by

Canadian International Development Agency under various assistance programmes: 1214; Students under Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan: 239; Total: 1453.

2. Regulations concerning living allowance are at present under review. However, for the past two years the average stipend has been $165 a month for an undergraduate student and $180 a month for a graduate student. In addition to the monthly living allowance granted, CIDA also pays all tuition fees and certain allowances for clothing, books, etc., as well as providing for essential dental and medical care.

3. In fiscal year 1967/68 CIDA spent $8,396,000.00 on its training programs which includes expenditures for all students or trainees administered by CIDA and NOT only those at Universities in Canada as shown in Answer No. 1.

4. There are approximately 1800 Canadian students studying abroad under various programs. This includes 1200 under the auspices of the Canada Council, 347 under the auspices of the National Research Council, 93 under the auspices of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Program and 74 who have received scholarships from foreign governments. These figures do not include Canadian students abroad which have received scholarships from provincial governments.

QUESTIONING OF APPLICANTS AT MANPOWER CENTRES

Question No. 1,776—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. What official of what department is responsible for drawing up questions to be put to applicants appearing before examining boards at various Manpower Centres in regard to positions on ships operated by the Department of Fisheries in the Atlantic region?

2. Do these questions remain the same for all applicants?

3. If not, is there one or more of these questions that remains the same for all applicants?

4. What questions were required to be asked applicants for the position of cook on the Patrol Boat "Sabella" at examining boards at the Manpower Centre, Sydney, Nova Scotia, on February 17, 1969 and at Port Hawkesbury, Nova Scotia, on February 18, 1969?

**Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** 1. Regional Marine Supervisor of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, after consultation with the Regional Personnel Office.

2. Yes.

3. Not applicable.

4. These cannot be made available as they are confidential.



STRENGTHENING OF FRENCH LANGUAGE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Question No. 1,852—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

Is the Government of Canada committed to contributing to the strengthening and advancement of the French language and French culture in any foreign country and, if so, in what countries and in what measure in each case?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** The Government of Canada has undertaken many initiatives with foreign countries which, broadly, if only indirectly in many cases, have contributed to strengthening and advancing the French language and French culture. The Government is highly interested in the progress and advancement of both. Indeed it has sought for instance to expand the use of the French language in the United Nations and it has collaborated in improving it as a working language by its interest in the "Conseil international de la langue française". The French language and culture are also the bases of exchange programs conducted under Canadian cultural agreements with France and Belgium. The Government also conducts many developmental programs with the French countries of Africa. It is clear however that the assistance provided under this heading is intended primarily for social and economic development although it may have significant and welcome effects on the progress and development of the French language and culture.

BEAUSOLEIL ISLAND NATIONAL PARK

Question No. 1,976—**Mr. Rynard:**

1. How many organized summer camps are now located in Beausoleil Island National Park?

2. Does the government propose to expropriate the lands occupied by any of these summer camps?

3. What are the reasons for expropriation and when is the expropriation to commence?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. 5.

2. No.

3. Not applicable.

C.B.C. COSTUMES

Question No. 1,981—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Is it the policy of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to refuse to loan or rent costumes to performing groups or individuals for performances other than those being televised or broadcast for the C.B.C.?

2. Were costumes in the wardrobe of C.B.C. Winnipeg worn by the Jimmy King Orchestra at the Winnipeg Auto Show, March 5 to 8, 1969 and, if so, was there a rent charged?

3. Was an employee of C.B.C. Winnipeg Wardrobe Department attending an opening night of that show for fitting purposes and, if so, was there a fee charged for his services, and what fee?

*Questions*

4. Have costumes in the wardrobe of the C.B.C. Winnipeg been rented or loaned to the "Cercle Moliere", The Manitoba Theatre Centre or other organizations and individuals and, if so, what organizations and individuals and what rent or other remuneration was involved in each case?

5. If costumes from the wardrobe department of C.B.C. Winnipeg were rented or loaned to any groups or individuals, in exception of general policy, what were the reasons in each case?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows:
1. Yes. However, on very rare occasions costumes may be loaned, e.g. when C.B.C. performers have contributed their services to an organization for charitable purposes, or when a private function is involved and the general public is not in attendance.

2. Jackets were loaned to the orchestra through a misunderstanding on the part of C.B.C. personnel. The circumstances have since been reviewed and C.B.C. policy has been reemphasized to prevent recurrence of any similar situation. No rent was charged.

3. No.

4. Costumes have not been loaned or rented to the Cercle Molière or the Manitoba Theatre Centre. However, on occasion the C.B.C. costume department in Winnipeg has loaned a costume to other organizations, notably the Winnipeg Press Club and Rainbow Stage. No rent or other remuneration was involved.

5. Costumes have never been rented. The loans to the Winnipeg Press Club were authorized since a private club function was involved which was not attended by the general public. In the case of the Rainbow Stage group, the costume loaned was not obtainable from any other source in Canada.

*GASPÉ SCHOOL BOARD—C.B.C. COVERAGE

Question No. 1,983—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Was a C.B.C. crew sent to investigate a financial crisis in the Regional School Board?
2. If so (a) how many were in the crew (b) how did they travel?
3. What were the expenses for (a) the crew (b) accommodation (c) transportation?
4. Was it necessary to dispatch a private plane from Rimouski to pick up the television tapes (a) if so, for what reason were the films not returned with the crew (b) what was the cost of the chartered flight?

**Mr. Robert Stanbury (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State):** I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: 1. The program «Aujourd'hui» was in the area from January 16 to 18, 1969 to investigate a financial crisis in the Regional School Board.

2. (a) Six persons in all three in connection with production and three for filming; (b) By air.

3. (a) $992; (b) $152; (c) $1,132.

4. No, because the film travelled with the production team. Total cost of the chartered flight was $460. However, the decision to charter a plane permitted a saving of $850 in reimbursements from Air Gaspé, living allowances, and other costs not incurred since the team did not have to wait two extra days for regular flight.

EASTERN HALIFAX COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS

Question No. 1,987—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. How many public wharfs, breakwaters, skidways and other such facilities are there in Eastern Halifax County?
2. Where is each located?
3. In each of the last three years, how much money was spent on each facility for general maintenance?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** 1, 2 and 3, listed below:

| Location | Structure | 1966 $ | 1967 $ | 1968 $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baker's Point (E. Jeddore) | Wharf | 220 | 3,000 | 3,595 |
| Carter's Point | Wharf | — | — | — |
| Chezzetcook East | Wharf | 495 | 1,100 | — |
| Cooper's Point | Breakwater | 4,400 | 4,700 | 1,200 |
| Clam Bay | Breakwater | — | — | — |
| Eastern Passage | Breakwater | 50 | — | 2,738 |
| Eastern Passage | Retaining Wall | — | — | — |
| Eastern Passage | Berthing | — | — | — |
| Ecum Secum West Bayport | Wharf | — | — | — |

*Questions*

| Location | Structure | 1966 $ | 1967 $ | 1968 $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ecum Secum West | Breakwater | — | — | — |
| Ecum Secum West | Freight Shed | — | — | — |
| Factory Cove | Wharf | — | — | 300 |
| Fox Island | Breakwater | — | — | 650 |
| Fox Island | Beach Protection | — | — | — |
| Grand Desert | Shore Protection | 50 | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| Grand Desert | Breakwater | — | — | — |
| Harrigan Cove | Breakwater | 50 | — | — |
| John Vogler's | Shore Protection | — | — | — |
| John Vogler's Shore | Breakwater | 90 | — | 5,706 |
| Little Harbour | Wharf | — | — | — |
| Little Harbour | Freight Shed | — | 200 | — |
| Lower West Ship Harbour | Wharf | — | — | — |
| Lower West Ship Harbour | Freight Shed | — | — | — |
| Macdonald's Cove | Breakwater | 240 | — | — |
| Maugher's Beach | Breakwater | — | 650 | 30,000 |
| Mushaboom | Wharf | 1,119 | — | — |
| Ostrea Lake | Wharf | — | — | — |
| Owl's Head | Wharf | — | — | — |
| Owl's Head | Freight Shed | — | — | — |
| Petpeswick | East Wharf | — | 100 | 4,657 |
| Petpeswick | East Freight Shed | — | — | — |
| Sheet Harbour (East) | Wharf | 34 | 2,424 | — |
| Sheet Harbour (West) | Wharf | — | — | — |
| Sheet Harbour (West) | Wharf | — | — | — |
| Ship Harbour | East Wharf | — | — | — |
| Ship Harbour | Freight Shed | — | — | — |
| Sober Island | Wharf | — | — | — |
| Sober Island | Freight Shed | — | — | — |
| Sober Island | Breakwater | — | — | — |
| (Mosher's Cove) Spry Bay | Wharf | 185 | — | — |
| Spry Harbour | Breakwater | — | — | — |
| Tangier | Wharf | 5,800 | 400 | — |
| Three Fathom Harbour | Breakwater | — | — | — |
| Three Fathom Harbour | Wharf | 200 | — | — |
| Three Fathom Harbour | Causeway | 75,000 | — | — |
| Three Fathom Harbour | Groyne | — | — | — |
| Three Fathom Harbour | Shore Protection (Talus) | 8,000 | — | — |
| Turner's Island | Wharf | 5,830 | — | — |

*Questions*

ATOMIC ENERGY WAGE CONTRACT

Question No. 1,997—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. Does Atomic Energy of Canada Limited have a wage contract with its employees that is based on regional or zone divisions?

2. If so, what are the rates paid by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited to the various classifications of employees in the different zones?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Atomic Energy of Canada Limited reports as follows: 1. No. However, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited has collective agreements with unions representing prevailing rate employees at Ottawa, Ont., Chalk River, Ont., and Pinawa, Man.

2. Following are the rates of pay under current collective agreements for a representative selection of occupations common to the three locations:

| | Hourly Rate | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Ottawa | Chalk River | Pinawa |
| Tool Maker | $3.65 | $3.74 | $3.74 |
| Electrician | 3.55 | 3.58 | 3.57 |
| Spray Painter | 3.32 | 3.25 | 3.22 |
| Stationary Engineer Cl. 3 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 3.10 |
| Truck Driver | 2.66 | 2.65 | 2.58 |
| Labourer | 2.37 | 2.35 | 2.27 |

COLLECTION OF MOTOR VEHICLE TAXES

Question No. 2,005—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. Is the Department of National Revenue considering adopting the recommendation of the Auditor General in his 1968 Annual Report, page 87, paragraph 148, that all duties and taxes related to motor vehicle manufacturers be collected at the time of importation and that benefits or incentives provided be made available to the manufacturer only when evidence is produced that the required conditions have been met?

2. If not, what alternatives is the Department considering regarding improving the procedures in administering concessions made to motor vehicle manufacturers, in order to adequately protect Canadian Government revenue?

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue):** 1. The practice of permitting duty free importation of vehicles by qualied manufacturers of motor vehicles and motor vehicle components under the Motor Vehicles Tariff Order 1965, was questioned by the Auditor General in previous reports. As a consequence, the matter was referred to the Department of Justice. In the opinion of legal authorities, if the goods were entered under tariff items imposing a duty, there would be no basis for permitting re-entry of the goods under the Motor Vehicles Tariff Order 1965, and, consequently, no importer would be able to obtain the advantage thereof.

[Mr. Laing (Vancouver South).]

2. The procedures in administering the program were considered to be adequate for the protection of the revenues. The records of motor vehicle manufacturers are audited on an annual basis. Failures to meet the requirements of the Motor Vehicles Tariff Order 1965, are reported to Government for appropriate action. Importers are required to amend entries and pay duties on goods imported under the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Tariff Order 1965, and subsequently diverted. Customs officers have been instructed to ensure that such amending entries are presented at regular intervals. In addition, the Investigation Service of the Department checks for diversions at premises of both vehicle manufacturers and parts suppliers.

AIRCRAFT TO EXTERNAL AID OFFICE

Question No. 2,008—**Mr. Saltsman:**

What is the name of the Canadian aircraft manufacturer referred to in the Auditor General's 1968 Report that sold one of its aircraft to the External Aid Office for $120,000 and repurchased it shortly thereafter for $100,000?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** The DeHavilland Aircraft of Canada Ltd.

STUDENT MILITIA PROGRAM

Question No. 2,013—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider the feasibility of providing summer employment through implementing a broader and more extended plan of student militia and, if so, will the government consider the program for both male and female students and, if so, will the government consider the ages from 15 to 21 inclusive?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** The Student Militia Program was terminated in 1966 as it was found that there were distinct disadvantages to enrolling these special groups and that many left the service on completion of courses. The conducting of further special courses for students in the Reserves is not contemplated due to the shortage of funds and Regular Force instructors.

DON MESSER SHOW—COMMENTS BY MR. STANLEY BURKE

Question No. 2,022—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Were the words of farewell used by Stanley Burke at the end of the National News of Wednesday, April 16, with reference to the Don Messer show, part of the script or ad libbed?

2. What were the words?

3. How long has the Don Messer Show been telecast nationally?

4. Has the C.B.C. received written or oral complaints about lack of taste by Mr. Burke with reference to the words spoken and, if so, is an apology contemplated?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: 1. The words were scripted.

2. The words were "And now to Marg Osborne, Charlie Chamberlain and the rest, a very good night and as the song says, 'May the good Lord bless and keep you' ".

3. Eleven years.

4. The C.B.C. has no record of audience complaints about the words quoted in 2 above.

FIRST TELECAST OF DON MESSER SHOW

Question No. 2,023—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. On what date was the Don Messer show first telecast nationally?
2. What has been its highest position in the ratings used by the C.B.C. on television, among the C.B.C. programs?
3. What has been its lowest position in each case and how many programs were included?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: 1. Summer, 1958.

2. Seventh, out of an average of about 20 C.B.C. network programs all broadcast in prime time and aimed primarily at adult-plus teenage audiences.

3. Fourteenth, out of an average of about 20 C.B.C. network programs in prime time.

TAX CONCESSIONS FOR OIL DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 2,034—**Mr. Harding:**

1. Is it the policy of the government to offer financial or tax concessions to companies exploring for and developing oil reserves in Canada's north and, if so, what are these concessions?
2. Have any additional concessions been offered to companies contacted during the recent European tour of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and, if so, what are these concessions?
3. Has the government made a commitment of any kind to the aforementioned companies regarding retention of present depletion allowances?

**Mr. Yves Forest (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. The Income Tax Act allows companies exploring for and developing oil reserves anywhere in Canada to deduct drilling and exploration expenses as defined in the Act. It does not provide any special concessions in respect of northern operations.

The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development provides three basic forms of financial assistance to the northern mining community. Under the Northern Resource Roads Program, federal financial contributions may be made under prescribed circumstances, up to an amount of two-thirds of the construction cost of a permanent access road. The Northern Resource Airports Program provides for federal financial contributions up to 50 per cent of the cost of an approved airstrip or airport construction project associated with mining, exploration or production operations. Roads and airports so assisted are available for public use. The Northern Mineral Exploration Assistance Program provides for a federal financial contribution of up to 40 per cent of the cost of an approved exploration project, and any amount paid under this Program becomes repayable with interest should the assisted project result in production for gain on the property on which it was undertaken.

2. No.

3. No.

METROPOLITAN TORONTO POSTAL DISTRICTS

Question No. 2,044—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the Minister of Communications consider the re-zoning and renaming of postal districts in Metropolitan Toronto with a view of conforming to the local municipal boundaries and, if so, when will this be carried out and, if not, for what reasons?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: On May 1, 1969, the Post Office Department introduced a new zoning scheme for the Metropolitan Toronto area which does take into account, as far as possible, local municipal boundaries. This new system is part of a nationwide program designed to facilitate delivery of mail addressed to postal patrons in larger communities.

TEACHERS IN SOEST AND HEMER SCHOOLS

Question No. 2,061—**Mr. Marshall:**

In each calendar year, how many dependents of 4th Canadian Infantry Division personnel have applied for positions to teach in the Senior High Schools at Soest and Hemer (a) of those successful, what were their qualifications and rank of their husbands at the time of appointment (b) of those unsuccessful, what were their qualifications and rank of their husbands at the time they made application?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** 1967-68 Five; (a) one applicant as a part time substitute teacher at Soest—Saskatchewan

Professional Senior Certificate with two years' full time experience and six years' supply experience—Major; one applicant taught one day at Hemer—BA in English with limited supply experience and no teaching certificate —Captain; one applicant taught two days at Hemer—graduate of Ryerson Institute with one year's experience in Home Economics—Captain; (b) one applicant—Nova Scotia Teachers' License Class One, no teaching experience—Corporal; one applicant as part time substitute teacher at Soest—Ontario standard grade one certificate, graduate of Ryerson Institute, eight years' teaching experience in Home Economics—Sergeant.

1968-69 Three: (a) one applicant as part time substitute teacher at Soest—Ontario standard grade one certificate, graduate of Ryerson Institute, eight years' teaching experience in Home Economics—Sergeant (this applicant was unsuccessful in 1967-68); (b) one applicant with B Ed., BA (French, BA (Hon. Classics) with two years' experience at university level—Corporal; one applicant with BA and Ontario Interim High School Assistance Certificate, type B, three years' teaching experience—Captain.

LEGISLATION ON ROYAL AND NATIONAL ANTHEMS

Question No. 2,072—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation, dealing with our Royal and National Anthems before the summer recess and, if so, when?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Due to the pressure on the legislative program, the answer is no.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES STRENGTH

Question No. 2,085—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What was the authorized strength of the Canadian Armed Forces as of March 31, 1969?

2. Is there to be any change in this figure prior to March 31, 1970 and, if so, to what numerical level?

3. Is any change being considered for the following year?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** 1. 98,241.

2. The 1969-70 estimates are based on a strength of 98,238 being in the Canadian Forces on March 31, 1970.

3. This will not be known until phase II of the defence review has been completed.

[Mr. Groos.]

PRIVY COUNCIL PUBLIC RELATIONS STAFF

Question No. 2,089—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Privy Council have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What is the total cost of public relations for the Privy Council for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

**Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister):** 1. The Privy Council Office has no public relations staff.

2. Not applicable.

"THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STORY"

Question No. 2,098—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. Has the firm of Berger, Tisdall, Clark and Lesly Ltd and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development reached an agreement on directions and priorities to be followed in presenting information to the public about "The other side of the story" as referred to in a letter from the said firm to a William J. Fox of the said Department dated January 13, 1969?

2. What in detail are those directions and priorities?

3. What was meant by the said statement "The other side of the story"?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. Yes.

2. 1) To improve communications and understanding between the three groups: The Indian community in Ontario; The General public and The Department of Indian Affairs. 2) To project the accomplishments of the Indian people in Ontario through all available public information media. 3) To assist the Regional Director and his executive staff in communications, press and press relations. 4) To provide advice to the Regional Director and also to the various superintendents on all matters affecting public opinion of the Indian community and the department as required.

3. There are popular and damaging misconceptions about the Indian people. "The other side of the story" referred to telling the story of the many successful Indian businessmen, agriculturists, farmers, fishermen, lumbermen, carpenters, etc.

INDIAN AFFAIRS—PUBLIC RELATIONS MEETING

Question No. 2,099—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. What are the names, addresses and positions held by each person who attended a public relations Contractors meeting held at the Indian Affairs and Northern Development Headquarters in Ottawa from November 27 to 29, 1968 inclusive?

2. Was any money paid for other than Departmental personnel to attend and, if so, what amount?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. Mr. David Gamble of Berger, Tisdall, Clark and

Lesly Ltd., Toronto Dominion Centre, Box 61, Toronto 1, Ontario. Mr. Frank Crockett, Crockett Writers, 109 Bruce St., St. James, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Robert Williams, Williams and Wilson, 1161 Melville, Vancouver 5, B.C.; Robert Russell, Williams and Wilson, 101 St. and Jasper Ave., Edmonton, Alberta; Jacques Guay, Jacques Guay and Associates, 1010 St. Catherine St., West, Montréal, P.Q.; Mr. W. J. Fox, Information Officer, Indian Affairs and Northern Development; Mr. J. Shelton, Information Officer, Indian Affairs and Northern Development; Mrs. Marion Smythe, Information Officer, Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Various other officials from the Department also attended but for very short periods of time during the three-day meeting.

2. Yes. $950.

DEUTERIUM OF CANADA HEAVY WATER PLANT

Question No. 2,106—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. Has the heavy water plant of Deuterium of Canada Limited been completed and, if so (a) is it presently in operation (b) did operations commence on the date stated in answer to Question 758?

2. Have the owners of Deuterium of Canada Limited provided any explanation of the delay in deliveries to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and, if so, what is the explanation?

3. Have officers of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited inspected the plant owned by Deuterium of Canada Limited?

4. Has Atomic Energy of Canada Limited made any arrangement for acquiring a supply of heavy water from Canadian sources to replace what was to have been delivered by Deuterium of Canada Limited if the Deuterium plant never begins production and, if not, when does Atomic Energy of Canada Limited expect Deuterium to begin deliveries?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Atomic Energy of Canada Limited reports as follows: 1. (a) The plant has not been brought into operation; (b) No.

2. The explanation by the owners indicates that the delay has been occasioned by a number of factors acting in combination, including late delivery of equipment, labour difficulties during construction, equipment failures, and design and engineering problems revealed on start-up.

3. Yes.

4. Atomic Energy of Canada Limited has arranged to acquire supplies of heavy water from the United States to replace what was to have been delivered by Deuterium of Canada Limited. A second heavy water plant is nearing completion at Port Hawkesbury, N.S. and construction has just started on a third one near Kincardine, Ontario. AECL hopes for deliveries from the Deuterium of Canada plant in 1970.

SWEDEN—C.B.C. WORLD HOCKEY COVERAGE

Question No. 2,117—**Mr. Mather:**

How many C.B.C. employees were sent to Sweden to cover the world hockey championships (a) how long were the employees in Sweden (b) what was the total cost of the operation?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: Six C.B.C. employees were sent to Sweden to cover the world hockey championships—three for the English network and three for the French network. (a) They were in Sweden for various periods individually, ranging from six days to 21 days; (b) Approximate total cost was $7,000.

PUNISHMENT FOR EXCEEDING WORK QUOTA

Question No. 2,118—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

With reference to Question No. 1,942, does there exist in Canada (a) any federal statute referred to therein, or (b) any provincial statute referred to therein, whether by statutory provision or any regulations made thereunder specifically prohibit any labour union or any local thereof to set up any quota system of production whereby a worker may be disciplined or punished for exceeding any such quotas whether quantitative or fixed in monetary terms?

**Mr. Jim McNulty (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour):** (a) There is no federal statute specifically prohibiting the provisions stated in the question; (b) The Minister of Labour is not aware of any provincial statute specifically prohibiting the provisions stated in the question.

KOOTENAY WEST, B.C., CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES

Question No. 2,128—**Mr. Harding:**

1. (a) How many employees are there in the Customs and Excise Branch of the Department of National Revenue in the constituency of Kootenay West, and (b) how many are there in each centre?

2. (a) How many ports of entry are there in the constituency of Kootenay West, and (b) what are the hours of operation of each port of entry?

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue):** 1. (a) Twenty-two; (b) Paterson, B.C., 6; Trail, B.C., 5; Waneta, B.C., 1; Nelson, B.C., 2; Nelway, B.C., 3; Rykerts, B.C., 5.

2. (a) Two, namely the port of Nelson, B.C., and the port of Trail, B.C., including air facilities, as follows: Nelson Seaplane Base; Trail Columbia Gardens Airport; and in addition four other places of entry: the outport of Rykerts, B.C., including Rykerts Air-

port; the outport of Waneta, B.C., including Waneta Airport; the outport of Nelway, B.C.; the outport of Paterson, B.C.

2. (b) Hours of operation: Nelson, B.C.: 8:45 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday; Nelson Seaplane Base: as required; Trail, B.C.: 8:45 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday; Trail Columbia Gardens Airport: as required; Rykerts, B.C.: 8:00 a.m. to 12 midnight, daily; Rykerts Airport: as required; Waneta, B.C.: 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., daily; Waneta Airport: as required; Nelway, B.C.: 8:00 a.m. to 12 midnight, daily; Paterson, B.C.: 8:00 a.m. to 12 midnight, daily.

P.F.R.A. EXPENDITURES

Question No. 2,144—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. Since its passage in 1935, how much money has the federal government spent under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act?
2. What programs are administered under this Act at this time?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** 1. $404,186,000.00.

2. Programs for land use and water conservation and development, including dam and irrigation construction works, farm dugouts and community pastures.

TREE FARMS

Question No. 2,147—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. How many tree farms are operated in Canada by the (a) Department of Agriculture (b) Department of Fisheries and Forestry, where are these farms located, in what provinces, and what is the size of each?
2. What was their individual production in 1967?
3. What was the cost of operating each farm in 1967?
4. Are new farms being planned and, if so, on what dates and at what locations?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Fisheries and Forestry as follows: 1. (a) None; (b) None.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

4. No.

U.N. TRUST FUND FOR SOUTH AFRICA

Question No. 2,149—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. What has been the total contribution by the Government of Canada to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and to the United Nations Consolidated Educational and Training Program for South Africans?

[Mr. Côté (Longueuil).]

2. What is the annual breakdown of these contributions, if applicable?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1 and 2. Canada donated $10,000 to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa in 1968. A donation of $25,000 was made in 1969 to the Consolidated Educational Program for Southern Africans. A contribution of $25,000 was also made in 1967 to the United Nations Program for the Education and Training of South Africans which is now a component of the Consolidated Program.

ESKIMO—20TH CENTURY EXHIBITION

Question No. 2,161—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. Was the firm of Desroches Josmin Associés of Montreal chosen to prepare and distribute publicity material regarding the Eskimo—20th Century Exhibition held at Place Bonaventure from November 20, 1968 to December 1, 1968 and, if so, what amount of money was paid to this firm?
2. Does the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development consider itself not competent enough to have performed this work?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. Yes. $1,515.30.

2. The department called in the contractor to assist in the promotion.

ALLEGED STATEMENT OF MR. ROBERT F. BATTLE

Question No. 2,162—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

Did Mr. Robert F. Battle, Assistant Deputy Minister, Social Affairs Branch of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development speak to the Manitoba and North Dakota International Symposium on the Legal Rights of Indians held in Grand Forks, North Dakota on March 7, 1969 and, if so, did he say "There have been too many people attempting to identify the needs of the Indian people for them. This unconscious paternalism is a curse and too often comes from the pen of one who is setting himself up as a sort of Don Quixote charging the windmill of Departmental paternalism" and did he refer to someone in particular, and, if so, what is the name of that person?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** (1) Yes, Mr. Robert F. Battle spoke to the Manitoba and North Dakota International Symposium on the Legal Rights of Indians held in Grand Forks, North Dakota on March 7, 1969. (2) No, he did not refer to anyone in particular.

CORDAGE INDUSTRY REPORT

Question No. 2,173—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. Has the report on the cordage industry in Canada been completed?
2. If so, on what date was it completed?

3. Is it the intention of the government to make this Report public?

4. What action does the government intend to take on the recommendations of this Report?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** 1. The Tariff Board Report on binder twine and twine for baling farm produce has not yet been completed.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Answered by No. 1.

SOUTHERN RHODESIAN PATENT APPLICATIONS

Question No. 2,207—**Mr. Nystrom:**

What is the present status of the two applications for patents from Southern Rhodesia filed in 1967-68 as reported at page 39 of the first Annual Report of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** The Patent Office, while keeping track of the country of origin of inventors for statistical purposes, does not keep a record of the serial numbers of applications filed according to different countries. A lengthy search through approximately 30,000 applications would be required to locate the two applications from Southern Rhodesia.

As the processing of applications takes much longer than one year in nearly all instances we can only assume that these two applications have "pending" status.

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

BILINGUALISM—DEPARTMENTAL ADVISERS

Question No. 1,694—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. How many departments presently employ departmental advisers on bilingualism, and what departments?

2. Of the departments referred to in part 1, which have a departmental adviser on bilingualism whose (a) mother tongue is French (b) mother tongue is English (c) other (d) who are bilingual?

3. What is the age and education level of the departmental advisers in each of the departments?

4. What is the job level in the structure of each department and at what level was the incumbent appointed in each of the departments?

Return tabled.

BILINGUALISM—GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS HAVING ADVISERS

Question No. 1,709—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Which of the following currently has an adviser on bilingualism on his staff: the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer, the Insurance Department, the National Gallery, the National Research Council, the Public Archives and National Library, the Privy Council, the Public Service Commission, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Public Printing and Stationery Department?

2. Of those in part 1, which have departmental advisers on bilingualism (a) who have French as their mother tongue (b) who have English as their mother tongue (c) who have another language as their mother tongue (d) who are bilingual?

3. What are the ages and educational levels of the advisers on bilingualism of each of these bodies?

4. What is the administrative level of the position of adviser on bilingualism in each of these bodies, and in each case, at what level have such appointments been made?

Return tabled.

BILINGUALISM—CROWN CORPORATIONS HAVING ADVISERS

Question No. 1,710—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. What proprietary Crown corporations currently have advisers on bilingualism on their staffs?

2. Which of the corporations named in the reply to part 1 have advisers on bilingualism who (a) have French as their mother tongue (b) have English as their mother tongue (c) have another language as their mother tongue (d) are bilingual?

3. What are the ages and educational levels of the advisers on bilingualism of each of these corporations?

4. What is the administrative level of the position of adviser on bilingualism in each of these corporations and, in each case, at what level have such appointments been made?

Return tabled.

PESTICIDES—USE IN CANADA

Question No. 1,864—**Mr. Haidasz:**

1. Which pesticides have been approved for use in Canada by any federal government agency or department?

2. Has the use of any pesticides been discontinued or banned by any federal government agency or department?

3. Has any federal government agency or department produced any publications, programs or films on the harmful effects of pesticides?

4. Which of these publications, programs or films have been released for information?

5. Which, if any, of these publications, programs or films have been withheld from the public?

Return tabled.

ALCOHOL ADDICTION—MENTAL PATIENTS

Question No. 1,903—**Mr. Mather:**

1. What is the estimated percentage of mental patients in hospitals, psychiatric wards and medical and surgical wards whose presence there is related to drinking alcoholic beverages?

2. What is the estimated percentage of arrests caused by drinking?

3. Does the Department of National Health and Welfare provide any money directly or through the provinces to persons or to families adversely

affected by addiction to alcohol and, if so, how much?

4. What was the 1968 federal revenue from the sale of spirits?

5. What was the 1968 federal expenditure on promotion of temperance?

Return tabled.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### COMBINES

POSSIBILITY OF MONOPOLY IN ACQUISITION OF BREWERIES BY CONGLOMERATES

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** I wish to direct this question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister given any instruction, or does he intend to give any instruction, to the Director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigation Act to examine and look into the possibility of conglomerates developing a monopoly or monopolies prejudicial to Canadian interests, in view of the fact that certain multi-million dollar United States tobacco corporations have offered to purchase a controlling interest in one of Canada's largest brewery companies?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** I take it the hon. member is referring to the offer by Phillip Morris to acquire shares in Canadian Breweries Limited.

This would appear, as we now understand it, to be an offer by one foreign-owned multinational company to acquire control from another, namely, Rothmans of Canada. The director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigation Act is aware of these reports but no violation of the Combines Investigation Act would appear at this time to be indicated. The offer would appear to be in the nature of a step toward a conglomerate merger, which is not an offence, or would appear not to be an offence under the Combines Investigation Act.

The whole question of conglomerates is of course one which is very much on our minds and the Director of Investigation and Research is presently in Europe as chairman of a working group of the O.E.C.D. which is concerning itself with the control of multinational corporations.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** May I ask the minister whether he and his department are preparing any legislation to deal with the problem of conglomerates, mergers and combines?

[Mr. Mather.]

**Mr. Basford:** As is well known, the government referred the whole question of competition policy, monopolies and mergers and restraint of trade to the Economic Council of Canada some time ago, and I am expecting a report from the council on this whole question in June of this year, at which time a complete revision of the combines legislation will be undertaken.

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Will the minister take an early opportunity to make a statement on motions clarifying the attitude of government toward the displacement of existing Canadian ownership by conglomerates, involving either Canadian or foreign capital?

**Mr. Basford:** I should be happy to make a statement at any time relative to the Combines Investigation Act or its revision. However the larger question of foreign ownership and investment in Canada is the ministerial responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Finance, and any such statement should I think come from him.

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I believe the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has a supplementary.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question that I will direct to the Prime Minister. In view of the recommendations contained in the Watkins report to the effect that a government agency should be set up to carry on continued surveillance of foreign takeovers, has the government in mind setting up such an agency in the near future?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we have not reached such a conclusion yet, but the subject is under consideration.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the widespread interest in this matter and the threat that it poses to Canada's sovereignty, on the minister's own admission in his answer to the last question when he said this matter covers more departments than his own, would he give consideration to having this matter referred to a standing committee of this house?

**Mr. Basford:** Mr. Speaker, I do not quite see how that would be appropriate at this time. Of course, any revision of the combines act would go to a committee of this house, at which time there could be a full discussion of the larger issue. However, with reference to the first part of the hon. member's question, I did point out in my first answer that it would appear that this is an offer to purchase shares of a Canadian company, an offer made by one foreign-held, multi-national corporation to another.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** I take it from the minister's answer that he must have obtained advice from legal officers either in his department or in the Department of Justice to the effect that there has been no violation of the combines act, if this deal has been consummated as suggested. Is this correct; did the minister get an opinion?

**Mr. Basford:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is proper for me to give a legal opinion—

**Mr. Woolliams:** I did not ask for one.

**Mr. Basford:** —but I have naturally been in consultation with my officers this morning, and as I pointed out it does appear that the offer to purchase these shares, according to the way the offer is worded, is not a breach of the Combines Investigation Act. Naturally the director is aware of this sort of report because he follows all activities of this kind, as he has made clear in his previous annual report; and should it appear that there is or that there may be a breach of the combines act, the director can be expected to take action.

## AIR CANADA

### STRIKE OF MECHANICS—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. May I ask the minister whether he has received any communications from the International Association of Machinists and/or from Air Canada requesting assistance in resuming negotiations, in the hope of reaching a settlement of the present strike?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I have received telegrams over the weekend from both parties, I believe one yesterday and one this morning, requesting assistance from the Department of Labour. If I may, I would like to expand my answer a little and take the house into my full confidence in emphasizing that no one in this country would be more happy than the Minister of Labour to see this strike brought to an end.

Having said that, I must point out that the strike can be settled only through the free collective bargaining process and not through passage of emergency legislation in the House of Commons—at least, not until the strike does become a national emergency. Both parties have reached the present impasse because they have failed to reach agreement after six months of negotiations. Prior to the strike we did place at the disposal of the parties the services of Mr. Kelly, and subsequently those of Mr. Wilson. However the parties have not materially settled their differences.

So in answer to the question, may I say that although I have received these telegrams it is not my intention at this moment to place the Department of Labour at the disposal of both sides until I have had an opportunity to have formal discussions with both parties in order to determine whether these telegrams are anything more than an effort to convey the impression to the members of the union and the Canadian public that meaningful talks are going on, when in reality they are not.

**Mr. Lewis:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I assure the minister that I am not thinking and would not think of suggesting any legislation. But since he has received these telegrams, and assuming they were sent sincerely and not for the publicity for which he fears they may have been sent, could I ask him whether the time has not arrived for him to consider seriously the appointment of some outside mediator with instructions for him to sit with the parties day and night for the next number of days in order to seek a settlement. I ask that because parties in a strike do not usually ask for assistance if they do not wish to arrive at a settlement.

**Mr. Mackasey:** Mr. Speaker, this of course is under consideration. If I can ascertain from my informal discussions that both parties in reality are willing and anxious to come to a settlement, this will be one of the avenues available to the Minister of Labour. In the meantime I recommend to both parties that they take advantage of the next couple of days and resume direct negotiations.

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. According to Canadian Press wire photographs from Mont-

real, birds are building nests on the wings of some grounded D-C8's. Has the minister reason to think the strike will be over before the eggs hatch?

[*Translation*]

## AGRICULTURE

MEETING BETWEEN FARM ORGANIZATION AND FEDERAL MINISTER

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

Last week, representatives of the C.F.U. came to Parliament and asked the federal government to improve the dairy policy.

Did the Minister meet these representatives and did he receive representations asking that the dairy policy be improved instead of being allowed to deteriorate?

[*English*]

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I did not meet the representatives of the U.C.C. directly, although according to my information a number of members of parliament and one or two cabinet ministers met them. I have had however a number of representations from the U.C.C. and their affiliated organization, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, with respect to matters raised by the hon. member. I think these meetings were useful in explaining the reasons for the government's regulations for the 1969-70 dairy year.

[*Translation*]

CONTINUATION OF FEED GRAIN SUBSIDIES

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

Could the Minister of Agriculture give us the assurance that the subsidies granted for the transportation of feed grain will be continued in Eastern Canada?

[*English*]

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Well, Mr. Speaker, the question as asked would indicate these people wish the Minister of Agriculture to say that these subsidies will be paid in perpetuity. I cannot give that assurance. Certainly governments have to adjust, amend or improve policies from time to time. However there is no intention of withdrawing the subsidy immediately.

[Mr. Schreyer.]

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

REQUEST FOR LAW OFFICERS OPINION ON CONSTITUTIONALITY OF MEASURE

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Justice a question. Considering the doubt expressed by Hon. J. T. Thorson, who at one time was a member of the Mackenzie King government and who occupied at another time the second highest judicial position in Canada, concerning the constitutionality of certain sections in the languages bill, and that doubt having been expressed by others as well, is the minister prepared, as was done on one occasion within my recollection, to place before the house before the debate on the bill begins the opinion of the law officers of the Crown as to the constitutionality of certain clauses of the bill. Also would he say whether any law professors across Canada were consulted on this matter and asked to give an opinion. Would the minister be prepared to table the opinion of such persons outside his own department?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, we take the position on the basis of advice tendered to us by the law officers of the Crown—which advice has been unofficially supported in other quarters—that the bill is constitutional as it stands and that it is within the competence of parliament to enact. It is not the intention of the government to initiate a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** My question did not have to do with that. Would the minister produce the views of the law officers or those outside who he now says actually were approached, so that the house will have the fullest information on this matter as there are grave doubts being expressed?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the right hon. member will appreciate that if despite our best efforts there is a challenge made as to the constitutionality of this bill, any opinions we have received will be privileged. If they were public it might well prejudice the case of the government of Canada.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of prejudice of the case. Is there the possibility that the government might be prejudiced?

## HOUSING

INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE REDRAFTING OF AMENDING LEGISLATION

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the great concern expressed during the weekend, which received considerable publicity and which I feel the Prime Minister is aware of, by the former deputy prime minister, and the Prime Minister's statement on page 5525 of *Hansard* that "governments are to a large degree powerless" to deal with urban renewal, housing, urban transportation and pollution—

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Hees:** Here is the question: Is it the intention of the government to withdraw the National Housing Act for redrafting, disband the urban transportation unit of the Department of Transport and cancel consideration of a Canada water act or a clean air act?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Obviously not, Mr. Speaker. To say that governments are to a large degree powerless is to say that the constitution does impose certain limitations on both levels of government, but within their jurisdiction things can be done. Some of the examples quoted by the hon. member are things that have been done in these years. It means we cannot cover the area in its entirety without changing the constitution. Under the constitution as it now stands we have done these things. We are doing more in a bill now before the house. I am surprised the hon. member wishes us to withdraw these very progressive pieces of legislation.

**Mr. Hees:** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has put in my mouth words I did not use. I would like to ask him a supplementary question. If the government intends to go forward with matters of this kind which are of great importance, would the Prime Minister then stop using the constitution as an excuse for inaction, as described by the former deputy prime minister?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Prime Minister may not want to reply to a question which is out of order.

## SOCIAL SECURITY

POSSIBILITY OF LEGISLATION TO DECREASE FAMILY ALLOWANCE AND OLD AGE BENEFITS

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Does the government have any intention of introducing legislation to eliminate or cut back either the family allowance or old age security pensions?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** There is no government decision one way or another in respect to this matter. If there should be any intention on the part of the government in this regard, it will be announced as a matter of government policy.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister not in a position to assure us that, whatever else will be done in the field of social legislation, the means test will not be put back on either of these two pieces of legislation?

**Mr. Speaker:** It seems the hon. member is asking in different words the question he asked in the first instance.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Ten o'clock.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** May I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister? I wonder if he was just throwing up trial balloons when in his speech he talked about doing away with the baby bonus, or was he contradicting his Minister of National Health and Welfare?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** My question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Could he tell the house whether the reduction or the increase of family allowances is being considered by the government?

**Mr. Speaker:** Again it appears to me that the hon. member is just asking a question that has already been raised.

[*English*]

## OIL

DISCUSSION WITH ALBERTA PREMIER ON NATIONAL POLICY

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Will he please tell the house the nature of the discussions he held with Premier Strom of Alberta on Friday? Was the Prime Minister able to indicate any progress in updating Canada's national oil policy, and specifically did he indicate to Premier Strom

which shared-cost programs he meant when on Friday morning last he adumbrated on the nature of vested interests in federal expenditures?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we had talks on a number of matters including oil policy, wheat, federal-provincial relations and various aspects of the constitution.

**Mr. Woolliams:** And the weather.

**Mr. Trudeau:** And the weather. It was not intended that these meetings between Premier Strom and myself would be other than of a confidential nature. I do not feel it proper, therefore, to report on the substance of the meeting.

## CRIMINAL CODE

### OPERATION OF OFF-TRACK BETTING ESTABLISHMENTS

**Mr. R. L. Whiting (Halton):** My question is directed to the Minister of Justice. Is it the intention of the government to amend the Criminal Code to prohibit the operation of off-track betting establishments?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Any policy in that regard in the normal course will be announced in the usual way.

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

### SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. About ten days ago in this house I asked the minister if he had any emergency plans for employment of students during the summer months. The minister replied in the affirmative, but did not give details. Is the minister now in a position to give details of his plan for employment of students during the coming summer months? Thousands of students are without employment at the present time.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** There will be a large number of students applying for jobs this summer because of the heavy increase in the student population. I believe however that the efforts of the department, other levels of government and private employers will improve the situation in the labour market and offer a great number of opportunities to students this summer. There may be a shortfall. I am sure all hon. members realize that the solution to this problem requires not only leadership from the federal government, but assistance from other governments and individuals in this country.

One step we as a federal government have taken, in order to provide some indication of our concern, is to authorize and direct all departments to increase their student hirings by at least 10 per cent over last summer, in accordance with the growth of the student population. That is one measure.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** In view of the minister's reply to my question, is it a fact that some tentative plans referred to by the minister ten days ago in this house have now been scrapped?

**Mr. MacEachen:** No, Mr. Speaker. What I stated was that the discussion of this whole question cannot be undertaken on orders of the day. Last week I made a very extensive statement on this problem to the standing committee examining my estimates. I will be happy to provide the hon. member with a copy.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

### NATO—POSSIBILITY OF CONFERENCE ON EUROPEAN SECURITY

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and ask him if the government has received an invitation from the government of Finland to attend a conference of NATO pact and Warsaw pact countries on the subject of a European security arrangement to replace the present military alliance?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I received the ambassador of Finland some days ago who conveyed to me the views of his government. I want to make it clear however that the government of Finland has not issued an invitation. Finnish representatives have approached Canada, the United States and all European countries to take soundings of their attitudes toward the eventual holding of a conference on European security under suitable conditions. The government of Finland has intimated that if other countries were agreed, if all governments concerned could take part, if the conference were thoroughly prepared and if there seemed to be reasonable prospects of success, it would be ready to act as host to a preparatory meeting to deal with questions of procedure.

**Mr. Brewin:** Could the minister say whether the Canadian government's attitude to the various conditions is also favourable?

**Mr. Sharp:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I assured the Finnish ambassador that we were very interested and that we would carefully and seriously explore the suggestions. It is the Canadian view that questions of European settlement are very urgent. Our only concern is that any proposed conference should succeed, because an abortive meeting would be worse than useless.

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, could the Secretary of State for External Affairs inform the house whether the Canadian government has encouraged other members of NATO to respond in a way similar to that of the Canadian government?

**Mr. Sharp:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I did say to the house, when I was asked originally about the NATO meetings, that that was the position taken by Canada and was responded to very constructively by the NATO powers.

## TRADE

### INHIBITING EFFECT OF CANADA-U.S. TRANSPORT POLICY

**Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Private Planning Association of Canada has reported that Canada-U.S. transport policy is inhibiting trade between the two countries would the right hon. gentleman state whether this problem is being actively studied at the present time to ensure that this is not the case?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I would have to take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware of the representations which the hon. member just mentioned.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL

### APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION CHAIRMAN FOR LIMITED TIME

**Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North):** Mr. Speaker, I too have a question for the Prime Minister. Will he inform the house why the government has taken the extraordinary step of appointing the chairman of the National Capital Commission for a period of one month?

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps this question might be debated at the time of adjournment. I have the impression that this is the type of question which normally ought to be put on the order paper or discussed at the time of adjournment.

[*Translation*]

## INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

**Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

Since the symposium held recently by the Quebec Liberal party proves that that party has a bank of ideas, could the Prime Minister tell us whether he intends to apply to that bank?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I do not think the question is acceptable.

[*English*]

## SHIPPING

### CHANGE IN REGISTRATION OF "CAPE BRETON MINER"

**Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, my question could be directed jointly to the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Labour, but in the absence of the Minister of Transport I will direct it to the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware that Upper Lakes Shipping Limited is presently making application to change to foreign registry the registry of the vessel *Cape Breton Miner,* construction of which was subsidized by the Canadian taxpayer? Further, is the minister in a position to advise whether this change can be prevented in order to save the jobs of 39 Canadians who will be replaced by cheap labour—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder whether the hon. member would agree with me that that question might well be considered at the time of adjournment. I realize there might be some urgency, and if there is the question might be given priority for the adjournment debate.

## FLOODS

### TRAIL, B.C.—STATEMENT BY MINISTER RESPECTING FINANCIAL AID

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Public Works. In view of the urgent need for the Trail committee to know what finances are available to them for rehabilitation after the recent disastrous flood, could the minister indicate to the house when he could make a definite statement on the federal government's contribution to the disaster fund?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder whether the hon. member is not restating a question he asked last Thursday or Friday. If not, the minister might wish to reply.

**Mr. Harding:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it was not the same question. It was along similar lines, but the information given at the time was that the department was considering it. I am just wondering whether they have considered it to the point where they can indicate when an answer can be given.

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is very tenacious. I think he is aware that the government has already advised the City of Trail that we will repair the wall which protects the city from the Columbia River, which wall had been breached. As to the other application made by the Mayor of Trail, and I think by Premier Bennett of British Columbia to the Prime Minister, I have advised the hon. member that it is being studied in conjunction with damage claims from the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and we would expect a decision will be taken shortly.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

### EFFECT OF RATE CHANGES ON NON-PROFIT PUBLICATIONS

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the laconic Postmaster General. It concerns the increasing number of trade union and other non-profit publications going out of business on account of increased postal rates. Can he advise if he is prepared yet to take another look at this serious matter, with a view to forestalling further shrinkage in the publishing industry?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I think I have replied on many occasions that the labour journals and indeed many other non-profit publications could recover all of the increases in the postage rates by a very nominal increase in their subscription rates, sometimes as low as something in the order of 17 cents or 25 cents a year. I reiterate my belief that I do not think these journals can expect the postmen, the whole 48,000 of them, to continue to subsidize these journals.

## AGRICULTURE

### DAIRYING—COMPLAINTS FROM WESTERN PRODUCERS

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. It arises from a communication sent by the Manitoba Dairy Association calling on the minister to give urgent consideration to a rethinking of national dairy policy so that western Canadian dairy producers will no longer be discriminated against in terms of quota allocations. Is the minister giving consideration to this request?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, we have had a number of discussions about this and I am of the same opinion that I expressed to the hon. member several days ago, that the Canadian dairy policy does not discriminate against western producers.

**Mr. Schreyer:** As a supplementary question, can the minister say whether it is true that 8 million pounds of quota allocations have been removed from western Canada—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question as asked by the hon. member is clearly argumentative and out of order.

[*Later:*]

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I believe Your Honour would want to give a dispassionate and fair ruling on what I submit is a point of privilege. When the Minister of Agriculture states repeatedly in this house that national dairy policy is not discriminatory in its effect—we are not talking about intent—upon dairy producers in western Canada, and when I say to him that we have proof that in two years 8 million pounds in quotas have been removed from western Canada, I believe Your Honour should want to regard this as a question of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I certainly cannot regard that as a question of privilege but rather as a question of debate. The hon. member says there is discrimination and the minister says there is no discrimination. We could go on in that way for a long time. This is clearly a point for debate and on that basis I have to rule that the hon. member's question as asked cannot be posed at this time.

## HEALTH AND WELFARE

### MEDICARE—DISCUSSIONS WITH CANADIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. As the executive of the Canadian Medical Association have for four months been asking pretty steadily for an

appointment with the Prime Minister to discuss the very important matter of medical insurance, and have specified that they do not wish to meet the Minister of National Health and Welfare but rather the Prime Minister, has the Prime Minister found it possible to include them in his agenda in the near future?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression they had given up asking me for such an appointment. I know of no recent request. I believe the request was made during the time of the recent federal-provincial conference and obviously I could not meet them then, but I have at all times suggested that they see the ministers responsible for this act and others. I believe that representatives of the Association have seen the Minister of National Health and Welfare twice and are going to see him again tomorrow, and I believe they have met as well with the Minister of Finance. The opposition will have to get used to the idea that we are not running a one-man show.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Hees:** Mr. Speaker, I think the reason for the renewal of the request was that this body was impressed by the Prime Minister's continuing statements that he is anxious for more dialogue with the Canadian public.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

## CRIMINAL CODE

RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF DEATH PENALTY

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Justice.

Following the 69th murder committed in Montreal in 1969, does the minister intend to propose that the death penalty be re-enforced in Canada?

**Mr. Speaker:** It seems to me that the question put by the member has already been asked in the house a few days ago.

[*English*]

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

REQUEST FOR POSTPONEMENT OF PROGRAM FOR BILINGUALISM

**Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the Prime Minister's statement that serious cutbacks in expenditures are necessary to make possible the government's programs of bilingualism and regional development, will the government consider postponement of the bilingual program until such time as this program becomes reasonably and economically feasible without the serious curtailment of other government programs?

POSSIBILITY OF EXPANSION OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the parliamentary assistant to the Secretary of State. I gave him notice of it some months ago and I am sure he is anxious to get it off his books. It concerns new Canadians taking courses in English and French. Is the government considering increasing aid in respect of these language courses for all new Canadians to the level awarded in support of the Czech refugees when they came here after the invasion last August?

**Mr. Speaker:** I would suggest to the hon. member that his question should be placed on the order paper.

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

WOODS REPORT—REQUEST FOR TABLING AND REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the programs announced by the Minister of Veterans Affairs to be held in conjunction with the anniversary of D-day, will he consider making the commemoration of this event more meaningful by tabling the white paper dealing with recommendations of the Woods report by that date?

**Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I answered this question very recently.

**Mr. Burton:** May we expect to have this report before the house rises for the summer recess?

**Mr. Dubé:** Mr. Speaker, I did answer that question in full last week.

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, would the minister intervene with the Postmaster General on behalf of various veterans organizations which publish magazines and are now having difficulty in this regard, or are about to drop them, so that the members of these organizations will know what is going on in the veterans' world?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the concern of many veterans organizations over the fact that their appearance before the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs is being delayed, will the government reconsider its position and refer the Woods report to the standing committee even before the white paper is produced?

**Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Here again, Mr. Speaker, I did answer that question very recently when I said it would be much preferable for veterans associations to appear before the committee, once they have had the white paper in hand.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** They don't think so.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

### DELAY IN ISSUING PASSPORTS

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he will lend his very able administrative talents to the passport office for a day or so to do what he can to take additional steps to clean up the indescribable mess in that office?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I can assure hon. members that these inconveniences have been caused by the enormous workload that has been put on the passport office. In the next day or two I intend to give a description of the enormous volume of passports that have been issued. We have witnessed far and away the best work done by the passport office in its history. This problem arises because of the enormous increase in the volume of travel, which I am very happy to see, but which is something we could not have anticipated.

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** Mr. Speaker, what arrangements is the Secretary of State for External Affairs making to see, first of all, that passport forms are simplified, and secondly to ensure that an adequate supply of the new forms is provided in those parts of the country which are still using the old forms, thus adding to the confusion of this overworked and harassed branch?

**Mr. Sharp:** These forms are now in the course of being printed.

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** Mr. Speaker, since the departure of the hon. member for Trinity as Acting Prime Minister, and in view of the mess the Secretary of State for External Affairs has made in respect of passports, can we assume that he will not be getting—

[Mr. Aiken.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

### REQUEST FOR RESTORATION OF SATURDAY DELIVERY

**Mr. George Muir (Lisgar):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Postmaster General would consider re-instating Saturday mail delivery in order to bring the Post Office Department back into the 20th century?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have the impression that this question also has been recently asked.

## GRAIN

### REQUEST FOR SYSTEM OF GUARANTEED PRICES

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the acting government house leader, or the acting house leader of the government.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** You were right the first time.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Will he say whether he can advise the house that the Minister of Agriculture on behalf of the government will be bringing forward any proposal regarding the two price system or a guaranteed price system in respect of western grains?

**Mr. Speaker:** This question was asked toward the end of last week of the Minister of Agriculture. I believe he was the proper minister to direct the question to at that time.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## CRIMINAL CODE

### REPORT STAGE

The house resumed, from Friday, May 9, consideration of Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, and motion No. 44, Mr. Winch.

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I had the opportunity of speaking for some 11 minutes in introducing and explaining the motion which is again before the house. As I said then, I want it clearly understood that clause 110, which creates new section 37A, does not deal with inmates within the penitentiary system. It has reference only to inmates in provincial reformatories and jails whose sentences are less than two years.

As I said on Friday, on reading the clause I was completely amazed at the restriction found in this clause and completely stumped as to the reason for its inclusion. I took the opportunity over the weekend of re-reading all the preceding clauses dealing with parole in an endeavour to ascertain whether there was anything that would explain the reasoning behind this wording, which I hope will now be amended. Perhaps it is because I am not a member of the legal profession that in all this terminology I could not find any explanation.

I can understand the wording of proposed section 37A in clause 110 when it suggests that the Lieutenant Governor of the province should have the power to appoint an official with the authority to let an inmate out of a reformatory or jail, with or without an escort, for an unlimited period of time for medical reasons. However, I cannot understand why there should be a limit of 15 days on the period for which a provincial inmate may be let out by the same official for humanitarian reasons. I presume that humanitarian reasons would include the serious illness or death of a parent or other member of the family, and that 15 days is considered to be a satisfactory period for release for humanitarian reasons. But I cannot understand the limitation of 15 days on release for rehabilitation purposes.

• (3:00 p.m.)

As I started to say when it was time to stop last Friday, I fully understand the position, power and jurisdiction of the Parole Board. I feel most strongly that if we are truly interested in rehabilitation, and I hope we are, in our provincial reformatories and jails, we must realize that the officer in the institution is the one who knows the inmate best. He is the one in daily touch with the inmate. He is the one in daily or at least weekly touch with the foreman of the workshop in which the inmate may be employed, or with the teacher if the inmate is in a class. He is the one in touch with the priest or padre if the inmate is attending services, or with the psychiatrist or psychologist if the inmate is receiving such treatment.

The officer in the institution is the one who under this section would have the power vested in him by the Lieutenant Governor to let a person out for medical or humanitarian reasons, but the same responsible official has the power to let the man out for only 15 days if the release is for rehabilitative purposes. I cannot conceive of an official letting a person out for even 15 days unless he is certain the man has made such progress that he should be released. Moreover, if the official made a mistake the same provision would apply under this section with regard to temporary leave as applies to one who breaks parole; in other words, he would be picked up and put back in jail. So there is no danger there.

To my mind this provision is absolutely unreasonable. It is not understandable that an official should have the power to let an inmate out for rehabilitative purposes but that the period should be limited to 15 days. Right then and there the very purpose and goal of rehabilitation is crucified. A person who has won this reprieve and is making a success outside must return to prison within 15 days. Right there you destroy absolutely the attitude, social responsibility and progress of the one who is being let out. I could go on and on in this regard, Mr. Speaker, but I know that if I did I would only be repeating myself, and I do not want to do that.

I sincerely hope that the minister believes in rehabilitation, that he believes that a boy, girl, young woman, young man, or adult man or woman serving a sentence of less than two years should, if they have proved to the satisfaction of the official responsible to the Lieutenant Governor that they can be rehabilitated, be rehabilitated and everything should be done to aid their rehabilitation and not to stultify it. If there is a reasonable explanation of why this wording is in the clause, I sincerely hope the minister will rise and make it clear because it is not clear to a great many of us at the moment.

I assure the minister that I am a reasonable member of this House of Commons. If he has a satisfactory answer than can clarify the situation and make sense of what appears to be a nonsensical provision, I am prepared to listen and accept it. But unless there is a clear explanation and a good reason for it I say that the present wording will stultify the very purpose of rehabilitation; it will kill the motivation of somebody who is trying to

become socially acceptable and has succeeded to the point that he can get out of prison for 15 days. If there is not a clear explanation and if it is not certain that the present wording constitutes good legislation, I hope the minister will accept my amendment. I sincerely hope that if there is not good reasoning behind these words in new section 37A the minister will be the first, in the interests of rehabilitation and good legislation, to recommend to all hon. members the adoption of the amendment I have put forward.

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to attempt to clear up the matter because I believe the hon. gentleman is under a complete misapprehension as to the proposed clause, what it means and its interpretation. Clause 110 of the bill now before us seeks to add to the Prisons and Reformatories Act a provision dealing with temporary absences of less than 15 days duration and the granting of such absences by an officer given the power to exercise that authority by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

As the hon. member knows, there is in section 26 of the Penitentiary Act a provision which is almost identical in wording. With regard to a prisoner in one of the institutions covered by the Prisons and Reformatories Act, by virtue of having received a sentence of less than two years, there is no such provision. In both types of institutions there is authority for the National Parole Board to deal with parole for federal offences. Parole is dealt with in that way. The hon. member's remarks relating to parole were applicable to that legislation and were not applicable to this clause. In the case of inmates in prisons and reformatories who are in the custody of the provincial authorities, no authority has been granted by the federal government, in respect of a breach of the Criminal Code and like statutes, to deal with temporary situations which may arise.

• (3:10 p.m.)

For example, it is not infrequent for an inmate to be released, because of a serious illness in the family or the funeral of someone in the immediate family, for a period of one or two days, or as the case may be. Such cases of penitentiary inmates are dealt with under section 26 of the Penitentiary Act. Cases of inmates who, at the end of a sentence—I will give some examples in a few minutes—have secured a suitable job or employment and whom it is desirable to release say two days ahead of the date fixed in the parole board order, are also dealt with under that section.

Perhaps I could illustrate the situation by describing a case I had to consider just before lunch today. An inmate in a provincial institution who is eligible for release on the 19th or 20th day of this month—I have forgotten the precise date—had made arrangements for his employment starting six days before the date of his release. Without this proposed clause, what was required in that case was an act of clemency, an Order in Council signed in the regular way by the Governor General. It is neither practicable nor possible to get that kind of order quickly enough in most such cases.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Why did you put a limitation on it?

**Mr. McIlraith:** Just a moment. That is the purpose of this clause. It has nothing at all to do with parole. It has to do with the humanitarian cases or humanitarian reasons I spoke about and cases such as the one with which I dealt this morning it has to do with the rehabilitation of the inmate and with enabling him not to lose the good job he secured. This happens periodically. In our experience with inmates in these institutions where such authority now exists there has been no request whatever that I could find where officers have been asked for a longer period than 15 days. The usual type of case covered by this clause is a request for one or two days, and it is not anticipated that there will be any request in provincial institutions for more than 15 days, and if there were it could be processed under the regular machinery having to do with parole.

Let me give another example to illustrate the point more clearly. It will be remembered that last December there was a church service of a special nature held in Ottawa. A large number of inmates were brought from one of the federal institutions, undoubtedly in the belief that it would assist in their rehabilitation. This was for one day. Surely there should be some authority vested in the provincial institutions, who deal only with inmates who have been sentenced to a period of less than two years, similar to that used in the federal institutions where inmates have longer sentences.

That is the only purpose of this clause. What is done is an attempt to assist the reorientation and rehabilitation of an inmate into the community. In the case of a person with whom the Parole Board has not been

involved, who is coming to the end of his sentence and for whom there is a demand from people wishing to hire him and interview him, surely it is desirable that he be released for a day for this purpose, and surely that decision should be made by the custodial authority at the time without having to apply to the Parole Board.

**Mr. Winch:** Why limit it to 15 days?

**Mr. McIlraith:** Because there is no demand for more than 15 days. The demand is usually for one day, for part of a day, or for two days. There is no need for the period to be more than 15 days. If it were for more than 15 days we would then be setting up another authority to deal with what is more comprehensively dealt with by the parole board authority. Admittedly, 15 days is arbitrary. It might just as well have been 10 days, according to what I found out by checking. There is no reason to suggest there would be any need for more than 15 days. There is nothing in our experience that would indicate a need for more than 15 days. If one were going on experience only, it could be argued that a period shorter than 15 days would be sufficient.

I trust that explains the purpose of the clause. I can assure the hon. member that I am very concerned and just as anxious as he is to ensure that the work of training and rehabilitation of these inmates is speeded up so they can be released at the earliest possible date to take part fully in society. I can assure hon. members that they should have no fear on that score whatever. I have firm views on the subject and I believe those firm views can be substantiated by the action taken in the last few months.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to hear the minister's explanation and I hope I am right in my interpretation that what he is trying to say is that except for the situation dealt with here the Parole Board will deal with such cases for humanitarian reasons and for the purpose of rehabilitation, whether the request for release is for two months or six months. New section 37A reads:

> Where, in the opinion of an official designated by the Lieutenant Governor of the province in which a prisoner is confined in a place other than a penitentiary, it is necessary or desirable that the prisoner should be absent—

I suppose that means absent from where he is incarcerated.

> —with or without escort, for medical or humanitarian reasons or to assist in the rehabilitation of the prisoner at any time during his period of imprisonment, the absence of the prisoner may be authorized from time to time—

But he cannot be away for more than 15 days. I am at a loss to understand the section. If it is what the minister says it is, I do not know why he put a limitation on it because if the Parole Board has any control surely it can say he can be away 16 days, 6 days or 6 hours. So I think there is something to be said for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch).

Let us take a look at the humanitarian reasons. According to the dictionary the definition of "humanitarian" is an adherent of humanism or the religion of humanity, a visionary philanthropist. I think we all know what humanitarian reasons are and what it means to rehabilitate a prisoner. What the minister said is not clear, and this provision seems to be completely superfluous. Someone may interpret it as meaning that the Parole Board can only release an inmate for 15 days if it receives a request for the release of a prisoner for rehabilitation purposes.

Perhaps the minister would wish to answer me and I hope the house will consent inasmuch as we are not in committee of the whole. This section is not at all clear to me. I should like to ask the minister the following question. Surely this section might be interpreted to mean that a prisoner could only be released for 15 days under any conditions. It could be interpreted as limiting the Parole Board in making a decision. If it does, it is bad law. If it does not, then why put the 15 days in here? I cannot see why the minister cannot accept the amendment. If a person is going to be away for only four or five days, then why make the period 15 days? Why not make it 20 days or shorten it to five days? If the minister would like to answer me before I become critical—

• (3:20 p.m.)

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Woolliams:** —I would be glad to give him the opportunity to do so. I should like him to make his position clearer than he has done up to now.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. This could, of course, be done by leave of the house. As the hon. member for Calgary North has pointed out, we are not in committee. At the same time, if the house consents to the minister answering the question—

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. McIlraith:** I am sorry I did not make my earlier statement clearer on this point. I would be glad to answer the question asked by the hon. member. There is no difficulty about the granting of parole in respect of periods longer than 15 days. The Parole Board can make an order for any length of time it wishes. There are, however, situations in which requests suddenly arise, and no process I know of is capable of dealing with these requests quickly enough. This proposal is intended to deal with such situations. For instance, it must be clear that the need for speedy parole for humanitarian reasons often arises quickly, and at present there is simply no way of getting the necessary order made in time for those who are inmates of provincial institutions. Authority is now being provided to enable someone on the ground to take action.

As to the granting of parole for periods longer than 15 days, this is a responsibility which Parole Boards can handle quite easily. It is not the intention to set up an authority with jurisdiction concurrent to that of the Parole Boards. The intention is only to deal with cases of temporary emergency. Let me give an example which arose the other day in connection with a group of inmates being given a special course in data processing—computer training, as it is often called. At a certain point in their training it was thought desirable to take them to Montreal to show them some pretty sophisticated pieces of equipment in actual use. Their absence was a matter of hours. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is not the kind of a case which should go before the Parole Board authorities for the issuance of an order, and that sort of thing, bearing in mind that the person having custody of this special class knows exactly what the situation is and has all the arrangements in hand. Surely, if an arrangement of this kind has been so helpful and so successful in the case of inmates who are incarcerated in the penitentiaries, its benefits should also be granted to those who are confined in provincial institutions. What is suggested here is a stop-gap procedure giving local officers who have primarily custodial responsibility an emergency type of authority in order to avoid the necessity of formal application being made to a Parole Board, whether for the granting of parole or for the exercise of clemency.

As to the time element, there is no experience which would indicate that 15 days is not sufficient. As a matter of fact, it could be argued that a much shorter time would be sufficient—six days, for example.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Might I ask a question with the permission of the hon. member for Calgary North? I assure the minister we are not trying to be obstructive; we are trying, rather, to be helpful and to understand his point of view. I take it the minister is telling us that the reason for this provision is to enable the authorities to deal with cases of emergency where it would take too long to place these circumstances before a Parole Board—cases where action must be taken quickly as when, for example, an inmate has an opportunity to get remunerative employment provided he can be released soon. Someone has to be given authority to act quickly. I think we are all sympathetic in cases of this kind. My question is: has the minister any assurance that 15 days will be sufficient in all these cases of emergency? Suppose an inmate had to get out 21 days earlier instead of a few days earlier in order to take advantage of a job offered to him. According to the minister's argument, a case of this kind could not be dealt with under the legislation now before us; an application would have to be made to the Parole Board, and the job might be lost in consequence.

What the hon. member for Calgary North is saying is that surely the decision could be left to the person who is appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province. Surely he could be allowed to use his own good judgment whether the period should be 15 days, 18 days, or whatever he thought fit.

**Mr. McIlraith:** To answer that question specifically, let me say this: if a remission of sentence of 21 days is involved, surely that is a matter for the Parole Board and not for the local officer administering the jail. That is the effective answer to the hon. member's question. I assure the house there is no suggestion on the part of any of the authorities dealing with this question that there is need for any longer term than the one which is proposed. On the contrary, all the experience is the other way. The Parole Boards are still able to deal with applications for parole in the ordinary manner. I repeat, it is not the intention here to set up a duplicate parole authority, nor is there any need for a duplicate authority. If this were contemplated, authority would not be assigned to an individual custodial official; it would be given to some kind of board which would examine these cases thoroughly from the point of view of rehabilitation and so on. The provision we are discussing is intended to cover only stop-gap,

emergency situations. As I say, this arrangement has worked so satisfactorily when applied to inmates of our penitentiaries that it was thought desirable to make it applicable to those serving sentences of less than two years duration, namely, those affected by prisons and reformatories legislation.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I agree with the leader of the New Democratic party and with the hon. member for Vancouver East. I understand what the minister is trying to say. He is telling us that someone should be designated by the provincial cabinet as having power to make an order allowing temporary probation, as it were, for some humanitarian reason. But it seems to me that if the law is to authorize such authority, the person designated should be allowed to exercise the proper kind of discretion in determining the period. In my opinion this limitation should be removed. The clause would still satisfy the purpose the minister has in mind.

I hope the minister will not take the position that it cannot be altered under any circumstances. I have found, over a number of years, that once a bill becomes hard and fast, drafted by persons behind the minister, it is very hard to get any of these things changed. I submit this is a case in which the minister should consent to the amendment. If the person designated by the provincial cabinet had the confidence of the cabinet to make such a decision, he would also have the confidence of the cabinet to determine what is a reasonable length of time in cases of this kind. I can find no objection to the insertion of the words "a reasonable time" or some such words, or the deletion of the words suggested by the amendment.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I am not going to delay the matter further. I am going to support the amendment, and I know others will too. I think the minister has taken too hard a look at it. For instance, one does come across humanitarian cases to which this provision would apply. I myself had a case where an accused awaiting trial did not have enough money for bail, and while waiting for trial one of his children was burnt and as a result passed away. I obtained an order from a Supreme Court judge for the release of this accused without bail in order that he could attend the funeral of the child and be with the family for a few days. This is why we should give somebody other than the Parole Board the power to make such decisions, in accordance with the conditions mentioned by the minister.



Surely a body designated with this sort of power would act responsibly throughout. The leader of the New Democratic party has suggested a period of 16 or 18 days would be appropriate, but as far as I am concerned you could pick a figure out of the air—10 days, 12 days or even 20 days. The draftsman of the bill provided for a period of 15 days, and the minister is sticking to that. I would ask him to reconsider it.

**Mr. McIlraith:** May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

**Mr. Woolliams:** Certainly.

**Mr. McIlraith:** Did the hon. member hear me say that I had checked all the authorities having to do with this subject which were available in order to see what was the actual experience in regard to this type of request, and that I had found the period was generally very much shorter than 15 days, that 15 days was not really required in order to achieve the purpose of the legislation?

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to answer that question. Yes, I did hear the minister say that. I have heard ministers say before that they have checked every source and come to an opinion. That is how one bolsters one's argument. I am not implying that this is wrong. Ministers do bolster their arguments by saying they have searched the records, that they have talked to the Attorney General, that they have talked to legal officers, and so on. That is how they get legislation through and there is nothing bad about that. However, it is an argument that does not really impress me.

Perhaps experience does lead him to think that 15 days will be sufficient, but surely if some body is given the power to exercise this sort of discretion it should be exercised responsibly and within a reasonable period. That is all I am going to say; I support the amendment.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The question is on motion No. 44 (Mr. Winch):

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, be amended by deleting in clause 110 the words "and for a limited period not exceeding fifteen days" in lines 10 and 11 on page 120.

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 view the nays have it.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** On division.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion negatived on division.

Motion No. 44 (Mr. Winch) negatived.

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (for the Minister of Justice)** moved:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be concurred in.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Caouette:** On division.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** When shall the said bill be read the third time?

**Some hon. Members:** Now.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to special order made Friday, May 9, 1969.

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice)** moved that Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be read the third time and do pass.

He said: Mr. Speaker, if I might introduce this motion in a very few words, I gather that all the amendments have been disposed of, that the report stage has been concluded and that we are now on third reading. I also gather that under the rules I will have an opportunity to close the debate as well.

**[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]**

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The minister had better be careful. I do not think that provision applies to third reading.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I would point out that the minister has that right on second reading but not on third reading. There may be a disposition of the house in this regard, but I will not prejudge that matter.

**Mr. Woolliams:** He would not want to filibuster his own bill.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** In answering that remark may I say what ministers often say, namely, that we have had a full and searching debate—and I think I can say that with some justification.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Full, anyway.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Yes, it was certainly full. There have been serious and deep differences of opinion on certain aspects of this proposed legislation. I listened to those opinions with great feeling because I know how sincere and profound are the convictions of members in some quarters of the house, particularly those opinions that related to measures that affect private morals and the concept of life and death.

Despite this, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied, as I stated previously on behalf of the government, that we have placed before hon. members a bill that is sound and useful, and one that has the support of a significant majority of the people of Canada whether within or without the House of Commons.

May I just review for the record the history of this bill. Members will recall that it was preceded by Bill C-195 which was introduced by my predecessor as minister of justice, the present Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau). That bill was introduced on December 21, 1967, and it lapsed with the general election. When the new parliament was constituted I had the opportunity to review the bill, to meet with members of all parties of the house, to receive delegations from every quarter of the country and to listen to many representations. The bill was then reintroduced under the present appellation, C-150, and it contains significant changes from the earlier bill.

The present bill was introduced on December 19, 1968. Debate on second reading took place on eight different days. Second reading

and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs was moved on January 23, 1969 and, as I have said, debate on the second reading stage took place on eight separate days.

On February 26, 1969, the bill received second reading and was referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. The bill was discussed in committee on nine different days, comprising a total of 15 sittings of half a day each, or seven and a half days in all. In the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs 42 motions to amend the bill were made, of which 30 were carried and 12 were negatived. They include motions made to that part of the bill for which my colleague the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) is responsible. Six motions were made with respect to that part of the bill, of which five were carried and one negatived. Thirty-six motions were made to those parts of the bill for which I as Minister of Justice was responsible. Twenty-five of those motions were carried and 11 negatived.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I have drawn these matters to the attention of hon. members to emphasize the fact that, despite what has been said, where the amendments proposed before the standing committee that gave this bill detailed scrutiny were constructive and were improvements they were accepted by the government. As a matter of fact, one of the more significant amendments was to make the failure to take a compulsory breathalyzer test, where the statutory limit on the blood-alcohol ratio was set at 0.08 per cent, an offence punishable by way of summary conviction only. I did not approve of this amendment personally and opposed it in committee. The government was beaten in committee by a majority of committee members consisting of members from both sides of the house. I accepted the decision.

I took the position in committee and I take the position in the house now that the committee system as it is being extended and developed will improve our parliamentary process. I took the position that if members of parliament were able to cross-examine the minister and his officials and were able to bring independent, outside witnesses, as well as develop their own research in order to arrive at their own independent assessments, this was an improvement of our parliamentary procedure. If the member of parliament can benefit from independent advice, if he has the opportunity to cross-examine officials and outside witnesses, if he can oppose the minister's position on the basis of facts he has assembled, and if there is a certain relaxing of rules of party discipline, the role of the member of parliament will be enhanced. For those reasons we accepted the committee report and the government stood behind the committee report in parliament.

As I said, 25 amendments were carried with respect to that part of the bill affecting the Minister of Justice and five amendments were carried with respect to that part affecting the Solicitor General. And, of course, we stood behind the bill at the report stage.

During the course of discussion, entreaties were made to the government inside and outside parliament to split the bill. When I first assumed responsibility for the justice portfolio I said that my prime concern was not to split the bill but to ensure that the will of parliament could be assessed on every part of the bill, no matter whether it related to lotteries, gross indecency, abortion, firearm control, cruelty to animals or what have you. There are 120 clauses in the bill. I am satisfied that under the new rules, both at the report stage which we have just concluded and more particularly at the committee stage, any member of parliament or any group of members, whether they represented a party or not, has been able to move amendments in the standing committee and, pursuant to the 24-hour rule, to move amendments at the report stage in the house. Those hon. members have had the right to have those amendments debated and discussed thoroughly. The amendments have been canvassed by parliament and thoroughly scrutinized by the public opinion of Canada. Finally they have been voted on in parliament.

Once this bill becomes law I hope the country will reunite behind this legislation and accept it as part of the law of the land. On every issue in the bill that divided this house, whether it related to lotteries, gross indecency or anything else, there was no attempt to curtail debate and restrict discussion. Every part of the bill that commanded either the loyalty or hostility of hon. members, every part of the bill that divided the house, has been given full scrutiny. I believe parliament has expressed itself on those areas of the bill that divided members of this house and, presumably, that divided opinion in the country. Hon. members on both sides of the house, holding deep convictions on aspects of the bill relating to private morals and life and death, will at least be able to say to their constituents, "We did our best; we put our views to

the people of Canada but parliament has decided. The bill was voted on in the house, and it may be said that the people through their parliamentary representatives have spoken. Now let us move on to other things."

**An hon. Member:** How do you know it will pass?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I am in no way anticipating.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I am in no way anticipating the results of this debate. But since this is the last time I shall have the opportunity under the rules to speak in this debate I say to the hon. member that I hope the results of this debate will heal whatever divisions there are in the country and in parliament with relation to the subject matter now before us.

Many hon. members were disturbed because this was a government bill. We said on second reading that we took the position, and we still do, that the government should take the responsibility before the people of Canada and before parliament for the reform measures being recommended in this bill. We want to make perfectly clear to the people of Canada that we accept responsibility for the bill, both before the people who do not like it and before those who approve of it. I am under no illusion, if we look at the full panoply of the omnibus bill, in thinking that all in this country approve of everything in the bill. In fact, there are few people in the country and probably very few in this house who approve equally strongly of every one of the items included in this bill. Unfortunately we have only one woman in the house. May I say to her through you, Mr. Speaker, that I commend her for the vigorous and convincing speech she made on behalf of the feminine point of view in this house. The feminine point of view has been inadequately represented here.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** We took the responsibility for this measure of criminal law reform. We are identified with it. We will take whatever credit there is in it and bear whatever blame there is in it as well. At the same time, I repeat that I do not think there is one member of this house—and I hope there is not one member of the party I represent—who can accuse me or accuse the government of trespassing one whit on the private rights of any hon. member. No matter whether he disagreed or agreed with any of the clauses of the bill, we did not trespass on his rights to take an independent or contrary position. We said we were not going to trespass on the conscience of any individual member of the House of Commons and we were not going to trample on the private morality of any member of the house where such hon. member expressed either his own view of the bill or the view of his constituents.

I think that we can well point to the vigorous debate promoted by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand), who disagreed with the wording of clause 18 relating to abortion. I think we can also point to the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont). It is clear that the government did not carry all its own members on all amendments. That does not reflect upon individual hon. members in any way whatsoever. I understand and respect their convictions and do not think one whit less of them. Situations like this force a member to weigh his responsibility as a member of the government party and his own private conscience and convictions. It is the most difficult decision any member of parliament has to make.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Finally, I want to speak on the question of law and morals. I will reserve reviewing the whole relationship for another time. The matter of law and morals has been mentioned. I want to emphasize that anything I have said should not be taken as a belief on my part or on the part of the government, that there is no relationship between morality and the criminal law. It is self-evident that historically the principles of morality have significantly influenced the development of our criminal law. No doubt they will continue to affect the nature and scope of those laws.

On the other hand, I want to repeat what I said on second reading: all that is immoral has not been and is not now criminal. I agree with and support the view that in the field of sexual behaviour the basic function of the criminal law is to preserve public order and decency. It is to protect the citizen from what is offensive and injurious and to provide sufficient safeguards against the exploitation and corruption of others, particularly those who are especially vulnerable because they are young, weak in body or mind, inexperienced or in a state of special physical, official or economic dependence. Where poten-

tial violence, corruption, public order or the total integrity of society are involved, or where the general consensus of what is right and wrong is involved, then there is a connection between law and morals. In those certain areas of private behaviour which are more properly left to the conscience, which are in private and do not involve public order or the corruption of others, particularly the young, we are of the view that this is no place for the criminal law.

The opposition has expressed itself with great force and on occasion with great eloquence during this debate. Without in any way presuming on the good temper of the house, with almost everything having already been said, with public opinion having been generously alerted and with the position of hon. members having been very forcibly set forth to their constituents and the people of Canada, I hope we can move on to what is before us in the way of a legislative program. Parliament must operate in the balance between being a theatre—the forum of the nation—and a workshop. I want to thank hon. members for their repeated courtesies to me, despite some of the strong language throughout the debate, and call upon them to give the best conclusion to what has been a most energetic debate.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to follow the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). I was one of the first members on this side to congratulate him when he was made Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs; therefore it is not in any spirit of affectation that I say that I have enjoyed working with him and members of his department. When we are all working for reform, we as members of parliament feel that we have achieved something so far as our dedication is concerned.

I do not want to appear to be throwing cold water on the speech the minister just made, but I want to come to grips with this great committee of which he speaks. What kind of a bill do we have before the house? It is not the kind of bill wherein an average man who is charged with an offence and does not have the money to get bail can find any solution. It does not help people of that kind. In the application of our law there is still a law for the rich and a law for the poor.

Through public relations a group behind the minister and his party painted great pictures with large brushes, for example, in *Maclean's* Magazine, before the bill was presented to the house. There was a beautiful portrait of the minister, and this bill was to be one of great reform. It is not. The minister will be the first to admit that nothing has been done by parliament in this lengthy debate to change the fact that people without means who are arrested for the same offences as others with means, will appear before magistrates and judges who will set bail and they will remain in jail because they have no means while the affluent person will be able to walk out of jail. Nothing in this bill solves that problem.

When we speak of the average man we do not really mean a man with an average income. As a lawyer who worked his way through university, I have seen young boys and girls charged with joyriding in an automobile or stealing an automobile, which are indictable offences. Every boy likes to put a key in a car and drive it. Boys love to drive sports cars. When appearing before a judge or magistrate he pleads guilty without the benefit of counsel, and he then finds himself at the age of 16 or 17 years with a criminal record.

There is nothing in this great bill of reform to expunge the criminal records of such boys as I have mentioned. After completing school a boy with a criminal record walks into a bank to apply for a job. He is well dressed and the manager says he would like to hire him. When the bank starts to check on the boy it is found that he cannot be bonded. There is no job for that boy because his record bounces up all the time. He may have committed two or three small offences when a young boy. What happens if he gets into something that is rather serious? Crown counsel stands up in court and says that this man is applying for bail. He was found guilty of minor offences when he was young and a rebel, but he is now at the stage of life where he has matured. Crown counsel lists all the offences of which the boy was found guilty.

I would like to see something done to expunge such records and help the youth of this nation. The human resource is the greatest resource. If this bill did something to expunge the records of young people, they would then have a chance to hold good jobs and even be able to join bar associations. Lawyers acts in all provinces contain the same prohibition. If a person has been charged with an indictable offence it is difficult for him to try and join a bar, and I do not mean the kind of bar one finds in the Chateau Laurier. If something had been done in this regard I would have said it was a great

reform. It would have been something for the average man.

• (4:00 p.m.)

What about the provision of counsel? This is covered by liaison between the federal government and the provinces. When a young boy is faced with a charge of manslaughter, it having been his bad luck to hit someone with an automobile, what kind of mouthpiece does he hire, especially if he comes from the class of people of below average income? According to statistics quoted the other day by the Leader of the N.D.P. 60 per cent of the population is in that category. That young boy cannot hire a good, experienced lawyer. In the past he would have gone before the bar of justice without counsel. Now counsel is appointed for him. Young counsel gain their experience through these appointments. That is not good enough. If this bill had come to grips with some of these subjects it would have done something to make sure that the law of Canada is applied equally to the rich and the poor.

I read in the newspapers the other day that the minister is trying to reclaim the former status of the Department of Justice and of his portfolio. Apparently it had fallen into some disrepute and its functions had been divided among other ministries. If this bill had done something about bail, expunging records, guaranteeing counsel and making appeals less costly it would have raised the status of the department.

Appealing a conviction for an indictable offence is a costly business. An appeal book costs $1 or $2 a page and may run to 500 pages. If a lawyer says to the father or mother of a young defendant who has been convicted. "I think this is a case where the judge did not instruct the jury properly and you should appeal," the first expense may be $1,000 for the appeal book. Legal aid is provided in some provinces, but really nothing is done in this great bill.

What is this bill all about? It is not that beautiful painting outlined by the great brush used by the minister. What a great painter he is, and what oratory he can exercise in this chamber when he wishes. This is a bill through which the government wants to change the law on homosexuality and abortion, questions which affect the consciences of all Canadians, but the government knew that if it wrapped up these amendments in one great cornflakes package it could put it through parliament. It is a bill tied up with great big bows and ribbons, but it contains no reform so far as the average man is concerned except in relation to the morals of the nation.

The minister says that no influence was exerted on the members of his party. I can just hear every little heart over there throb and members saying, "I wasn't influenced; I love my Minister of Justice." If there was no influence and if the minister was not afraid of the pie, why did he not carve it up as he promised his constituency president and the nation as a whole? I know what goes on in the workings of government and parties. Anybody who has sat in this house as long as I have cannot be so naïve as to believe there is no influence through party discipline on the Liberal ranks. If there is no such influence, then it is the strangest coincidence since the first conception. I say that the bill should have been divided so that all members of parliament could have spoken according to their consciences.

I now come back to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. I said I did not want to pour cold water on it. There were many amendments proposed. I managed to get several through, one of them changing the age from 17 to 16. But I defy the minister to stand in his place and say that the meat of the bill was not homosexuality and abortion. Very few amendments were permitted on those clauses without influence from the Liberal members of the committee. Those amendments that did pass did not centre on the core of the bill.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Woolliams:** Always from you, sir.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The hon. member was an assiduous member of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. Does he recall the amendment introduced by his colleague, the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave), affecting gross indecency, where he had the word "force" added to make it perfectly clear that consent could not be obtained by force? Does he recall as well the amendment to the abortion section where the word "approved" was added to the word "accredited" so as to enlarge the range of hospitals?

**Mr. Woolliams:** I said material amendments, and through you, Mr. Speaker, I say again to the minister that there were no material amendments. I will deal with both of those

right now. Here is what a professor of the Faculty of Law of the University of Toronto had to say about homosexuality when he claimed that the government had legalized bestiality in certain circumstances:

> There is only one point I would like to raise, and it is a legal point. It is factually impossible for two consenting adults to commit bestiality and clause 7 purports to say that Section 147—that is, everyone who commits bestiality—does not apply to any act committed in private between a husband and wife or any two persons. I am not quite sure what that means but in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it does not mean anything. As it stands I think it would mean that if one person committed a sexual act with his dog he would be guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for 14 years. If two people did it they would not be guilty of any offence.

When we brought that forward Liberal members said we misunderstood it. Only one word needed to be changed in section 147 of the Code to achieve the same result as proposed in the long amendments submitted by the minister. That word was "unlawful".

Section 209 of the Criminal Code dealing with the killing of an unborn child, says:

> Every one who causes the death of a child that has not become a human being, in such manner that, if the child were a human being, he would be guilty of murder, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life.

There was a saving section in the Criminal Code to protect a doctor who killed an unborn child in order to save the life of a mother. The minister says that that section would not apply to abortions. I say to hon. members that they should go back and read the Criminal Code. I ask hon. members to read section 209. I say that if the words "act of birth" were removed from the Code and the word "unlawful" inserted the result would be the same as proposed by the minister, except that he proposes the setting up of a committee of doctors.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Most communities do not have enough doctors to form such a committee. In any event this is a lot of nonsense, but that is what is proposed. Every accredited hospital, and most of them are, has set up a committee of doctors to analyse every operation. When such a committee finds that a doctor is taking out too many appendixes the members want to know what is taking place. So every doctor's operations are controlled by a committee in that way. To suggest that a great change is being made now in the field of abortion is complete hogwash, and even the minister must blush inwardly. This is not a great bill of reform.

Pregnant young girls who think they can go to a doctor and get an abortion will find this not to be the case as a result of this law, although that is the impression they may have as a result of what they have read about it. They will first have to prove that if they have the baby it will or is likely to kill them, or that something will happen to their health. We all know that in the world today the mortality rate in respect of pregnancy is dropping lower and lower.

To illustrate what I have said in this regard, let me refer to a case I learned to of today which occurred in a city in Ontario. A young girl was charged with attempting to abort herself rather than tell her parents she was pregnant. She will not be any better off after the passage of this bill than she was before so far as obtaining an abortion from a doctor is concerned. She has been charged and she would be charged when this measure comes into effect.

There are one or two other things I should like to mention before I sit down of which I am sure the Canadian public is not aware and which have not been discussed to a great extent in the house. The first is the matter of drinking and driving. I have gone along with the proposal in the bill because one has the feeling that drinking and driving are related to population growth and an increase in the number and use of automobiles. But I wonder whether the Canadian people realize that when this bill passes there will be three offences.

It has been my experience personally and the experience of my clients that when a police officer stops an automobile he always has reasonable grounds for doing so. As a result of this measure the police officer will ask the individual to take a breathalyzer test by blowing into a bag. If the individual says he does not intend to blow into the bag, that he is driving all right and everything is fine, and he does not blow into the bag, he will be guilty of an offence.

It is my opinion and the opinion of a number of my friends that there are many people who drive with .08 per cent alcohol in their blood. I suggest that not many people leaving a cocktail party would have less. It would be interesting to stop every car coming and going tonight to determine how many drivers would be guilty of this offence. I suggest we do not have enough jails to hold them all. In any event, if you do not take the test and do not blow into the little old bag, that is prima facie evidence against you in respect of an

impaired driving charge. As a result of my experience it would be pretty hard to refute or defend against such a charge.

If you do blow into the bag and it is found that you have .08 per cent alcohol in your blood you are guilty of an offence. There are three offences involved. If you refuse to take the test you are guilty of an offence; if you do take the test and you hit that .08 per cent jackpot you are guilty of an offence, and in respect of impaired driving this is prima facie evidence that you were not driving properly or that you were impaired in charge of an automobile. That will be the law, and it will be very hard for a defence lawyer to digest.

It does seem to me that at times this new law will infringe upon civil rights, but I agree with the minister and I intend to support the provision because we must come to grips with the situation. The public should know what it will have to face with the adoption of this new measure. I am not one of those lawyers who suggest that there is an infringement of civil rights every time a law is changed to deal with situations created by increases in population and increases in the use of automobiles in our urban centres. Very often these changes are necessary, and in that way I think this is a good change.

Let me conclude by saying that Canadians should not consider that this is a bill of reform. The minister must be on the same wavelength as the Prime Minister who continues day after day to promise jam for tomorrow but never jam today. He has suggested we will have a new mini-omnibus bill to cover those things I have mentioned. Why were they not covered in this bill? This is not a bill of reform. It is a bill which changes the language of the abortion law but does nothing really in that field. It does legalize homosexuality under certain circumstances. In my opinion these people should not come under the Criminal Code but should be treated in hospitals in an attempt to rehabilitate them. I am not impressed with these reforms on which we have spent 18 days.

On the other hand, I enjoyed working with the minister and other members of parliament on the Criminal Code. Many of us reviewed much of the law that we had probably forgotten. If the minister wishes to maintain his image in the future I hope he will bring in amendments in respect of the matters I have described. When this bill becomes law it will be applied in such a way we will still have one law for the rich and another for the poor. As a result of the financial environment in which I grew up I will never be happy until people in all walks of society have the law applied equally.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the debate on third reading of this bill mainly for the purpose of dealing with one specific subject, indeed, one particular aspect of a specific subject. In reference thereto I shall be presenting an amendment.

Before dealing with the particular matter I have in mind I should like to say a few words in support of the position taken by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) when he declared that in his view parliament has done a good job on this piece of legislation. I hope I do not sound at the moment as though I am trying to win friends on both sides of the house when I say I also agree with the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) that there are a number of subjects which ought to have been included in this bill but which the government failed to lay before parliament at this time. I think particularly of our bail system, the expunging of records, the right to counsel, the abolition of corporal punishment and matters of that kind. The statement by the minister that these matters will be dealt with at a later date is too much like statements we get all the time from the government. Things are always coming soon, they are always under review and always under consideration.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Stick around.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The minister invites me to stick around and that is an invitation I intend to continue to accept.

• (4:20 p.m.)

It seems to me that in an omnibus bill of 120 clauses dealing with many aspects of criminal law the government ought to have included these other items. However, I think the hon. member for Calgary North should be reminded that though there are things this bill did not cover, and we complained about this fact as much as he did, it is unfair to say that it deals only with sexual behaviour and sexual offences. After all, he himself has referred to the new law that has been written regarding breathalyzer tests and drunken driving, and there are also new laws regarding firearms, and so on. There are many changes in the law respecting court procedures.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Insanity.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Insanity, and so on. In other words, in 120 clauses there are only a few that have dealt with the subjects which have been the cause of most of the debate we have had.

Having paid my respects to the hon. member for Calgary North, I come back to the position the Minister of Justice took when he spoke earlier this afternoon, namely, that given the bill that was presented to parliament, parliament has done a good job on it. This is in part because parliament is a good institution most of the time, but it is also due to the fact that we have made some improvements in our rules that really first came into play, so far as legislation is concerned, in the handling of this bill. I think it has to be admitted that we had a good debate in the house on second reading. Reports from our members on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, as well as my own observations, indicated that it did a very thorough job, and there was some surprise that it was able to do that job in less time than it had been thought would be taken.

When the bill came back to the house we had an experience at the report stage which I think the hon. member for Calgary North ought to recognize. Despite all he says about the fact that the government was unwilling to divide the bill, despite all his attempts to embarrass the Minister of Justice with statements he made on a particular occasion, the fact of the matter is that the members of the House of Commons have had the right, and have exercised that right, to express their views both in speeches and by their votes on the contentious issues.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Whatever views people may have had about changing the law with regard to homosexuality, whatever views members may have had about changing the law with regard to abortion or with regard to lotteries and other things that have been brought before us, hon. members not only had the right to put down their amendments but they were put down, we have had debate for days on end, and we have had recorded votes. Parliament has made its decision on each contentious issue standing by itself.

When we voted on abortion we were not voting on something that was in a cornflakes package; we were voting on abortion by itself. When we voted on the question of state lotteries, an instance where in my view parliament voted the wrong way, we were nevertheless voting on that issue by itself. I am not claiming that we lost that amendment because it was in some sort of package; neither can hon. members on the government side say in defence of their vote that it was because something else was tied up with it. They voted for the principle of allowing state lotteries so far as the Criminal Code is concerned. I would be stretching the rules a bit if I were to try to rehash those debates, particularly by referring to the votes, but I think it is appropriate to say that under the rules, parliament being the kind of pretty good institution it is, we have made our decision on all these contentious issues.

When the vote is finally taken—it is really a formality—on third reading and the passing of the bill, it will be a bill on which parliament has spoken individually on each of the contentious issues. I think this is good. I think parliament deserves credit for the job it has done. I still think it is a bit of nonsense to argue that the bill should have been divided and to say that we have been asked to take a cornflakes package.

There is one point about the votes, however, that I should like to emphasize. We had a good many of them at the report stage. They came on all the various days of the week. That is quite in order because parliament sits five days a week and Standing Order 5 says that members are supposed to be here at all times and votes can come on any day. But some of the votes on Mondays and Fridays were pretty light. As a matter of fact, the number of people who voted on Friday on certain amendments having to do with abortion represented much less than a majority of the House of Commons itself. I think the votes on Friday were of the order of 108 to 35, which is a pretty overwhelming majority of those who were present. But 108 is not a very large number of members out of a house of 264. I hope, therefore—and I address myself to the acting house leader on the government side, to other house leaders and to myself—that when the vote comes on third reading there will be enough members here so that those who vote for this bill will represent not just a majority of those present but a majority of the membership of the House of Commons. I suggest not only to the house leaders but to the whips that it is rather important, with a major piece of legislation like this, that the vote be a clear and convincing one by having on the affirmative side a number that represents a clear majori-

ty not just of those present of the total membership of the House of Commons.

Having said those preliminary words which were prompted, of course, by the remarks of the Minister of Justice and those of the hon. member for Calgary North, I should like to turn to the narrow point with which I would still like the house to deal. On April 21 at the report stage I moved an amendment which sought to delete from clause 13 of the bill the two subparagraphs which would make it legal for the federal or provincial governments of this country to hold state lotteries. My amendment, as I say, was moved on April 21 and is recorded in *Hansard* for that date at page 7774. The vote was taken the next day, April 22, and is recorded in *Hansard* at pages 7838 and 7839. My amendment was in fact defeated by a vote of 118 to 54. I believe that under our new rules there is one thing about which there is no question; once we have made a decision in the house, with Mr. Speaker in the chair, on an issue at the report stage, it would not be appropriate to try to revive precisely the same issue at the third reading stage. Therefore I do not intend to make that effort. I still think the house was wrong in approving of state lotteries, federal or provincial, but that decision has been made and I have to accept it, just as the minister has to accept some other decisions that were made.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The house is never wrong. You just regret the decision.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** That is a euphemistic way of putting it. If you want me to say I regret the decision, I will; but I also say the house was wrong. However, I want to make it clear that I feel just as strongly now as I did on April 21 and on other occasions when I spoke on this matter, that whatever views we may be willing to agree to regarding private lotteries, games of chance, bingo and all that kind of thing, I thoroughly disapprove of federal, provincial or municipal governments being put in a position where they can resort to the holding of lotteries for the raising of public revenue. I think this is a backward step of the most regressive kind. As I have said on other occasions, we get some pretty regressive taxation proposals from the present government, but this is even worse in its potentialities than some of those put forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson).

• (4:30 p.m.)

My position is not one that is held by only a few of us. I will not take the time of the house to read it all, but on those occasions when the Winnipeg *Free Press* supports me editorially I think it is time to get it framed or, as my friend says, to watch out.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Watch that you are not framed.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** My colleague thinks that I might be framed. I think not, for this editorial is a very serious one. At any rate, I invite the minister to read the editorial which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press* on Thursday, April 24, the heading of which is "Invitation To Folly". The *Free Press* editors, without qualification, expressed their regret, to use the minister's language, that the government did not see fit to accept the amendment that I moved on April 21. I say without going into it at length, because I have done so on previous occasions and because there is nothing we can do about it anyway, that I think permitting state lotteries as a means of raising public funds is a regressive step that we should not take. However, that decision has been made. But there is a detail in that decision which has not been discussed, has not been argued at any of our stages, at second reading, in the standing committee or at the report stage, namely, that clause 13 in Bill C-150 not only permits state lotteries but in the case of the federal government permits those lotteries to be held in accordance with regulations made by the Governor in Council.

It is on this point that I wish to move an amendment in a few minutes. When the minister was arguing for these subparagraphs in his bill he spoke about symmetry. He said he wanted to provide for the federal government to have the same position that was accorded to provincial governments. Again I point out that subparagraph (b) of the legislation in question says that provincial governments may conduct lotteries only in accordance with any law enacted by the legislature of the province concerned. But in the case of the federal government, the government has drawn up this bill so that once it is passed the federal government may organize any kind of lottery it wishes, and it can do so entirely by Order in Council. It can make any conditions or terms it wants. It can give away its own shirt and the country's shirt too, and it does not have to come back to parliament to get approval for the terms and conditions of any of those lotteries. It can all be done by Order in Council.

It is on this point that I am registering this lastditch objection. Despite my objection to

state lotteries in principle, I cannot do anything about that. I have to accept the fact that parliament has voted for state lotteries in principle, federal and provincial. But I do contend that I have the right to ask for this one thing to be done, for the minister's symmetry to be carried out, for the law to be changed by only a few words so that the same provision applies to the federal government as would apply to the provinces, namely, that any such lottery should be held only in accordance with a law enacted by parliament itself.

I speak of this with a fair amount of feeling so far as the subject of state lotteries is concerned. I think that if we start on this path we are responding to what the *Free Press* calls an invitation to folly. I think we are on a slippery slope. But I appeal even to members of parliament who favour state lotteries, particularly members on this side of the house and, I think, a few over there, to face up to the fact that one of the things that we in parliament should guard most jealously is the question of how much authority we give to the executive to act by Order in Council. If there is anything that has happened in modern times that is derogatory to the strength and the importance of parliament it is the extent to which the executive has been strengthened because it has asked for Order in Council powers and parliament has been willing to give the government those powers.

I think, for example, of a situation to which I will refer in passing. We did a pretty good job in this parliament on the National Transportation Act but we are discovering now that we gave a great deal of power to the government. We went even further; we gave a great deal of power to the Canadian Transport Commission. As a matter of fact, we gave a great deal of power to one man whose name is well known all over this house. There are other examples, but this is what we are doing here and I plead with members, even members like the hon. member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade) if he were here, to realize that this issue goes beyond the question of lotteries. It goes to the whole question of the relation between parliament and the government. We should not lightly and without serious thought and concern pass a law in which we give another wide power to the executive to act by Order in Council without having to come back to parliament for any kind of endorsation or approval whatsoever.

Incidentally, the one paragraph in the editorial in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of April 24 that I would like to read zeros in on this point. It reads as follows:

> The federal government pleads not merely symmetry but also virtue, since it does not now plan to set up an all-Canada lottery scheme. Mr. Turner, however, cautiously inserts two qualifying phrases, "as far as I know" and "at present". The important point is that the government, regardless of its intentions, is obtaining authority to introduce lotteries, as and when it chooses, by Order in Council. Obviously, it cannot bind its successors and it is not even clear from the minister's language, that it has bound itself for any length of time. This is a great and unwelcome change—

This is the Winnipeg *Free Press* talking.

> —which could and should have been averted by acceptance of the Knowles amendment.

That is the amendment I moved on April 21, and since the government was not wise enough to accept that amendment I am going to give the government a chance at another one today. I am giving the government a chance to make restitution.

**Mr. Benjamin:** They do not often get a second chance.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** We are full of compassion over here and we would like to give the government a chance to do something about its sins. As the minister knows—and I am sure he will not mind my saying this—I spoke to him about this a few days ago, and today I sent him a copy of the amendment I propose to move because I am quite serious in what I am asking the house to do.

There are times, of course, when we move amendments knowing that there is not a chance of their being accepted, but we go through the motions anyway; we go through the ritual of making a motion, of having a vote and of being defeated, after which we can at least tell the country we tried. If one springs something like this on the government one realizes, of course, that the government has some excuse. I am not springing this on the Minister of Justice. As I said, I spoke to him about it last week, and earlier today I sent him a copy of the amendment in the hope that he will give it favourable consideration. If my amendment is accepted, it will not be an acceptance of the basic position I took on April 21 that there should not be state lotteries at all, but at least it will protect the government against the charge that it wants a blank cheque, that it wants one more Order in Council power, and that it wants to be able to bring in at any time any kind of

lottery it wants without any reference to the parliament of Canada.

That is why I ask the house to take this matter seriously. I do not deny that it revolves around the question of state lotteries, but the question is much larger than that. It involves the whole relationship between parliament and the government, and I believe even hon. members who favour state lotteries should be on the side of my amendment. Indeed, the government itself, rather than have this voted on, should do what the *Free Press* said it should have done, that is, it should accept the amendment in order that this very minor change could be made.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Having indicated the nature of the amendment, perhaps I should move it at this time, seconded by my hon. friend, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis). After the tremendous accolade accorded her by the Minister of Justice I thought that having her second it might help my chances, although I might have asked any of my other hon. friends to do so.

**Mr. Benjamin:** What about me?

**Mrs. MacInnis:** Why not the Minister of Justice himself?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The member for Vancouver-Kingsway has said that the Minister of Justice might second my amendment. That would be fine. Despite the byplay which is going on, it is an extremely serious matter, and that is the reason I now move, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway:

That Bill C-150 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, with instruction that the said committee has power to amend clause 13 of the said bill, at lines 33 and 34 on page 31, by deleting the words "in accordance with regulations made by the Governor in Council" and by substituting therefor the following words: "in accordance with any law enacted by parliament".

Clause 13 as it now reads contains in it a new section 179A of the Criminal Code, a lengthy one which I shall therefore not read. Paragraphs (a) and (b) near the beginning of that new section are the paragraphs which take state lotteries, federal and provincial, out of the realm of the Criminal Code. The language in (a), goes further and provides that federal lotteries can be held in accordance with regulations made by the Governor in Council. The language in (b) provides that as far as the provinces are concerned lotteries can be held in accordance with any law enacted by the legislature of the province in question. I have taken the exact words the minister uses in paragraph (b) and asked him to put them in paragraph (a). In other words, I have asked him to go along with the procedure which he himself has advocated in connection with this legislation; I have asked him to provide that as far as federal state lotteries are concerned it should be recognized that the law would remove them from any criminality, but that any law providing for the holding of a lottery should come before parliament itself.

I thank the house for its attention to this matter. I do not try to hide my concern with regard to the economic and social effects of such lotteries. I think they are wrong. But parliament has made its decision on that point. Over and above that issue is the question of the authority of parliament over the executive, and I call upon every member of this house who believes parliament should be supreme to support my amendment and, by doing so, to declare that lotteries which, we say, may be held by the federal government, may be held only when the government comes to parliament for the necessary authority.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Before putting the amendment, may I say I have had an opportunity to consider it. It would seem to me that the most fundamental objection to it was discussed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, namely, whether it raises a matter which has been previously disposed of at the report stage.

I see that the Minister of Justice is anxious to rise. I must say that having considered the amendment I do not see that an objection on this ground can be held in the present case. However, I am open to argument and if the minister is anxious to rise I will hear from him.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** With the greatest respect, Your Honour, I was hoping you might have held that point open until I had been given an opportunity to argue it. However, in case you are open to second thought or, if I may say so with respect, to more mature thought on this subject, I would be glad to address myself to what I believe to be the fundamental objection to the admissibility of this amendment, reserving my comments as to the substance of the proposal; at this stage I do not wish to engage in a debate on the substance, though I shall be prepared to do so later if necessary.

Parliament has long been guided by the principle that once the view of the house has been obtained on a matter it cannot be expressed again on the same subject. I wish to refer Your Honour to citation 200(1) to be found at page 167 of Beauchesne, fourth edition:

> An old rule of parliament reads: "That a question being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the house." Unless such a rule were in existence, the time of the house might be used in the discussion of motions of the same nature, and contradictory decisions would be sometimes arrived at in the course of the same session.

May I now refer Your Honour to citation 415 (4) of Beauchesne to be found at page 287:

> On the third reading of a bill, an amendment to refer back to the committee of the whole must not tend to change the principle approved on the second reading.

I think you can read parenthetically here, "back to the standing committee" because the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre would agree, I am sure, that under the new rules the standing committee replaces the committee of the whole.

Let us come now to the amendment. The amendment suggests substituting for the words "in accordance with regulations made by the Governor in Council" the words "in accordance with any law enacted by parliament". I submit to Your Honour that in effect this amendment really does nothing except to eliminate paragraph (a) of section 179A(1). It deletes the words "in accordance with regulations made by the Governor in Council" and in doing so strikes at the very essence of the paragraph relating to a lottery scheme conducted or managed by the government of Canada.

The words "in accordance with any law enacted by parliament" do not, in substance, mean anything. If parliament is supreme it can always enact a law. No statute passed by this house need last forever; it can be repealed in a subsequent session or by a subsequent parliament. So when the hon. member says we should substitute the word "law" for the word "regulation" what he is really saying is: let us make it necessary for a law to be passed in future to bring this into effect.

Mr. Speaker, laws can always be enacted by parliaments of the future. Parliament being supreme, this amendment is redundant. It is what logicians call tautological. It is redundant. In terms of the constitutional practice of this country, the effect of the amendment is really to strike out the words "in accordance with regulations made by the Governor in Council" and, by extension, the clause as a whole.

• (4:50 p.m.)

The attention of Your Honour should also be directed to amendment No. 10 moved at the report stage and to be found in *Routine Proceedings* for Wednesday, April 16 on page ii. This was the amendment put by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre at the report stage. It sought to strike paragraph (a) and paragraph (b) from the first subsection of section 179A. In other words, what the hon. member attempted to do at the report stage was to strike the provisions relating to a possible federal lottery scheme and relating to a possible provincial lottery scheme from the bill.

This time the hon. member is saying: "I will leave the provincial law alone but I will try to get at the federal aspect again under paragraph (a). The way I will try to get at it is by eliminating the power to make regulations and inserting the power to make a law. I submit to Your Honour that parliament always has the power to make a law, and therefore the effect of this amendment is to eliminate paragraph (a). The effect of the amendment is to fall back on a decision that the house made with respect to amendment No. 10 at the report stage.

I submit that what the hon. member failed to do at the report stage because he lost the decision of the house he is now trying to do under the guise of substituting the word "law" for "regulation". The word "law" in relation to the supremacy of parliament does not mean anything. He is really trying to do indirectly what he failed to do directly some weeks ago.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the efforts of the Minister of Justice to assert that this amendment is out of order, and if I may I should like to deal with his points seriatim.

First, the minister relies on citation 200, paragraph (1), of Beauchesne's fourth edition, to be found at page 167, which says that a question once being made and carried either one way or the other cannot be question again but must stand as the judgment of the house. I could not agree more. That is why I not only agree but assert that decisions that we have made at the report stage cannot be

made the subject of amendments for a subsequent vote at this stage. If other hon. members attempt to move that kind of amendment, Your Honour can quote me as holding that they are out of order.

I submit that this is not a case of reopening the issue with which my earlier amendment on April 21 was involved and to which the minister has just referred. The minister also went to citation 415 of Beauchesne's fourth edition to narrow the effect of amendments on third reading.

If I may move on to what the minister seemed to regard as his main argument, I should like to suggest that it is not as strong as he thinks. The minister tries to say that my amendment is tautological or redundant—we are full of big words today—because it would deny to parliament a right that it already has to make a law at any time. That being so, why does the minister bring in this new section 179A (1) (a) in clause 13?

I would ask the minister to note the context in which it appears. The new section reads:

> Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this Part relating to gaming and betting, it shall be lawful—

And so on. This proposed section 179A is being put into the Criminal Code after the present section 179, which is the law governing lotteries, betting and gambling of various kinds. What the minister is saying in paragraph (a) of this amending section is simply that, notwithstanding what is already provided by section 179, it is not illegal or criminal for the federal government to conduct a lottery. If that is all that the proposed section is saying, I submit it is not necessary. The government could make a law at any time to set up a lottery, notwithstanding section 179; the minister just said so. Parliament is the supreme authority and can speak at any time.

I think the drafters of this law were a little smarter about what they were doing than the Minister of Justice realizes. They were saying that, despite the general law against lotteries and gambling of various kinds, parliament is by law making an exception in the case of federal governments and provincial governments. I suggest it was not redundant for the government to ask parliament to make that law so as to open the way to state lotteries.

Therefore I submit to Your Honour that this principal argument of the Minister of Justice falls to the ground. In effect, what the amendment is seeking to do is not to reopen the issue of parliament's rights. Parliament's rights are always there. What this amendment is seeking to do is to assert parliament's rights so far as the establishing of a lottery by Order in Council is concerned, which is a separate matter from the right to hold lotteries at all.

Therefore I submit that on all the counts raised by the minister this amendment is definitely in order. It does not open a subject that was voted on at the report stage. It does not seek to do in some indirect way something that was tried at the report stage. As he knows, I regret what the house did at the report stage. At the report stage federal and provincial state lotteries were approved. My amendment does not seek to deny that approval. My amendment does not seek to put federal lotteries back under the aegis of the Criminal Code. My amendment accepts the principle which was decided at the report stage. But my amendment does zero in on one aspect; it says that, this law having been changed as it has, it is still necessary for the government, in respect of any specific law about lotteries, to bring that law back to parliament. I submit this is completely different from the issue we voted on on April 22, and because it is different it does not violate any of the prohibitions against amendments at this stage.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain briefly the motives for which the Ralliement Créditiste deems acceptable the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

I feel I have to participate in this debate on procedure after hearing the hon. minister say that this amendment is useless, first because it raised again a matter already settled by the house, and second because it is useless for the house to make sure that the matter will come under an act passed by parliament and not under regulations established by the governor in council.

Mr. Speaker, we find those two arguments unacceptable. We refuse the first one, namely, that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is a repetition and would bring again into question a previous decision of the house.

Indeed, as was said by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has already introduced an amendment to remove completely from the Criminal Code clause 13 which provided for

the addition of section 179A, which would authorize the legalization of lottery systems in Canada.

The motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre reads in part as follows:

—be amended by deleting from clause 13 thereof, paragraph (a) and paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of the proposed new section 179A of the Criminal Code.

Later on in the day, we voted with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in favour of that amendment while other members voted against it. At that time, it was a matter of deciding whether or not we should legalize lotteries and, therefore, it was a question of principle.

Now, the amendment under study obviously proposes the rejection or acceptance of lotteries, just as the amendment did which was then proposed and appears in the *Proceedings* for April 22, 1969.

In fact, this amendment means, to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, that the house has decided by a majority vote to legalize lotteries.

The amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre proposes the deletion of the words "in accordance with regulations made by the governor in council" and the substitution therefor of the following words "in accordance with any law enacted by parliament".

To my mind, the amendment does not repeat the one that was rejected on April 22, 1969; instead, it proposes the referral of the bill to the committee with the instruction that it is authorized to substitute for the expression "governor in council" the expression "parliament".

Mr. Speaker, I believe the argument put forward a moment ago by the Minister of Justice is not valid since the amendment concerned is not being brought before the house.

The minister said that a decision made by the governor in council was always equivalent, for practical purposes, to a decision made by parliament, which is not true. A legislation has a much wider scope and parliament is much more responsible for a law it has enacted than for a cabinet decision. In fact, the cabinet, if it is responsible, may make a decision which goes against the will of parliament, as has happened in the past.

Mr. Speaker, we admit that this amendment is in order, and we would be glad if Your Honour would also accept it so that we may deal with it.

[*English*]

• (5:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I thank hon. members for their contributions. In the light of their contributions I think it would be advisable for the Chair to take the amendment under advisement and give a ruling at eight o'clock tonight. The latter point the Minister of Justice raised regarding the effect of the amendment on the sense of the clause is important. I have not considered it enough. I should like to discuss it with Mr. Speaker and the officers at the table and give a ruling at eight o'clock.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I have one thought, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to delay debate by argument. I am happy you took the position you did. If one looks at the amendment the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre moved on April 21 I think it will be seen, as the Minister of Justice has said, that the amendment sought to delete from clause 13 of the bill paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection (1) of proposed new section 179A. Basically, the effect of the present amendment would be very similar to that of his previous amendment.

The Minister of Justice referred to Beauchesne, saying that one cannot move substantially the same amendment affecting a specific subject matter twice in any one session of parliament. I ask Your Honour to examine what took place with respect to the Crowsnest Pass freight rates which were considered in a bill piloted through the house by a previous minister of transport, Mr. Pickersgill. On the occasion in question, when the Crowsnest Pass freight rates were being considered in committee of the whole, the opposition had more members in the house than the government and defeated that part of the bill. Mr. Pickersgill is not in the house so I can call him by name. He retaliated by introducing an amendment to try to correct the defeat. In that amendment the Crowsnest freight rates were called "statutory rates". At the time we argued that those statutory rates were still the Crowsnest Pass freight rates, and no matter whether you were considering one rhubarb pie or another, you were still considering rhubarb pie. The chairman on that occasion, who is not now a member of the house, ruled against us. The very wise Speaker of the house, who still occupies the chair, overruled the chairman and agreed that one cannot introduce the same matter twice in one session of parliament.

Actually the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is attempting to move an

amendment here which would have the same effect as his previous amendment if it had been passed.

**An hon. Member:** Hogwash.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I hear an hon. member saying "hogwash". When we say things others disagree with, they retaliate by shouting hogwash. At any rate, the Crowsnest Pass decision is too recent to be included in Beauchesne. Nevertheless I ask Your Honour to look at *Hansard* to see what happened. In my opinion the Minister of Justice is right. Your Honour's ruling ought to be made after careful consideration; otherwise we may see at this stage a duplication of all the previous amendments moved, and even I could not stand that.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** I am very glad, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you are proposing to consider this matter before making a final ruling and are going to confer with Mr. Speaker. The comments made by the hon. member for Calgary North really are not germane. He contended, as did the Minister of Justice, that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has an effect exactly similar to that of the amendment of April 21. On that occasion the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre sought to delete from clause 13 of the bill paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection (1) of the proposed new section 179A. Let us examine paragraph (a). It seeks to do two things, the first being to remove a state lottery operated by the federal government from the strictures of the Criminal Code. Section 179 of the Code says that you cannot have a state lottery and that to have a state lottery would be a criminal offence. Paragraph (a) of new section 179A says that the federal government may operate a state lottery. The removal of that paragraph was the primary reason for the amendment which he moved on April 21.

But paragraph (a) also says that such a lottery can be set up by the federal government without their being any reference to parliament. In this instance my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre is not asking that the provision stating that the federal government may set up lotteries be struck out; he has accepted the expression of opinion of parliament on this matter. All he is asking in his amendment is that the second provision of paragraph (a), namely, that the federal government may set up such a lottery by Order in Council, be removed.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

One must remember that paragraph (a) has two parts and that the hon. member is submitting that only the second part having to do with the setting up of lotteries by Order in Council should be removed. He agrees that the whole question of whether lotteries shall be permitted has been considered by the house. We are not debating that part and the amendment does not seek to change that. It merely seeks to remove from the legislation a power that would enable the cabinet by Order in Council to set up lotteries without reference to parliament. I hope this distinction will be kept in mind when Your Honour is taking this matter under advisement.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to what I consider the central point here. No one, including the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, will disagree that any amendment which by its nature is repetitious or which revives something that has already been decided by the house is clearly out of order. Citations 200 and 415 of Beauchesne were referred to, as well as several others. The arguments seemed to be directed to the point of having the house reconsider something or revive something after it has made a decision.

• (5:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Would the minister permit a question? I do not wish to deflect him. Would be not agree those citations do not really apply? We are in a new field. None of those citations was written after the introduction of the report stage. It does not change the hon. member's argument, but should not the point be noted?

**Mr. Olson:** I agree. I am sure the hon. member will also agree that the Speaker's rulings on a number of occasions since the new rules came into effect have been that no amendment is in order if it revives any subject matter upon which a decision has been made. This is still a fact whether one uses Beauchesne's fourth edition, the Standing Orders or any other authority.

I wish to deal with the other point briefly. When the house at the report stage made a decision to reject the amendment, specifically to reject the deletion of paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection 1 of new section 179A, clause 13, that decision did in fact reinstate, if that is the right word, that law respecting lotteries in the Criminal Code. It will be part of the law of Canada. What the hon. member is now doing is attempting to prevent the operation

or use of that law through the making of regulations by the Governor in Council, which is a normal procedure following passage of legislation by the house. In my view the effect, if we were to accept his amendment, would be to negate the power the house obviously wanted to confer on the Governor in Council to make regulations so that this part of the law could be operative. The effect would be to take away the power that this house wished to grant to the Governor in Council to make regulations. This, of course, was rejected by the house when it voted on that amendment at the report stage.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** If there are no further contributions, the Chair once again thanks hon. members for their contributions. Before reverting to the debate on the motion for third reading of Bill C-150, I might advise the house as to the business to be dealt with at the time of adjournment.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Stafford)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—ban on tobacco advertising; the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart)—Transport—Chapleau, Ont.—closing of part of C.P.R. shops.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### CRIMINAL CODE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner that Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be read the third time and do pass.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** We are now on third reading of the omnibus bill intended to legalize unrestricted abortion and homosexuality and quite a number of other practices, since it contains over 120 clauses.

When the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) rose to move third reading, and when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre took the floor after him, both claimed to be the champions of democratic parliamentary rights, emphasizing the fact that hon. members had been free to talk and to vote on the various clauses of the bill.

I do not share the opinions of these two hon. members for the simple reason that they are not consistent with the facts.

The Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre stated essentially that members had had the opportunity to express their views separately on every part of the bill. That is not correct.

On second reading and at the committee report stage, more than 44 amendments came before the house. They were combined in order to facilitate the discussion of this legislation and the voting procedure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, every time we voted on the amendments, the members did not vote necessarily for or against such or such clause of the bill, but rather for or against each amendment. To say that the members had the opportunity of voting freely on every one of the clauses in the bill does not tally with the facts, since the members did not really have to vote for or against such or such a clause of the bill, but for or against the various amendments.

And the same could be said about the committee stage, the second reading and the committee's report stage.

We did not have any opportunity yet to vote for or against such or such a clause of the bill.

The members have not have the chance yet to say whether they approved or rejected abortion.

• (5:20 p.m.)

They could only vote for or against such and such an amendment moved by such and such a member and, therefore, what the Minister of Justice and the member for Winnipeg North Centre said, and I want to stress this point, is not correct.

As for us, as far as this disputable bill is concerned—because we are not at all sure that the bill meets the wishes of most Canadians and that the majority of Canadians have asked for it—we are inclined to think that it was not even asked or wanted by the people, but that it was forced upon us by a strong-minded prime minister and by officials who do not always carry out the wishes of the people.

It is unfortunate to realize that those officials are not responsible to the people, that they are not answerable to the people. Members of the house, the cabinet and the government are answerable to the people. That is why we must enact laws that people want, that meet their needs because we are answerable to the people for our actions, our statements and our attitude in the house.

In view of those principles, we urge for the umptieth time the minister and the government to allow a vote on third reading on each and every clause of the bill. To vote on 120 different clauses is unthinkable. It is unthinkable and inconceivable. A member cannot be asked to vote on the bill as a whole on third reading. It is impossible to do so, unless one is irresponsible.

We would like to ask once again the Minister of Justice to seriously consider our request. We do not want to defeat the government. Such is not our intention.

We would like to pass a proper legislation that meets the wishes and the needs of the Canadian people, but we cannot imagine how members could vote for or against questions as different as the control of firearms, parimutuel systems, lotteries, breathalizer tests, abortion, homosexuality and what not, included in the omnibus bill.

Mr. Speaker, who is so intelligent as to imagine that a responsible member of parliament can vote on a bill that contains so many various subjects which have nothing in common except that the Criminal Code deals with them?

The fact that capital punishment, flogging, homosexuallity and lotteries are regulated by the Criminal Code is not enough to have us vote on those various subjects lumped together. It is antiparliamentary, Mr. Speaker. Hon. members should not be obliged to vote on this bill.

If the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) denies the freedom of expression and of vote within the Liberal party, it is his right, and he will be judged by his followers. The Prime Minister has no right to force opposition members, over whom he has no authority, to vote for or against the bill as a whole.

We appeal to the Minister of Justice who, in our opinion, is a responsible man—at least we hope he is, and we are inclined to think so—to allow a vote on every subject dealt with in the bill.

Let us divide the bill by subjects. Lotteries, abortion, homosexuality have nothing to do with each other. Firearms control and breathalizer have nothing to do with homosexuality and the other matters the bill is dealing with. We sincerely would like to be able to decide freely on each aspect of the bill.

It could easily be done. The dignity of Parliament would be preserved. Parliament is the ideal place where the rights of democracy can be enforced and where members can make a decision on various clauses of legislation, freely and with a clear conscience. The procedure pertaining to the vote must conform with the tradition of the house and the rights of members. Let us vote separately on each of the various matters of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we feel this is fundamental. The most important stage of a bill according to the new rules and procedure, is third reading, because it is going to end a debate that in this case may have been hard and long, but that was surely dynamic.

As far as we are concerned, we have defended the rights of democracy in the house. We have also been able to express the views of the majority of Canadians, whether the minister thinks so or not.

The government is proving its dishonesty in compelling us to vote for or against the bill as a whole. If the Prime Minister wishes to rule the roost and to compel Liberal members to vote on the bill as a package that is his right. He will be judged accordingly.

But he does not have the right to impose upon us a procedure that conflicts with our interests and with the basic rights of democracy which have always been acknowledged in this house.

We demand once more to be able to vote—and the right—an elementary, fundamental right—to vote on each section of the bill separately.

A vote on the breathalyzer issue will mean a vote on the breathalyzer issue. This vote will not bear the same consequences, from a social and economic standpoint, as will the vote on abortion and homosexuality.

I would like to put forward another argument. As for myself, I am in favour of the provisions on the breathalizer, since it would protect drivers.

I am entirely against the proposal aimed at legalizing abortion. The Prime Minister, with the procedure which he is enforcing in this house, places me in the following situation; If I vote conscientiously and responsibly in favour of the breathalizer, in accordance with the wish of the constituents of Lotbinière

whom I represent, the procedure imposed by the government would make me vote at the same time in favour of abortion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this would be flagrantly inconsistent with all statements which I have made in this house. I cannot, with a clear conscience, vote on the bill as a whole, if it is not subdivided. Why? Because we of the opposition have had nothing to say regarding the planning of this procedure and particularly because the bill, as everybody knows, has much more serious implications than one might think at the social, family, economic, human and, finally, moral levels.

We must consider these implications before voting, and we should have the possibility of making a separate decision on each of the various aspects of the bill. We have not had the chance to do it yet, since, to date, the house has only managed to reach a decision on the amendments to the bill and not on the bill itself.

At the third reading stage, I had decided to speak to the house quite objectively.

• (5:30 p.m.)

First of all, we are rejecting abortion. Nobody, not even the minister, has no longer any doubts about this, for approving abortion, in my opinion, is no answer. Those who favour abortion are much more concerned with its social, psychological and economic aspects than with its therapeutic implications as the minister would have it. Even in the therapeutic field the bill is supposed to cover, it goes further still then what the minister suggests: for it has social, psychological and economic implications. The case of the unmarried mother, for instance, of rape, of incest, of alcoholism, of backward couples, of those who are unaware of birth control means or for whom these means have not worked, of couples whose income is too low to allow them the burden of another child, of the problem couples, of the pregnant, discouraged mother overwhelmed by the burden of a large family, of the woman who simply refuses to have another child because it will jeopardize her future career or her present job. And we have also the case of people simply refusing to accept a child because they want more social amenities. These are so many cases, overlooked by this bill, these are so many problems to which it gives no answer.

But let us ask ourselves whether the passage of this legislation will settle the problem in all the cases I just mentioned or if it is not going to make it worse.

It is a known fact—and statistics prove it—that from 50,000 to 80,000 illegal abortions are performed each year in Canada. Now, we must ask ourselves if passing this legislation will solve the problem of clandestine abortions or at least reduce it. One must admit that there is much cause for perplexity, as far as the effects of this bill are concerned, since it does not suggest any effective solution to the clandestine abortion problem nor to the other cases I mentioned earlier.

If the legislator sincerely wishes to reduce the number of clandestine abortions, and ensure respect for life and the human being, he will not achieve the respect for life through the passage of obscure half-measures such as these, left to everybody's free interpretation. The solution lies in going to the root of the problems. We must discourage abortion by getting down efficiently and with determination to the real problems.

Abortion is not a solution in itself. What is regrettable, in my opinion, is that with this bill the Canadian people are under the impression that abortion is a solution, while to me, it would likely increase the problem.

There is only one way to deal with the problem in all the cases I have mentioned. It is not abortion, as the minister would have us believe, and I shall try to explain why quickly.

First, we should see to it that the education of our society is ensured and we should pass legislation intended to protect the family and the child to be born. Instead of putting in people's head the idea that their problem could be settled simply by getting rid of a child who would be a drag on them, let us participate in their education in order to build a better society based on sound values. Let us teach them that a child is not a charge nor a calamity but rather a desirable thing upon which we must build our society.

It is important first to instill into them a sense of well-balanced sexuality and a sense of love but not as it is presented in the movies, in novels and in advertising. I have noticed that for several members abortion represents a very weak aspect of a poorly-balanced sexuality while in fact abortion is rather a problem which is added to the others facing the Canadian family.

Love must not be considered as a series of short-lived adventures as the abortion proposal seems to infer: Let us enjoy life, let us play today without any respect for the human person and tomorrow let us kill. It is not on such a concept of morality that we shall build

a country and promote a healthy and worthwhile education. But we must force upon the people and the government the necessity of having a balanced and controlled sexuality and of fostering a conscious and responsible love.

Nobody can maintain in this house that to be in favour of abortions on request is a responsible act, because it means escaping our responsibilities. Let us build but let us build on firm ground.

Sexuality must be controlled love must be conscious of what it must offer and of what it receives. Thus, it will not be necessary to perform abortions on unmarried mothers, because every effort will have been made to reduce their number. That is the great difference between those who favour this legislation and those who oppose it.

Those who favour it do not ask themselves whether it will decrease the number of unmarried mothers or solve their problems.

On the other hand, those who oppose it would like to see, instead of this measure to legalize abortion, some legislation that really stands a chance of solving the problem.

We must stir in everyone a sense of respect for life, and this parliament must set the example.

If people understood all that abortion entails, a great number would already be willing to oppose it. We must abhor everything that can destroy the human being, for instance, war, murder, crime, and abortion on a large scale, rather than those cases where it is a question of saving the life of the mother when this can almost certainly be established by the doctor.

Another solution might be to instil in couples an awareness of their role as procreators, as responsible fathers and mothers, conscious of their role, instead of being the toys of their uncontrolled sex urge and of trying to destroy today the life they transmitted themselves yesterday.

• (5:40 p.m.)

That is a concept of life that the legislators should endeavour to translate into laws and to establish as a guiding principle in order to encourage the Canadian people to build the country on a solid foundation. To this end, one must be prepared to give financial aid if necessary and to establish the required organizations.

In my opinion, it is only at that level that the State should interfere. Is it not the State's duty to protect the welfare of Society instead of destroying the sense of family responsibility? Married couples should be helped to fulfill their roles as parents and educators. The State must supply the necessary machinery for this form of education, including all guidance and protection services at all levels of society.



Many organizations strive, by every means available, to make people understand that love is a great thing that must be cultivated, that it involves give and take, that it is not simply a pleasure but that it also entails duties and responsibilities. If on the one hand, private organizations do their utmost unstintingly to help the Canadian family achieve its noble purposes and if, on the other hand, the federal government destroys this voluntary work, we shall get nowhere.

Let us then work together in an effort to enhance the status of Canadian life, of family life, and of the human being. Let such an education materialize in educational courses for young people, in order to prepare them gradually for their role of married people, of responsible parents. We must make available to our young people a more immediate preparation for married life through appropriate courses, with subsidies if need be. The government should co-operate with private organizations in order to help young couples build their home on a sound basis. Those are the reasons why we are opposing the provisions on abortion.

At the same time, we have to suggest effective measures to help our families. For example, we should recommend the establishment of family courts, of advisory centres for the benefit of couples who experience difficulties. Today instead, couples in trouble either for social, family or marital reasons are left on their own, without any help. The government stays out of those problems, not through lack of a sense of responsibility, but because it has never been made aware of the question, and that it does not provide in its legislation anything in that respect.

The government should provide in its legislation a real assistance to homes, families and young people experiencing difficulties.

The Minister of Justice already had an investigation made on juvenile delinquency in Canada. The report has been on the shelves since I do not know when, and it will never be used. However, in order to make the people believe that we were looking after those juvenile delinquents, who might have had no opportunities, a very well thought-out report has been published; the authors laid their

finger on the problem and came up with clear-cut solutions to matters that we have been discussing here for more than three weeks, but that report has been shelved. And, at the same time, the minister tell us that the findings of surveys conducted in other countries have been studied and that he and the government reached the conclusion that abortion should be legalized. As for our own surveys, the reports are shelved. They deal with that very problem, but we disregard them.

Those reports should at least be read, because the problem of juvenile deliquency is a serious one and it is not to be settled by such legislation; the sense of responsibility and respect for others should be instilled in people.

We must lead man to his genuine development rather than pushing him back and only with laws respectful of the human being will we help man to progress.

Instead of trying to copy what the British parliament and others are doing, why do we not try to devise systems that would be truly Canadian. Let us lead the way with new ideas. Let us not make any mistake about that. Those methods, which I think are true, will be much more expensive than the ones proposed by the government, but they will surely bring better results. There lies the whole difference.

I should like to be brief. But I wish to come back to what I was talking about at the beginning of my remarks and tell the minister that we cannot accept to vote on the whole undivided bill at the third reading stage. In my opinion, this goes without saying and he will admit it.

In all fairness, no member, whether from the government party, the Progressive Conservative party, the New Democratic Party or ours, can vote on so many varied questions as breathalizer tests, lotteries, etc. We must, as members, vote sensibly for or against breathalizer tests, lotteries and abortion, with all due respect for individual freedom.

If the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or the Minister of Justice refuse to recognize that it rests with parliament to vote honestly, let them give instructions to government members, if they wish, but they should not compel the opposition to vote for or against the bill. They have no right to do so. The government has no right to impose such a procedure on us.

I urge the minister once again to respect our rights. We insist a great deal on that, because in our opinion, it is essential that the right of each member to vote freely be respected in the house, if not, our only conclusion will be that government wanted at any cost to have this bill passed and that it is a dictatorial and undemocratic government.

I challenge any hon. member, especially government members who are in the same predicament as we are, to prove that I am wrong. They are faced exactly with the same problem as we are, Mr. Speaker. Let them explain whether it is really possible for them to vote for or against the whole bill? Let just one of them rise and tell us whether he can do it or not. If they are honest with themselves, they will admit that there is no connection whatever between abortion, the breathalizer and so on.

We can at least ask the hon. Minister of Justice that on third reading hon. members be allowed to vote on the various parts of the bill. I keep on about it, because in my opinion, from the procedural standpoint, Parliament has been cheated from the word go. They wanted us to believe that Parliament had been able to exercise its rights, that we were able to vote on each of the various sections of the bill.

The minister said earlier that hon. members could have taken a decision on the various clauses of the bill. This is quite untrue, and once more I protest against such falsehood; because actually, members of Parliament have not yet voted in the house or in committee on any of the sections of the bill. We have only had the opportunity to vote on the various amendments.

Let us be honest once and for all, and admit that members were not free to express themselves on that matter. Could the hon. members, those on the government side especially, tell us if they are really free to vote sincerely and honestly on the bill as a whole.

• (5:50 p.m.)

The minister is looking at me and listening to me right now. I thank him. It seems to me that such a request is in fact acceptable and in order. As for the procedure he has in mind, it is not in order. We cannot, because of its very serious consequences, vote on the bill as a whole.

At the stage of the third reading, the minister should subdivide the bill according to subject-matters and let us vote separately on the various sections.

That should allow the Liberals, Progressive Conservatives and New Democrats to decide in favour of abortion. We shall vote against

but that should not prevent us from taking a stand on the breathalyser since we support the clause dealing with the breathalyser.

The minister puts us in an awkward position; we will have to vote against the breathalyser and against firearm control, simply because the bill contains some clauses which encroach on the hon. members' freedom.

Hon. members as conscientious and as able as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, an expert in procedure, who asserts himself every day, since he was elected to this house, as the champion of the rights of Parliament, and also the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), and all the other supporters of democracy, will recognize that we cannot, if we wish to be honest, vote on the bill as a whole. We should be permitted to vote separately on the various subjects dealt with in the bill.

If however the minister rejects our suggestion, let him tell us what link there is between the breathalyser and abortion.

[*English*]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I wonder if the hon. member would allow me to ask a procedural question? Would he not agree that on Friday of last week we had a clear opportunity to vote on the government's proposals on abortion when we voted for or against the amendment moved by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau)?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I support the comments of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. However, I do not necessarily think that the hon. members can really vote separately and freely on the divided bill. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will see that the sections relating to abortion form a complete entity. They could make up a bill.

[*English*]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I thank the hon. member for permitting me to ask a supplementary question. Did not the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford specifically deal with the abortion package, namely clause 18, and have we not therefore had a clear vote on that, which was not mixed up with anything else?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fortin:** As I have said, since the beginning of this debate, we have introduced only amendments. The house has had to vote on these amendments, but it has not yet had the opportunity to vote on the substance itself of the amendment.

When the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has introduced an amendment at the report stage regarding lotteries, it has been briefly discussed. As concerns his amendment regarding lotteries, which I consider complete, it tended to delete:

—from clause 13 thereof paragraph (a) and paragraph (b) of sub-section (1) of the proposed new section 179A of the Criminal Code.

When the house voted on April 22nd on his amendment regarding lotteries, we voted in favour of the amendment which aimed to delete from the bill the sections regarding lotteries. Therefore his amendment dealt with the whole section.

As to the majority of amendments brought forward, they were limited, inasmuch as they did not aim to delete a whole section, but a word or two only. In brief, the house did not have to make a decision on the subject matter of the bill, but rather on the amendment aiming to a slight amendment of the bill.

In my opinion—and the member for Winnipeg North Centre is aware of it—we did not have the opportunity to make a decision on abortion. We voted on the amendment, and the same goes for the other clauses. Actually, we could make up a complete act with the clauses relating to abortion only.

All the clauses concerning lotteries, firearms control and pari mutuel could make up a bill as well.

The minister, with the assistance of his advisors could split the bill so that it might be possible to vote subsequently on the various clauses, and the minister will agree with me on that point.

I would ask the minister to tell us if this is possible, and if hon. members really had the opportunity to express freely their opinion on the various parts of this bill. We did not, and there is no relation at all between abortion, homosexuality, breathalizer, etc. The minister should not try to make us believe that voting on amendments means approving the bill.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour):** Mr. Speaker, this has been a long and important debate. I am not one of those who have been critical of those who have spoken at great length in the debate of the past few days nor

have I been critical of the longevity of the discussion of this bill. I have not participated in this debate until now. I have listened with interest to members of all parties. I think some very fine speeches have been made by government members, by members of the official opposition, by members of the New Democratic Party and by some of the members of the Creditiste party. I think that members of this house respect the persuasions represented here and we have listened with interest and respect to those opinions. We are legislating in an area of great sensitivity,—this has been said many times in the past—an area involving deeply held philosophical and religious beliefs.

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

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being six o'clock, this sitting is suspended until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Before recognizing the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault), I might perhaps be allowed to make a statement in respect of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) this afternoon.

I have now had an opportunity to reflect on the amendment proposed by the hon. member and, in particular, to study it in the context of the bill itself. Having done so, I must confess that it gives rise to certain difficulties. Let me read the bill as it would stand if amended by the proposal of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. Section 179(A)(1) would read as follows—

> —for the government of Canada to conduct and manage a lottery scheme in accordance with any law enacted by parliament and for that purpose for any person in accordance with such regulations or anything described in paragraphs—

And so on.

There are certain difficulties as to meaning and consistency; I shall not go into them now, but would refer hon. members to May, 17th edition, page 550, paragraph six.

My most serious objections are on the grounds raised by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). The purpose of this bill is to authorize the government of Canada to conduct and manage a lottery scheme in accordance with regulations made by the Governor in Council. The effect of the amendment, I submit, would be to strike at the essence of that proposal and would restore the law to the state it was prior to the legislation now before us. In other words it amounts, in my opinion, to an expanded negative. For this reason, and with regret, the Chair cannot put the amendment.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** If you had called on me, Mr. Speaker, I would have said that I regret it, too.

**Mr. Perrault:** As I stated before the house rose at six o'clock, this has been a prolonged debate but no one will deny that it has been a worthwhile and important debate. I am not among those who have been critical of the protracted nature of the discussion of this measure. Members of all parties, many of whom have spoken extremely well, have expressed strong personal opinions. The depth of their feeling is reflected in the number of days and hours the debate has taken. There have been few occasions in the history of the Canadian parliament on which such a great range of emotions has been so deeply involved.

The subject of abortion, perhaps deservedly so, has been accorded most of the attention of hon. members. I am convinced—and I believe this conviction is shared by the large majority of members of this house—that the overwhelming number of Canadian mothers will continue to accept the responsibility of parenthood in good conscience as they have in the past, regardless of some of the statement we have heard during this debate. I am equally convinced that the amendments contained in this bill, within the framework of the various safeguards, qualifications and conditions, will not lead to the wide range of serious abuses predicted by some members, particularly by those to my far left.

Most of us here have great confidence in Canadian mothers and in Canadian parents, as well as in the Canadian medical profession. Indeed, our confidence may be greater than that demonstrated by our friends to the far left in the course of this debate.

**Mr. Peters:** Geographically, you mean.

**Mr. Perrault:** Geographically, I mean. Having said all this, however, I feel in conscience impelled to ask the government, indeed, to urge the government, as we give third reading to this bill, to see that careful and complete records are compiled over the next five

years so that we may measure the effect and impact, both direct and indirect, of the amendments contained in this bill. This should be done in co-operation with the appropriate authorities across Canada at all levels. Should unsatisfactory trends be indicated as stemming from any of these amendments to the Criminal Code, then let the government move courageously and immediately to introduce further amendments to strengthen the code to the end that the quality of Canadian life and the quality of Canadian society may continue to be improved. This, surely, should be the reason for legislation in this house, to strengthen the family and to strengthen society in order that we may build a better nation.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Having suggested that a five-year test be established, let me point out that the British did not hesitate to establish a five-year test in connection with the proposal to abolish capital punishment. While I suggest this test, let us never hesitate to amend the legislation if necessary to correct weaknesses or to remove sources of possible abuse which may become apparent before the five year interval has expired.

I must tell hon. members of this house that on two or three occasions I have discussed with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) this proposal carefully to review and survey the effects of the bill in the most intensive way over the course of the next few months and years to make sure there are no abuses. For example, in the area of abortions, there should be a review to ensure that we do not see in Canada the establishment of an abortion mill of the kind that is plaguing some nations of the world at the present time.

This afternoon the minister gave the assurance that, following passage of this bill, he would closely review and survey the effect it is having on the people of Canada. I feel sure the minister will take appropriate steps to bring in further amendments to make certain that the quality of Canadian life is protected. I am pleased to have this assurance, and I think all of us should welcome it. I have known the Minister of Justice for some considerable period of time. He has spent a great deal of time in my native province, and I know him to be a man of considerable conscience. He is known as that type of man to many of those who occupy the opposition benches. He is a good Minister of Justice.

Anybody who assumes that the last few weeks or months have been easy for the Minister of Justice do not know the minister very well. This period has involved a great deal of personal hard work. Many problems have troubled his conscience, as they have troubled all members of the house. The past few months have been a heavy burden for him, just as they would have been a heavy burden on some members of the official opposition had they occupied positions of government responsibility. As anybody in public life knows, it takes courage to introduce the type of controversial amendments that have been discussed during the debate on this bill. It takes courage to bring in measures relating, for example, to the post office—and I see my hon. friend in the house this evening.

A weaker or less dedicated Minister of Justice could well have chosen an easier political course, one which would have preserved the status quo, with all of the anachronisms and hypocrisies that have plagued this nation for too long. It would have been easy to find all sorts of excuses to delay action. This government, Mr. Speaker, has followed the harder road, and I think most members of the house appreciate the nature of the decision made by the government in this controversial area of the Criminal Code.

As a backbencher I have confidence that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Minister of Justice and their colleagues earnestly seek reform in the best interest of a pluralistic Canadian society. I am convinced that they want to see a more satisfactory and meaningful Criminal Code. I submit that they deserve our support.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, in spite of all that has been said on Bill C-150 and of the amendments that have been proposed in the house, we have reached third reading.

This afternoon, I was listening to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) who explained that, first, the bill had been drafted—everyone knows that—introduced in the house for first reading and printed, debated on second reading and referred to the committee.

The committee examined each clause of the bill and amendments were proposed. Today, we have reached the third reading stage.

The minister said this afternoon that parliament had every opportunity to consider this bill and that finally the majority of parliament would decide on it.

Now, everybody knows that when the bill was read for the first time, my colleagues and I strongly objected to it.

When it was deferred to the committee, some of my colleagues attended the sittings and brought forward two pediatrists. But the committee members were mostly government members and the instruction was that the government assumed the responsibility for that bill. The minister was therefore frank on that point this afternoon, when he stated that the government supports this bill, and if the people do not like it they will have the opportunity to let it be known in due time.

Mr. Speaker, at the committee report stage we brought in amendments to the various clauses of the bill. Not a single amendment—not even the two moved by government members—was accepted, because once again, all Liberals without exception had been instructed to take position in favour of the bill, or in other words, to see to it, as government members, that it would pass all the stages and be adopted.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, we have now reached third reading and the same thing is happening. This afternoon, the minister told us that the government assumed full responsibility for the bill, which deals with all kind of things, namely arms, lotteries, homosexuality, abortion, penitentiaries, tariffs, parole, etc. Everything was put in the same package, to get members of parliament to swallow whole what they would not have accepted separately, had the bill been split. Bill C-150 was imposed upon parliament, and I am convinced it will remain memorable in Canadian parliamentary history and Canadian history.

Our stand has been a firm one; we have been criticized, but much less than the government has been for introducing a bill that mixes all kinds of things together.

We asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he was Minister of Justice, to divide the bill, to group those clauses that deal with a specific or a common subject matter. Both he and the Minister of Justice refused stubbornly to hear of it. The constructive work of my colleagues of the Ralliement créditiste stems from that. And that work, as I said last week, was not performed lightly. My colleagues sought out information, called on doctors and others to testify; when they spoke in the house, their speeches were serious and logical. This, the Minister of Justice recognized himself.

Mr. Speaker, we have been accused of wanting to impose the wishes of the minority upon the majority. We should not be pilloried for wanting to force upon the minority the views of the majority. It is the minority which is now forcing its will upon the majority of Canadians. I was reading last week in *Le Droit,* from Ottawa, an editorial by Marcel Gingras, who is, I believe, the editor in chief of this newspaper. He wrote this:

> The Créditistes are very much aware of what is going on and their opposition seems to us more political than really virtuous—

I do not think we are making a show of our virtue. We are trying to prove that morality should be respected. The morality of a human person is not just that of any animal, it is that of a reasonable being, a being with a right to life at its Creator's will. It befits no man, whether he is a minister or not, whether he is a member of the Liberal, Progressive Conservative, Créditiste, or NDP party to take away the life of any human being. This is obvious.

People who want to dabble politics about this are more often found among petty, insignificant people, like Mr. Marcel Gingras of *Le Droit,* than among members of the Ralliement créditiste, for Mr. Gingras is a guy who is always on the side of the government whether it is right or wrong. Such an attitude serves his purpose.

There is another newspaperman, who is worth at least as much as the whipper-snapper from *Le Droit,* Mr. Marcel Gingras. At any rate, the other one is not a member of the Ralliement créditiste; he is an acknowledged supporter of the Progressive Conservative party, and well known all over the place.

He is Mr. Clémont Brown, of the newspaper *Montréal-Matin*—which does not give its allegiance to the Ralliement créditiste. He said, and I quote:

> There is a good amount of pharisaism in the vituperations of some newspapers against the filibuster conducted by the Ralliement créditiste against bill C-150, better known as the omnibus bill. The government's sycophants loudly clamor for the old Standing Order 16A, which limits the time of debates.

"Sycophant" means slanderer or informer. These slanders originate in government quarters.

> Let us say right away that even without Standing Order 16A, the business of the house has progressed quite smoothly and that the new Rules and Regulation are quite satisfactory.
>
> Parties agreed normally, without too much difficulty, on the length of time allotted for the discussion of various government measures. The Prime Minister abused his power. He even did violence to the conscience of his own members.

The Liberals, we know that.

> Créditistes make no bones about naming in private conversation those government members who gave them their support against abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I could name Liberal members who were against abortion, but I shall be discreet and kind, and refrain from doing so.

They even mentioned in public the hon. member for Matane, Mr. Pierre De Bané.

He rose in the house to say he was against the bill, but that he had to vote for it, because he had to toe the party line.

We have no reason to question their good faith. As far as we are concerned, two Liberal members told us privately they were opposed to the bill. There is not a single member of parliament who is not in this case.

Abuse begets abuse. The Créditistes' battle has been a long one. It is nearing its end now. Members of the Ralliement have proved loyal to the mandate conferred on them by their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the following words of Mr. Brown are very significant:

One cannot say as much for the Liberals, considering the ambiguous promise made by the Prime Minister and in particular by Mr. John Turner, to amend the Criminal Code, since those amendments did not materialize.

The filibuster on Bill C-150 is teaching us a lesson. We hope it will teach the Prime Minister that his own views on legislation cannot always prevail, when they go against the beliefs of a large part of the Canadian population.

Mr. Speaker, that is the testimony of a journalist who is not a Créditiste, but who states his opinion. Members of the Conservative party have supported the bill as such, while others who did not, especially the section on abortion.

The clauses which improve legislation concerning parole, the penitentiaries, customs tariff, we would have accepted straight away without the slightest debate, save maybe for a few suggestions here and there.

Regarding lotteries, we were in favour of an almost complete liberty. After all, people, men, are born gamblers. We love races, games of chance, risks of all kinds, we love to play the horses or the dogs. Those are just so many different forms of lotteries.

We probably would have allowed the passage of these clauses.

As for homosexuality, we objected for the same reasons that we opposed abortion. When the clause on homosexuality was voted by the house, one could read the following report in *Montreal-Matin* of Tuesday, April 22, 1969:

Three Cheers for the Omnibus Bill!
First social club—

—in Montreal.

The first private social club for homosexuals in Montreal opened quietly Saturday night, for the



"purpose of giving a better understanding of the homosexual's condition within today's society."

• (8:30 p.m.)

The club is called Gemini I and is located at 1285—

This is for those who would like to know the address.

—Maisonneuve Boulevard West. Deep pile has been used in large quantities for the interior decoration—

They say it is beautiful plush. Apparently, those who would like to go in have been advised to bring their snowshoes because it is a really a good deep plush pile.

I continue the quotation:

Besides, one can see a large oil portrait—

An Oil painting, not a water colour.

—of Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the Twins (Castor and Pollux).

An oil-painting of the Prime Minister, for inspiration purposes no doubt.

This is a newspaper add which gives the name of the owner. It is explained that he wants to educate homosexuals. All told, it is now public knowledge.

Eventually we shall see no doubt in our newspaper stands magazines showing men with lipstick on and wearing earrings.

Mr. Speaker, we opposed this clause of the bill and then we fought tremendously against abortion. This afternoon, I read an article under the byline of Muriel Bowen, in the Toronto *Telegram* of May 10, about the abortion legislation passed in England a little over a year ago:

[*English*]

The Abortion Act makes abortion legal on the three counts:

If pregnancy involves risk to the mother's life, if it involves risk to her physical or mental health (or to the well being of her existing children) if there is a substantial risk that the expected child would be physically or mentally abnormal.

[*Translation*]

It deals with the three essentials of the legislation on abortion in England.

After the legislation had been in effect for one year—

[*English*]

After a year there is still bitter disagreement in the medical profession over what is a proper interpretation of the third point, the so-called social clause. Some doctors, and politicians and many people who have studied the statistics say that it is resulting in abortion on demand, for those who can afford to go to private clinics.

In the first year, almost half the women who have had legal abortions have been single. Divorcees, widows, and women separated from their husbands account for a further eight per cent of abortions.

[*Translation*]

Which means that 58 per cent of all abortions in England were performed on young girls, divorcees, widows and women separated from their husbands.

Such is the result of the enforcement of the abortion law in England.

[*English*]

A large number of Canadians who value the scriptural and moral foundations of both our democratic society and nation will gratefully applaud your courageous opposition to the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code that would remove the illegality of homosexuality and abortion. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice are being informed of the contents of this message with added protest included.

[*Translation*]

Last Friday, I heard the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) say the following words:

For far too long the minority in this country has held back the majority in this matter. Certainly during past weeks we have seen a demonstration of how the minority in this house has held back the majority. Now it is time that the majority be allowed the right to act according to the conscience—

If they acted according to their conscience, well and good. But it is not according to the government members' conscience, that they act; on the contrary, they act in accordance with the party line. As I said last week: To hell with the country, as long as we save the party. And it is still very much the same.

I know some of the government members whose constituents are clearly against this bill on abortion. Those members have even not the right to rise in the house to express the opinion of their constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I am not talking through my hat, but with full knowledge of the facts because I have been informed by the people of these constituencies.

And the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway said also, and I quote:

—while respecting the right of the minority to continue in their own way according to their own conscience. The other night I heard the Creditiste leader say on television in loud and clear tones, "They must respect us as we respect them." We intend to respect them and we have proven that respect. This legislation will show respect for people who do not believe in abortions. On the other hand, those of us who believe in the modernization of abortion laws are not going to allow any minority in this country to hold back measures which are needed by the citizens of Canada.

It is obvious that abortion will neither improve nor help to preserve the health of any mother. I will say this to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway: To avoid abortion, she tells us that anybody can avoid it, anybody can pass it by, there is another way. Nothing compels a woman to go to bed with a man. This would solve the situation. A bit of fun and games is all very well, but it is completely irresponsible to try and shirk the consequences. If we want to do as we please, fine, but we must accept the results in any field whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I quoted last week so much evidence. We are indicted, because we are Catholics, but Catholics are not the only ones to oppose abortion. I have a few telegrams here. This one is from Montreal and I quote:

Re *Montreal Matin* omnibus bill May 3rd I approve you hundred per cent and not alone. Montreal May 5th.

[*English*]

Free Methodist Church
West Ontario Conference
E. A. Cooper, conference supt.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, surely that is not a Roman Catholic, he is a Methodist.

Here is another telegram from Toronto, that congratulates us on the good job we are doing against the legislation on abortion.

In this case, an organization:

[*English*]

The National Council of Jewish Women of Canada, in convention today unanimously adopted a resolution recommending the deletion of sections dealing with abortion from the Criminal Code without exception. This is a private matter between a woman and her physician.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** That is not what you meant to say.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, that is right. A telegram from—

[*English*]

This is not what we want, it is the opposite. I am reading a telegram which I received from a Jewish organization in Montreal which says it is their business and none of our business.

**Some hon. Members:** Right.

**Mr. Caouette:** Why is it in the bill?

*Criminal Code*

• (8:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

I have here another telegram.

[*English*]

It is from Reverend James Montgomery, Conference Liaison office:

The Western Ontario District Conference of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada meeting in Kitchener, Ontario, May first, 1969 reaffirmed the motion passed by the general conference of the Pentecostal assemblies of Canada at Windsor, Ontario—

[*Translation*]

—against the adoption of a measure of abortion—

[*English*]

—the district conference most strongly objects to the reprehensible features of the omnibus bill legalizing abortion that in our judgment give unqualified right to kill the human foetus and further objects to legalizing and sanctioning homosexuality between consenting adults.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this was another telegram from a church which is not a Catholic church.

Now we have here testimonies of protest such as this one from Rideau Garden Drive, in Ottawa.

I have another one from Saskatchewan and one from Edmonton in Alberta which I quote:

Keep on fighting the murderers who believe that God is going to change the law because Ottawa changes it.

Fight against vice. We are praying for you and for your good members.

From a Quebec City priest who dearly loves you.

Here is another testimony.

Mr. Speaker, I have received another one from Saskatchewan which says exactly the same thing, and opposes the adoption of the omnibus bill.

[*English*]

I would like to congratulate you on your stand against the Criminal Code bill. I support your party stand wholeheartedly on this issue, and I hope that you and party will be successful in blocking passing of this bill—

John F. Peters

[*Translation*]

—and it is signed John F. Peters. I do not suppose he is a relative of my hon. friend from Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). This is the evidence we are receiving.

I have another testimony from Westport, in Ontario—

[Mr. Caouette.]

[*English*]

C. J. McEwen,
Westport, Ontario.

Your stand in opposition to the proposed changes in the Criminal Code relative to abortion and homosexuality is most commendable. Sacred and secular history testifies to the rightness of what you are contending for—

I am not of your persuasion, politically, religiously or nationally. However, I would deem it a privilege to support a member of parliament of your principles.

As I say, this is from Westport, Ontario.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I am not making up these letters. Here is another one from Haileybury, Ontario, which is located in the riding of my hon. friend for Timiskaming. I quote:

This evening, on the C.B.C. news broadcast, a commentator clearly indicated that the members of the Ralliement créditiste are filibustering in parliament to assert their personal views and partisan ideas. Since when is it moral to practise abortion and homosexuality, even for a non-Creditiste? It is one of two things: people who advocate such practices are either ignorant scoundrels or, which is worse, diabolically mischievous!

I am not a "puritan" but, good grief, do you know of anything more disgusting than a government that wants to pass a law allowing "fairies" to shack up.

(Signed) Lionel Courchesne,
P.O. Box 896, Haileybury, Ont.

Mr. Speaker, here is another letter from a Mr. Dignard, of Ottawa.

I wish to congratulate you and all the Creditiste members for opposing those clauses of the omnibus bill that deal with abortion and homosexuality.

Keep up the good work; fight for the Christian point of view, for the majority (which is still Christian in Canada) have only you to represent them in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, here is another letter from the "Foyers Notre-Dame". You may tell me that this is a Catholic organization. Of course, but it is not afraid of taking a stand.

We congratulate you for standing firm in the face of the bill on abortion, specifically for insisting that human life be respected from the start.

This one comes from Hull, and is signed:

Bernard and Marie-Thérèse Robert, couple-in-charge, Foyers Notre-Dame, Hull Diocese.

Mr. Speaker, this is not evidence of a political nature, but protests against the immorality of abortion. It is also what we are against.

Now, we do not want to thrust our views upon others, but rather to make the Canadian people's views respected, and to be sure that they will have the right to make them known and that they think as we do.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin), the following amendment:

That Bill C-150, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act be not read a third time but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs with instruction to add a clause providing that clause 18 will come into force after the same has been approved by the Canadian people by means of a referendum.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** You mean a plebiscite.

**Mr. Caouette:** A referendum.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, such is the amendment we wish to move, not in order to—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The Chair having some doubts as to the acceptability of the amendment request permission to consider the question.

The hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette).

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Before the hon. member proceeds, Mr. Speaker, there is a minor point. I wonder if he should not name another seconder. I believe the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) has already spoken on the main motion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I thank the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). If this is so I would ask the hon. member for Témiscamingue, Quebec, (Mr. Caouette) to name another seconder.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Caouette:** Allow me to suggest that the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe) second my amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The seconder of the amendment of the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) is then the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe).

[*English*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, are we going to be given an opportunity to challenge the admissibility of this amendment?

**Mr. Peters:** No.

• (8:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Since we live in a democracy, I would ask the hon. members who have a few remarks to make on the acceptability of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) to kindly bring them to the attention of the Chair.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is the hon. member for Témiscamingue rising on a point of order?

**Mr. Caouette:** No, Mr. Speaker, I am not rising on a point of order, but I simply want to proceed with my remarks, since the Chair has informed us that it will take the amendment under consideration. Therefore, we shall not discuss it now.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. May I ask the hon. member to resume his seat. The hon. member has just moved an amendment and, according to the rules, he should resume his seat and only rise thereafter on a point of order.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Lotbinière is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, with all due deference, I should like to ask you to which standing order you are referring to prevent the member for Témiscamingue from pursuing his speech.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** To the standing order which provides that a member may take the floor only once. As the hon. member was completing his speech, and moved an amendment, I ask him, if he wants to rise on a point of order, to kindly state his reasons for doing so.

[*English*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit with respect that it would be quite in order to allow the hon. member to finish his speech as long as—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** As long as he has not spoken for 40 minutes.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** —as long as he has not spoken for 40 minutes. Sometimes we lose track of time when we are

listening to the hon. member. At the conclusion of his speech, however, I want to reserve the right, as I think other members do, to challenge the admissibility of his amendment.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member has resumed his seat and does not have the right, according to the Standing Orders, to speak a second time, except on a point of order.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I had not resumed my seat, but simply sat down to hear the reading of the amendment. But once the amendment has been read, I believe I still have 10 to 15 minutes.

You would surely have thought me rude had I remained standing while you read my amendment. And now, I want to know if I have the permission to continue.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** As long as it is not prejudicial to our right to wonder—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order!

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** —whether the amendment is in order.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I would ask hon. members to wait a minute until the Chair has taken a decision.

[*Translation*]

Order. When the hon. member resumed his seat, the Chair presumed that he had just completed his speech. Otherwise, the hon. member will be allowed to speak until 8.58, when the Chair will put the question.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I always had the impression that once an amendment is moved and read by the Chair, we were entitled to ten more minutes. But you are only allowing me four minutes.

Now, let me—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member has the floor for at least four minutes before the time allotted to him under the rules is up. Then, the remarks of the hon. member are in no way restricted at this time.

**Mr. Caouette:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I also thank the Minister of Justice for coming to my rescue and explaining he was so delighted to hear the members of the Ralliement créditiste. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we have been enlightening the minister for the past two weeks and a half.



However, I shall not take more of the time of the house, but before concluding, I would like to quote the evidence of doctors opposed to abortion without for all that introducing religious matters.

"I believe that the refusal to accept abortion on strictly moral grounds in good medicine"

(Samuel A. Cosgrove, M.D., who is not a Roman Catholic).

"To perform a therapeutic abortion is either to be ignorant of modern methods of treating pregnancy complications or not to take the trouble of using them",

(Roy J. Hefferman, M.D.)

At a symposium held in San Francisco in November 1951, three doctors out of four (Drs. Cosgrove, Hefferman and Bernard J. Hanley) stated that there were no indications for therapeutic abortion; the fourth (John H. Morton) refused to support such an absolute statement, but recognized that there are far too many such abortions.

Now, it was strictly on moral grounds that the members of the Ralliement créditiste objected and carried on such a fierce fight for over two weeks. All Canada will know about the fight we put up right here in parliament. It was not a political fight, but a fight for principles. We did our duty as representatives of the people. I want at this point to congratulate my colleagues of the Ralliement créditiste on the fine work they have done in the house, based on statistics and extensive studies, with the co-operation of medical practitioners. I believe we have also been of some help to all hon. members as a whole, and we are proud of the work we have accomplished.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I wish to point out to the house that the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Témiscamingue is not relevant to the nature of the bill, since it proposes that a referendum be held.

Secondly, this referendum implies that there will be an expenditure of public funds, which can be proposed only by a minister of the Crown.

For these reasons, I cannot accept—

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I recall that before the hon. member for Témiscamingue was interrupted, you had given the hon. members the right to express their opinions, when you said that we lived in a democratic country. Then, the Minister of Justice tried to show that the amendment was

out of order. We would like to have the privilege of refuting his argument before you give your ruling.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I thank the hon. member for Lotbinière.

It is precisely because nobody gave any explanation that I thought I should make my ruling. I am ready to hear the comments of hon. members on this amendment.

**Mr. Fortin:** The amendment brought forward by the hon. member for Témiscamingue refers to clause 18 of the said omnibus bill, which, as everybody knows, deals with abortion.

I recognize that an amendment which goes beyond the scope of a bill under consideration would not be in order because according to standing orders, to procedure and to jurisprudence, we cannot go beyond the bill itself. And Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what you have been saying.

I imagine the proposal of the hon. member for Témiscamingue is perfectly in order, for the simple reason that it relates to clause 18 which itself is part of the bill. And this clause deals with abortion. The hon. member for Témiscamingue proposes to seek in some way or other the opinion of the population on that clause. But as you said, Mr. Speaker, we are unable to estimate the expenses involved since we are not here to determine what means the government could use in order to hold this plebiscite or referendum. Therefore we cannot at this stage ask ourselves whether or not this will involve any expenses.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the two arguments put forward by the Chair could be dropped and, as a consequence, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Témiscamingue could be declared in order and acceptable, since there is no expense involved. On the other hand, such things cannot be anticipated. Moreover, this clause is related to the subject matter of the bill. It concerns only clause 18 which, from our point of view, is disputable.

[*English*]

• (9:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I want to attack, if I may, the admissibility of this amendment on three grounds. In the first place, the amendment calls for a deferral of the decision on abortion until there is approval by the Canadian people by means of a plebiscite or a referendum. I think the difficulty facing the hon. member is that it has been decided by the house on previous occasions that an amendment or resolution for a plebiscite involves the expenditure of money; it involves the imbalance of ways and means, and therefore it is not open, under our practice, to a private member to introduce such an amendment.

I want to refer Your Honour to the *Journals* of this house, Volume LXXXII, 1942-43, at page 48. This citation is in relation to the plebiscite in 1942 relating to conscription.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Necessary, but not necessarily!

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Well, I am not going to go into that. Mr. McLarty, who was then minister of labour, moved:

> That the house do go into committee of the whole, at the next sitting of the house, to consider the following proposed resolution:
>
> That it is expedient to introduce a measure respecting the taking of the votes of the qualified voters on any question submitted by way of plebiscite and for such purposes to make provision for the printing and publication of a Plebiscite Act and instructions issued thereunder, the preparation of voters' lists and other plebiscite documents, including forms and ballot papers, to provide for the fees, allowances, expenses or other remuneration of certain officials and employees.

In other words, a plebiscite involves the expenditure of public money for the printing and publication of the statute, for the preparation of voters' lists and other plebiscite documents, including forms, ballot papers and so on. Since the cost of all this would be a charge on the public revenue, a motion to hold a plebiscite it has to be introduced by a member of Her Majesty's government. If I may refer Your Honour to the index of the same volume of the *Journals* of the House of Commons, at page 816, you will find there was a special statute to provide for expenditures relating to conscription. In other words, this matter was within the responsibility of Her Majesty's government.

The second reason which I would submit to Your Honour for the amendment being out of order is the one I submitted earlier in respect of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Citation 200, paragraph 1 of Beauchesne's fourth edition reads as follows:

> An old rule of parliament reads: "That a question being once made and carried in the affirmative or negative, cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the house."

In other words, the judgment of the house once taken on an issue cannot again be called into question by a second vote of the house. If Your Honour would refer to amendment No. 19 proposed earlier at the report stage by the

hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), you will observe that clause 18 was called into question. The amendment was to delete that clause from the Criminal Code bill. The hon. member is attempting to defeat clause 18 by postponing it indefinitely until the taking of the plebiscite. What the hon. member and the Creditiste party have failed to do directly, they are now attempting to do indirectly. I would submit to Your Honour that the decision on clause 18 has already been taken by this house.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that no amendment, under the new rules or the old, and certainly not under Standing Order 75, subsections 5 and 8, can be admitted by Your Honour and put before the house if it goes beyond the scope of the original clause 18 or beyond the scope of the bill. I submit that calling for a plebiscite on the matter of abortion goes well beyond the clause as presently drafted, and goes well beyond the purpose of the Criminal Code bill itself.

For all three reasons, first of all that a plebiscite involves a financial obligation of the Crown; second, that the principle has already been decided by this house on the vote relating to amendment 19 at the report stage of the bill; and third, that the amendment goes beyond the scope of the clause and of the bill, I respectfully submit that the amendment should not be admitted for discussion by the house.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, in addition to the arguments advanced by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention one or two other authorities and citations you may wish to take into account when considering the admissibility of this amendment. Citation 406 of Beauchesne's fourth edition reads:

> Amendments are out of order if they are (b) inconsistent with or contradictory to the bill as agreed to by the committee;

I would also draw Your Honour's attention to May's 17th edition, page 549. There, you will see a number of conditions which make amendments inadmissible. On the next page, under paragraph 6 May says:

> Furthermore, an amendment may not be moved to insert words at the beginning of a clause with a view to bringing forward an alternative scheme to that contained in the clause, or to leave out the whole substance of a clause in order to insert different provisions—

I suggest that the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) is attempting to set up a whole new set of conditions in respect of the application of the clause to which he has referred. Therefore, he is trying to bring forward an alternative scheme to the one contained in the clause, and clearly that is out of order. Furthermore, I draw Your Honour's attention to paragraph 11 on page 551 of May's 17th edition, which reads:

> Amendments to a bill proposing that an address or a resolution of one house of parliament should effect the repeal of the bill, or that the provisions of a bill should be subject to a referendum, have been ruled out of order—

Therefore, I submit that this amendment is quite clearly out of order. I think it is extremely clear that the amendment is out of order and I simply wanted to draw this to Your Honour's attention when you were considering whether to accept the amendment.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I have been hesitating about rising on this point of order.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Don't spoil your reputation, Stan.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I beg your pardon? Anyway, Mr. Speaker, perhaps my hesitation has been set aside by listening to the way in which the government has brought in its heavy artillery. When I first heard this amendment I, too, thought it was out of order. Perhaps I thought that because I just did not like the amendment; it seemed to me to call for something that is utterly ridiculous. But I am not sure that the arguments advanced by the other side of the house are water tight. I thought that this afternoon, of course, and lost; but perhaps if I now have some doubts I may get along a little better. I am not sure that this amendment is completely foreign to the provisions of the bill.

• (9:10 p.m.)

There is already in the bill clause 120 which reads:

> This Act or any of the provisions of this Act shall come into force on a day or days to be fixed by proclamation.

We do not know when this bill or its various clauses will be brought into effect, and there is nothing to suggest that the bill will be brought into effect all at once. In fact, I am pretty sure this will not happen. It is possible there is some sense to the idea of saying to the Governor in Council that the abortion clause should not come into effect until after there has been a referendum or a

plebiscite. I admit quite freely that I find it difficult to make this argument because I have no liking for the amendment itself and I would vote against it, but I like to see minorities get their rights. So I suggest that after we have heard from these big guns on the other side trying to smash this mosquito over here in the corner at least something might be said in defence of the admissibility of the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the hon. members for their comments in connection with the motion which is now before the house. I may say at the outset that after listening to the arguments from the wings, I was very much impressed not only by the arguments advanced by the hon. members and by the Minister of Justice but by the position expressed by my associate in the Chair, the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Béchard). I have a feeling that in spite of the arguments advanced, after he had expressed an opinion I would be prepared to go along with the very learned ruling which he was prepared to give to the house. In fact, I find very little fault with what was said by the hon. member who was in the Chair a moment ago.

It seems to me hon. members must remember that what is before us at the present time is not the bill itself, not the Criminal Code, but rather a motion for third reading. What hon. members should do at this time is to propose amendments which will modify this particular motion. We should not entertain at this point motions to amend clauses 18 or 19 of the bill to amend the Criminal Code.

[*Translation*]

I am sure the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) who is listening closely to the ruling I am making agrees with me. At this stage we can only submit to the house amendments to amend the motion for third reading of this bill.

The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) suggests that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) is in order because it is relevant to clause 18. I say to him that it is not in order, precisely because it is relevant to clause 18 when it should be relevant to the motion for third reading of the bill.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said that we might listen to the big guns. I have listened to him and he is the biggest of all the guns, but not even he has been able to convince me this motion might be accepted.

What I should like to suggest to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre—and I am sure he knows it much better than I do—is that this motion can be amended in many possible ways. It can be amended by a reasoned amendment, provided the reasoned amendment is strictly relevant to the motion before the house. If hon. members will propose to this house a reasoned amendment which would not attempt to modify the clauses of the bill itself, then it will be acceptable and hon. members eventually will be called upon to vote on it. But if a reasoned amendment is phrased in such a way that it goes beyond the terms of the very limited motion which we have before us, by virtue of many precedents, including some quoted in Beauchesne, in May and in Bourinot, I do not see how the amendment can be accepted. This is the sum and substance of what was said to the house by the hon. member for Bonaventure, and I concur in his judgment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few remarks on third reading even if many things have already been said concerning the bill.

I had an opportunity to speak on the motion for second reading and I must admit that since then, I had been hoping that the government and the minister would reconsider their position, agree to the splitting up of the bill and allow parliament to vote freely on that legislation which I consider extremely important.

I remember that during the electoral campaign, the minister had suggested that he would recommend a free vote, that he was in favour of splitting up the bill and recognized that some of its clauses contained quite specific details. I do not know whether the fact of being in office could change a man to that extent, but we have to admit that after three or four weeks of debate and all the arguments that were put forward, he should be convinced by now.

In fact, we have advanced arguments which justified the splitting up of the bill as well as a free vote, because whether we want it or not, it is clear that many hon. members are perplexed by that bill. However, it is understood that many must toe the party line; they will do so, as usual, while recognizing that it contains some clauses that within themselves they consider unacceptable.

I have decided to say a few words. I believe that I never took up the time of the house unduly. On the other hand, I think that the role of the opposition is nevertheless necessary to bring the government to recognize what is good, and force it to act accordingly, and to question what is wrong. I believe that the government should be responsible enough also to admit the arguments that have been advanced during the past few weeks and, as far as I am concerned, I have no hesitation in acknowledging that some clauses in that bill urgently are required and acceptable. But I should add that it is not honest, in any case, to put in the same package such ill-assorted measures.

In view of the government's behaviour regarding this bill I am forced to vote against certain measures, and to reject, as a matter of principle and of conviction, some provisions therein contained.

It is dishonest to put us in such a position and I think that people and newspapers have brought up this fact many times.

Once again, I would like to ask the hon. minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to prove that he is acting in good faith. Yet I thought and I still think that he is sufficiently imbued with goodwill and justice to recognize that the clauses, mostly those on abortion and homosexuality, are not acceptable.

In my opinion that bill favours homosexuality unduly. I have already made my views known on this clause and I do not think, in view of the small number of people who could benefit from such a bill, that it is the duty of the government to legalize homosexuality.

In view of the arguments brought in for many months now, I appeal again to the hon. minister's sense of fair play, so that these two clauses as advocated by the leader of the Ralliement créditiste (Mr. Caouette) may be decided upon through a referendum.

Anyhow, it would be unfair not to recognize the disparity of subjects contained in this bill and to force us to vote on it as a whole.

• (9:20 p.m.)

If I decided to speak this evening it is probably to appeal for the last time to the good faith and the understanding of the government.

I am not given to criticizing what is acceptable, far from it, and I think that we must support the government when it is willing to pass good legislation. I think that it is the role of the opposition and I would much rather cooperate than fight the decisions of members of this house.



When the legislation under consideration is as important and controversial as this one, I think that it is our duty to rise and ask the government to review its positions, because I am under the distinct impression that the government is making a huge mistake.

I know also that some hon. members are greatly embarrassed when they have to comply with the party policy. But I think that owing to their commitments towards their constituents, they are as justified as I am in adopting a definite position this evening and in asking the minister once again to reverse the governmental position and bring in a divided bill.

I know that the government will maintain that most clauses are acceptable and this is surely true. But it is a thing of shreds of patches, and I do not feel that we should pass it as a whole.

Some people say that the support the government received in June meant that the population wished the bill would pass, although it contained very controversial clauses. It is untrue to say that people voted Liberal because they wished and asked for the legalization of abortion and homosexuality.

I think that is an easy rationalization, which shows up the weakness of those who lack the courage to take a firm stand on those clauses in the house.

In my opinion, even though we have reached the final stage of the bill, to approve a much too blatant legalization of abortion and homosexuality remains out of the question.

I think that legislation will be big with consequences, and the onus of it will lie upon this government. I hope nevertheless that there are enough members of good faith for us to try to bring the government to reason while supporting a lot of arguments that opposition parties wanted to have acknowledged and accepted.

It is a weak point on the part of the government to state that homosexuality is none of our business, since those acts are performed in bedrooms.

Homosexuality is perhaps a sickness in some people, perhaps a vice or a defect in others, but the fact remains that it is possible to rehabilitate those people and to build hospitals that would help them a great deal. This would be much more profitable and much more serious than the legalization of that

practice, which would surely downgrade society. The government which will adopt such a measure cannot but be held responsible for its consequences.

I hope that there are still hon. members to recognize that the section on homosexuality is not acceptable for the time being, when we think of all the ways whereby we could help those people, treat them and reassure society.

Mr. Speaker, I should like, before concluding, to extend my congratulations to those who had the courage to defend their opinions and the commitments they undertook during the election campaign. Members must have the courage of their convictions and duly express the wishes and aspirations of their constituents. We must pay tribute to them and congratulate them on having objected to certain clauses, since they did so in good faith, even though some people may not think so.

Many things have been said and I would not like to be accused of wasting the house's time, but I believe that those who are free to express their views will do so. I do not think that all hon. members were loyally and sincerely for all the clauses contained in this bill.

Some will say that the majority of the clauses are acceptable; nevertheless, some will vote for clauses which inwardly they do not think acceptable. I want the minister to know that I shall have to vote against certain clauses which I would have preferred to approve. But as I am not free to vote as I wish on each clause, I shall vote against some measures which are good, but which my principles, my convictions and my commitments compel me to fight. This bill, in my opinion, is unacceptable to society and I shall honour my commitments as a certain group has done in a very impressive way.

Dishonour lies not in losing a battle, but in refusing to fight.

**Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, we are coming to the end of a long debate during which varied and sometimes extreme opinions have been expressed.

In my opinion, the bill submitted to the house is far from being extreme in its implications; it reflects considered and reasonable opinions and this I shall endeavour to demonstrate. We have been asked where the bill comes from. Not so long ago, a man who today is the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) was appointed Minister of Justice and undertook the recasting of the Criminal Code which reflects the laws of present-day society.

The outcome of that recasting was 126 amendments to the Criminal Code, all of which are important. All of them are not equally far-reaching I imagine, but the bill deals inter alia with the breathalizer, cruelty towards animals, firearms, homosexuality, abortion and I submit that those are all important subjects.

• (9:30 p.m.)

True, certain matters affect the conscience of individuals, and that is why we heard in the house some remarks which go beyond the ambit of the bill.

How did those amendments come to be moved and how was the general consensus of the Liberal caucus arrived at? Most of us, like the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and myself, when I accepted to be parliamentary secretary to the minister, were convinced of the soundness of the proposed amendments. In my conscience, I believe that I can vote on each and all of the amendments relating to this bill, because I think the general interest of the population and of all Canadians is at stake.

The philosophy of this bill is simply this; in a society which, because of the social order which controls more and more the individual, interferes with his liberty, our legislation must be redrafted in order to respect to a greater extent individual freedom.

Only public interest must check that freedom. This is how one can explain why amendments have been made to clauses as controversial as those concerning homosexuality, abortion or lotteries.

As to homosexuality, what does the bill say? Two consenting adults indulging in homosexual acts are no longer committing a criminal act. However, corruption and scandal will remain criminal acts. On the one hand, there is the freedom of the individual, and on the other, respect for the common good.

On the matter of abortion, we have heard virtually all the theories. I believe that in this connection, the bill is sensible and reasonable. Some have claimed that it is a clarification of the law. I think they are right.

It has been said in some quarters: But it was assumed that abortion was not permitted.

The Code presently stipulates that an abortion can be practised if in good faith, it is thought, that the life of the mother is endan-

gered. One thing is to be noted, however: under the Code as it now stands, anybody can perform an abortion. The present government wanted to hand back the practice of medicine to physicians, surely a sounder proposition than to rely on our Créditistes friends who, under the present provisions of the Code, could procure an abortion.

As far as I am concerned, I have much more confidence in physicians. Let each practise his own profession. So we have here a clarification of the law.

Others have said that it allowed all kinds of abortions.

I do not see it that way at all. Therapeutic abortion alone is at stake. The new legislation is less strict than the former one in that the present law authorizes an abortion only if the life of the mother is endangered, while the new law will authorize therapeutic abortion when her health might be endangered.

In that respect I think, the new law is more permissive. On the other hand, only physicians will be entitled to decide, and to treat the patient.

Some people have said that we were more rigorous. They may be right at that. To sum up there exists a restriction. Who is going to decide that there will be a therapeutic abortion? An independent medical panel, i.e., independent from the patient's doctor. Thus, I think the new legislation is somewhat stricter than the existing law.

To sum up, these amendments are a compromise, a question that is both reasoned and reasonable. I do not think that you can hold up such an amendment to ridicule.

During the last electoral campaign, I must say that in my own constituency, I held about fifteen meetings mostly with representatives of religious communities.

I held in my area a meeting which was attended by 150 or 200 priests and nuns. During a seminar, the whole question of the bill as presented today, was studied, and I think that the result of the elections, in my constituency, has proved that I was also supported by these people.

It is said that representations were addressed to the government members. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there was no pressure whatsoever. The present Minister of Justice as well as the then minister of Justice the present Prime Minister, merely resorted to information as regards members.

Both of them made it their duty in caucus to provide information to all who wished to be informed. I must say I had the opportunity, with the present Minister of Justice, to convene several meetings to which we had invited all the party members who wanted explanations on all the amendments.

At no point was any moral pressure brought to bear on anyone, of course, in public life mutual influence has to be exercised; we must try and influence people if we believe that a given change to a legislation may be useful. It behoves us to spread the idea. That is a part of public life.

But there were no pressures. Besides, the attitude of certain Liberal members proves it. Unable for conscience's sake to vote otherwise, they chose to express themselves freely in this house. And as the Minister of Justice pointed out this afternoon, none of them will be subject to reprisals because they took a stand they believed to be in accordance with their conscience.

I do not want to extend this debate unduly. In this jet age, laws should be streamlined to suit the society in which we live.

We sit here as legislators to protect the rights of society and the rights of the individual. And the individual will feel an ever-increasing need for a private shelter, so as to be better prepared to meet with the self-denials that social order calls for nowadays.

[*English*]

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate those who have taken part in this debate, particularly those who have raised arguments based on moral and ethical grounds. This is all very nice, but this debate has really not taken place in a true atmosphere, and more has been left to the consciences of individuals than has been dealt with in this legislation. I also congratulate the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) on the opposition that he has put up, which I believe was sincere, and which has helped the cause of social justice in that it has brought about the discussion of a very important matter.

I was in my riding for several days recently, and while it contains a large Roman Catholic population, nobody came to ask me where I stood on abortion. What these people were worried about were much more mundane things, such as whether the post office was going to close or how many jobs on the highway were going to be discontinued or what works were going to take place in my riding. They were not really interested either in homosexuality or abortion.

In fact, the only sections of the Criminal Code that affected them were the gun provisions. I told them that these had been modified so no one would be adversely affected. My son will still be able to have his 32 rifles and 10 revolvers. I pointed out that the provisions were not going to hurt the rod and gun clubs, so no one was very much concerned.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think we should be concerned, particularly about the press of this country which has given a totally wrong impression of the meaning of the abortion provisions of the bill to the Canadian people. We are facing a very important social problem in this country. I believe the minister will admit that therapeutic abortions are not going to change anything. True, the doctor will now have some protection. Previously, even though he carried out a therapeutic abortion in a hospital and had ten people supporting his decision that it was necessary, in effect he was still performing an illegal abortion. Now, the proper machinery is established, abortions can be performed legally within the narrow confines of the law.

Hundreds of thousands of abortions are being performed illegally in this country, to the extent that the situation has now reached major proportions. In this regard, members of parliament should forget some of their parochial reasoning and decide what is for the public good.

• (9:40 p.m.)

The attitude of some hon. members reminds me of something I saw when I visited a southern Ontario township in which they were having a plebiscite. In this area there were hotels and many people did quite a bit of drinking. They did not drink legally, however, by having their drinks in the hotels. I saw a minister preaching to those people from the back of some truck. He was telling them how terrible it would be if they voted to have beer in Hanover. And who paid for the truck, Mr. Speaker? The bootlegger did, and everyone knew it. And who paid for the band? Why, the bootlegger did, and everyone knew it. You could go into almost every private house in the area and have a drink with the inhabitants; but you could not have two drinks because the people did not want their neighbours to know they were drinking. I cite this example to show how hypocritical everyone there was. Similarly, members of parliament and members of the press are equally hypocritical and stupid if they maintain that in this country there are two schools of thought on abortion; that one faction wants it and the other faction does not. That really is quite inaccurate, because when we talk of abortion we are talking of something that affects society.

Should there ever be one or two serious accidents in the abortion mills in this country as a result of which women die, we shall see a great hue and cry for changes to be made in the legislation so that women may have some protection. No matter why a woman wants an abortion, she thinks she has a good reason. She may be emotionally upset, or physically concerned; if she seeks an abortion she should have the protection of the law. The matter is of social concern.

Many hon. members here have talked about conscience. Very recently I listened to members in my household discussing the Pope's decision to change the list of saints. One of my sons is married to a Roman Catholic girl, and my other son shortly will marry a Roman Catholic. These are mixed marriages. I raised a family of nephews who were strong Roman Catholics; I tell hon. members this to show them that the discussion was serious and interesting. The members of my household were joking about the saints. They said you might get rid of St. Christopher, but you might have trouble in England getting rid of St. George, even though they got rid of dragons over there. They were most concerned about St. Nicholas, though. I think that even if our ecclesiastics dropped St. Nicholas from the calendar of saints the Protestants, and especially the shopkeepers, would make sure he would be revered at Christmas for a long time to come.

**An hon. Member:** But your party believes in Santa Claus.

**Mr. Peters:** If the Pope had decided to authorize birth control, no one would have argued with him. It is surprising that the consciences of many hon. members are not troubled by this decision; I say this because I have no doubt that some members of parliament of a Roman Catholic persuasion are practising birth control. Therefore, they accept the concept of birth control. Many of the laws of this country are, so to speak, ecclesiastically oriented. In many cases the ecclesiastical underpinning has disappeared, but the law remains. As ecumenical councils meet and consider many social problems, we shall consider many of our social problems in a changed light.

The newspapers carried articles supporting abortion and condemning it, just as in the capital punishment debate some supported the idea of capital punishment and some were against it. In this house we tried to hang together so that we would not be hanged individually. But with this legislation we ought to try to cure a social ill that seems to beset most of the world. Actually we have been blowing up a tempest in a teapot and arguing about something that is not before parliament. The point is that we shall have to bring about social changes.

This bill was not originated by the Minister of Justice. He inherited it from the previous minister of justice. Actually, it has been kicking around for a long time. I hope the minster will be examining the legislation to see how it can be brought into line with current thinking on social issues. You know, there is a saying that if the law is bad, enforce it and it will be changed. Well, certain acts that are not performed in public are hard to control. The laws relating to homosexuality have not been enforced severely. Although these laws lend themselves to many abuses they have not been pressed because homosexual acts are conducted in private, and therefore remain a private matter. It is, therefore, true to say that we must speculate to some extent about the area in which social change must be brought about. As members of parliament we are dishonest if we do not face social problems squarely and try to solve them. I predict that within two or three weeks after this limited legislation has been passed a young lady in one of the large cities will die in one of the abortion mills of the country. You can argue all you like about life and the taking of life, and there are some very nice arguments from the point of view of conscience. There are nice arguments ecclesiastically; they are great arguments in theory. But the practical fact will be that women will be dying in abortion mills that are openly run in this country. I say that because even social workers are sending women every day to these abortion mills. If we do not correct the situation by adequate legislation, then each and every one of us will be responsible for the deaths of these women.

I suggest it might be a good exercise if once in a while we held a referendum in this country on simple questions such as the constitutional responsibility for education, or something like that. I think members of parliament would find that the average Joe does not care a hoot about who has jurisdiction in that field. It might surprise many here to see the results of referendums.

In closing, may I remind hon. members of what happened when two or three of us in this house carried on a campaign to broaden divorce laws. Many hon. members opposed that broadening. They said they could not support the concept in all conscience. Yet, looking around me now, I see there are hon. members who, while first saying they disagreed with the concept of broadened divorce laws, later voted for the measure. Why do some hon. members not take the position of some of our churches, the representatives of which have said to us, "Our people cannot take advantage of broadened abortion legislation, even if the legislation is broadened to a ridiculous degree, because their consciences will not permit them to do so. On the other hand, we do not wish to stop others who are not so inhibited by their consciences from taking advantage of the change."

Some hon. members who have not felt too strongly on these matters will, I hope, nevertheless make representations to the Minister of Justice. We need changes not only in the field of abortion but in other fields also in order to enchance Canada's reputation and in order that social problems may be corrected by legislation instead of being ignored. I think we will be surprised, as every hon. member from the province of Quebec was surprised, to find that when we finally make the change, there is absolutely no reaction from the people from whom we expected the most reaction.

• (9:50 p.m.)

**Mr. D. R. Tolmie (Welland):** As Chairman of the Justice Committee which studied Bill C-150, I would like to make some observations of a general nature. I congratulate the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). He attended before our committee and in my opinion did a most admirable job. He was courteous and most knowledgeable. I also commend the officials who attended before the committee. They made a real contribution. I should not miss the opportunity of also congratulating the members of the committee.

When we first had this bill placed before us, many of us felt we would be faced with a long and tedious chore. I can assure the house that the members of this committee worked diligently, were most knowledgeable and worked in the interests of the Canadian people. I feel the committee system at this particular time was on trial. I know the test was passed superbly. The members worked

independently. There was no question of harassing members and trying to support the government. In most cases members of the government took opposite positions to government policy. I think this is a real tribute to the committee system.

I would also like to pay tribute to the members of the steering committee, the member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Wahn). In no little way were they responsible for the expeditious passage of this bill through the committee. It should be made very clear this bill was not given a perfunctory examination by the committee. We held exhaustive hearings. When considering abortions and homosexual behaviour, we had before us the reports of the Health and Welfare Committee, the Wolfenden report and the report of the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee on the breathalyzer test. There were four witnesses who gave evidence on the administrative and technical aspects of the bill. In my opinion this was sufficient and made it possible to have this bill passed effectively through the committee.

The committee realized this legislation was going to affect the lives and welfare of many Canadians. We had to strike a delicate balance. We had to make an exhaustive survey and at the same time get the bill through with dispatch so that it could be translated into legislation for the benefit of Canadians.

As a member of the government and as Chairman of the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, I was wholeheartedly behind this bill. I felt the government had at last taken subjects such as homosexuality and abortion out of the past and asserted that there should be change. In my opinion, these changes were long overdue. These changes were consonant with the feelings of the great majority of the people in Canada.

Naturally, a great portion of the debate centred around the question of homosexual behaviour and abortion. These are emotional matters. All members have certain definite opinions concerning these matters. The point should not be obscured that this bill also brings forth many other social changes. This is one of the things which has been missed.

I do not intend to go into all the ramifications of the bill. I do wish to point out, however, that there are many desirable changes made by this bill. If you vote for this bill you will be supporting the concept of the compulsory breathalyzer test. We all know that literally thousands of Canadians are killed on our highways, and millions of dollars in property damage result from accidents involving drinking drivers. Compulsory breathalyzer tests have worked in other countries.

By voting for this bill you are passing firearm legislation in the interest of public safety; you are passing legislation to prevent pain and suffering to animals; you are passing legislation which would eliminate or reduce harassing telephone calls. You will be supporting enlightened legislation which will enlarge the rights of the accused unfit to stand trial because of insanity and you will be making provision for greater use of suspended sentences and probation. In addition there are many technical amendments to this bill, especially with regard to the procedure relating to appeals. While still maintaining due process of law for the protection of society, these changes will give the accused individual every possible protection against the authority and might of the state.

In case you are led by my remarks to believe that this bill is comprehensive as it relates to social reform, let me say this is just a start. We must get into the field of bail, electronic eavesdropping and wire-tapping.

The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) in my opinion brought forward a most important amendment relating to the sealing or expunging of criminal records. This amendment was rightly ruled out of order, but it had one good result. It brought to the attention of this house the real need for such legislation. I introduced a private member's bill in June of 1966 to expunge Criminal record, but it has yet to be approved. I feel such an amendment will make the government realize the people want and need this type of legislation. I exhort the government to show the same initiative in introducing a bill which will expunge criminal records.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. It being ten o'clock, it is my duty to put the questions to be debated.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—BAN ON TOBACCO ADVERTISING

**Mr. H. E. Stafford (Elgin):** On May 7, the Board of Directors of the C.B.C. announced

that it will halt all tobacco advertising on its radio and television networks when current advertising contracts with the tobacco companies expire.

I do not have to be reminded that the board has the power to adopt the course it has taken. I stand here to remind the board that such licence is not in itself justification and that such power must be exercised equitably. In view of the circumstances surrounding this decision, the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) owes the large number of Canadians who have a vital interest in the tobacco industry something more than the stock answer that he only reports to parliament for the C.B.C. It is not enough to give them the threadbare assurance that he will bring the matter to the attention of the Board of Directors. In his position as the mouthpiece of the C.B.C. in parliament, I submit he has a very special duty in this case to add a personal postscript, namely that corrective action is to be expected.

By orders of reference dated November 29, 1968, the subject matter of six private member's bills dealing with tobacco and cigarettes was referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Services. The committee commenced its hearings on December 19, 1968 and the first witness called was the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) who said, as recorded on page 130 of the evidence:

> This committee should look at all possible ways that cigarette advertising can be strongly controlled.

Dozens of witnesses have been heard, hundreds of pages of evidence have been transcribed and the proceedings are expected to continue for some time. The President of the C.B.C. told the members of the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts on May 8, that the directors reached their decision to ban all tobacco advertising on radio and television without calling any witnesses, since they had the evidence of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. The president failed to mention how and when the matter was placed on the agenda or the measures he took to ensure that each of the directors was sufficiently informed of the evidence to make such an important decision. I would be reluctant to think that the directors were guided to their conclusion.

• (10:00 p.m.)

None the less, a conclusion based on such evidence is almost incomprehensible, since the proceedings of the standing committee are still in progress and the committee, until this evening, has heard only those witnesses who strongly oppose the use of tobacco. At the time of the board's decision the witnesses for the other side, including the tobacco industry, had not been called. Even in the imagination it would be difficult to envisage a more arbitrary and irresponsible decision. It contravenes all the canons of common courtesy and good faith. The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) should point out to the directors of the C.B.C. that Canadians will not for long tolerate bureaucrats who are insensible to the interests of all parties.

But as impossible as it may seem at this moment there is an even more serious aspect to this decision. The decision was made in the midst of the hearings of the standing committee whose task it is to decide this very point. It was an affront to parliament. It was a demonstration of bureaucratic power at its very worst.

The decision is even more difficult to comprehend when one considers the evidence of Marcel Ouimet, Vice-Chairman of Programming for the C.B.C., on February 6, as set out at page 425 of the committee proceedings:

> The corporation has in the past given consideration to the effects of withdrawing completely from cigarette advertising, but has come to the conclusion that the isolation of the C.B.C. in this field would do little actually to modify the attitudes to cigarette smoking.

While the decision will do little actually to modify the attitudes of people to cigarette smoking, it will certainly modify the revenues of the C.B.C. by a drop of $700,000. It may be that the vice-chairman was reflecting on the situation in England where cigarette sales have had a steady increase each year since cigarette advertising on radio and television was banned in 1965.

Among government departments, there is considerable variation in policy regarding tobacco. One department provides films for anti-smoking commercials; another provides advice and guidance to growers; another helps promote its sale. Now, the C.B.C., a subsidized—perhaps I might add a generously subsidized—crown corporation, has banned all tobacco advertising on radio and television.

The Delhi Tobacco Research Station carries out research work on flue-cured tobacco and recommends cultural practices to help farmers improve the yield and quality of their tobacco crops. The Harrow Experimental Farm works on cultural aspects and improvements in curing burly tobacco.

The Department of Trade and Commerce trade commissioners make efforts to facilitate the sale of Canadian tobacco abroad. They make special arrangements for growers of Canadian tobacco to meet buyers of other countries. The trade commissioners are very helpful and share the cost with the growers. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), at the recent Japanese Trade Fair in Tokyo, apparently urged the Japanese to buy Canadian cigars when he had his picture taken with the president of General Cigar Company at the company's exhibit.

More Canadians, and in particular the young, watch "Hockey Night in Canada" than any other C.B.C. program. This program, exhibiting Canada's national sport, is intermittently interrupted by rhythmic beer commercials which exude such fun, laughter, song and dance that the listener is almost lulled into feeling that its consumption is linked to some patriotic embrace of our big land. It is interesting to compare the free wheeling beer commercials, which offer every conceivable inducement to viewers, with the restricted cigarette commercials which so limit the scope of tobacco advertising.

Approximately 5,500 people were killed on our highways last year and statistics show that alcohol was a factor in half of these deaths. There is one thing about smoking—if you hurt anyone you hurt yourself. But if you drink you may hurt or even kill innocent people.

Cigarettes now—but what next? Any industry whose machines or giant smokestacks pollute our atmosphere, or whose organic wastes pollute our waters, may be banned from advertising on the C.B.C. Those great killers, the cholesterol bearing foods, may soon be lost to our television screens. There is no end to the protective role the C.B.C. could assume.

This censorship of advertising smacks of the regulation of human order in George Orwell's allegorical satire "1984". There is no place in Canadian society for the benevolent dictatorship of Big Brother or the Ministry of Truth's dreaded "Thought Police" who suppressed "thought crime." Perhaps I might quote from the diary of Winston Smith, the hero of Orwell's novel, who was himself an employee of the Ministry of Truth—"Down with Big Brother."

Before resuming my seat, may I say that the Canadian taxpayer and parliament have the right to expect the board of directors of the C.B.C. to exercise their authority in the right way and not merely to exercise it. In this case common courtesy would surely indicate that the board should have waited for the parliamentary committee to complete its report. The president did not reveal whether or not the decision received the unanimous approval of the board. If I were prone to conjecture, I would say that it did not.

Yesterday morning the president of the C.B.C. said on "Newsmagazine":

> We took action on our own initiative rather than have government action push us as reluctant dragons into it.

From these words one logical inference emerges to the surface, that the board beat the government to it. This may not be contempt of parliament, but it is certainly contemptuous of it.

**Mr. Robert Stanbury (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to congratulate the hon. member for his stirring defence of his tobacco growing constituents. I appreciate his words of praise for the government's efforts to assist them in selling their product. However, it seems clear that, under present and past broadcasting acts, parliament has delegated responsibility in matters of programming, including broadcast advertising, to the board of directors of the corporation, subject only to the general laws of the land and such conditions of licence and regulations as may be prescribed by the Canadian Radio-Television Commission.

I am informed by the C.B.C. that the question of tobacco advertising has been under periodic review for many years and, like many other products, its acceptance or rejection by the C.B.C. is a matter of the corporation's internal commercial acceptance policy.

The C.B.C. has expressed the opinion that it would be gross impertinence on its part to believe that its actions would or could in any way prejudice the findings of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. As for the suggestion that the corporation's action constitutes an insult to the committee, the members of that committee will undoubtedly speak for themselves. It is doubtful that many will share the view that the committee has been insulted. I am sure they will make their own decision.

Obviously the committee is free to make its own comments or recommendations, unimpaired by the corporation's action which has been taken on the authority and responsibility delegated to it by parliament. The corporation has advised me that it is its practice to follow

closely the proceedings of parliamentary committees when they are in any way germane to the work of the corporation, and I am sure that the corporation will continue to do so.

TRANSPORT—CHAPLEAU, ONTARIO—CLOSING OF PART OF C.P.R. SHOPS

**Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane):** Mr. Speaker, I do not relish the thought of speaking tonight on this subject because the story I must tell is one of tragedy. It is a story about the Canadian Pacific railway which has chosen once more to reduce its employees at Chapleau, Ontario. This time it is reducing to the extent of 66 the number of its staff working in the shops. This means that 66 families will have to move from Chapleau.

What will this mean to this small town? It will mean, first of all, a tragedy for these employees and their families, many of whom were born and brought up in that town. Many of them have married there and built homes there. This decision will also mean a tragedy for the town itself because the economy of such a small town is directly related to the inhabitants who live there.

When one thinks of 66 families moving out of this small area, one get some idea of how the overall economy of Chapleau will be affected. The decision is more serious than its effect on a few families or on this one town in northern Ontario. It indicates a continuation of this chipping away at the development of northern Ontario which has been going on for years, particularly in respect of the transportation industry. Both the C.N.R. and the C.P.R. seem to have little or no regard for development in northern Ontario. What is it that develops an area if it is not communication?

• (10:10 p.m.)

What was it that opened up Canada from sea to sea, if it was not the railroads that went from sea to sea? Chapleau finds itself in the midst of northern Ontario, closed off from everywhere except for a C.P.R. line which links it with the rest of Canada. It was a division point, an important link in the C.P.R. Chapleau has been slowly reduced in importance until now the C.P.R. is deciding to close the shops almost completely. To my mind this means only one thing, that within a short time there will probably be no railroad centre in Chapleau.

I know the C.P.R. is not a direct responsibility of the federal government. But if we cannot rely on the railroads to help open up those parts of the country which are not developed, upon what else can we rely? Who can we rely upon if not the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), and through him the transportation commission which might be able to influence such decisions by the railroads? If we cannot turn to the minister, I do not know where else we can turn. I know that today certain services of the railroads are being shut down and passenger services are being discontinued because they are not economically feasible. But to suddenly, with the stroke of a pen, decide the fate of 66 people in a place like Chapleau seems to me a bit much.

I will now relate something that is very unpleasant, Mr. Speaker, but it needs to be said. The news of the C.P.R. decision came out in Chapleau on Thursday night. I raised the question in the house on Friday. There happened to be one man in Chapleau who was quite senior on the railroad, and who perhaps was troubled in the past. He had three sons working in the shops in Chapleau who were affected by this decision. Whether or not the man was well is one question, but certainly this decision was the trigger that set things off. The man committed suicide over the week end and was buried in Chapleau today.

Perhaps we could say that this is not the railroad's responsibility. At the same time there is a question of human values that enters into the matter. It seems to me that we talk about human values when thinking of other parts of the world. Are we thinking about that same humanity when considering the less developed areas of our country? In the past there has not been enough said about northern Ontario. We always hear about the traditional areas that require development, such as the maritimes. We have heard so much in this house about some parts of the country and some parts of the economy that we are sick to death of hearing about them. I refer to wet wheat and fish. It seems to me it is time we started paying some attention to the development of northern Ontario, where industries would give us returns and revenue from the richness to be found in that part of the country.

**Mr. Hopkins:** And eastern Ontario.

**Mr. Stewart (Cochrane):** Yes. The hon. member mentions eastern Ontario. This is quite true. We find ourselves in a very similar situation. The eastern part of Ontario and the northern part of the province are cast aside by the barons of Bay Street; they are thrown aside by the great, developing indus-

tries. It seems to me it is time, and past time, that we started to give a little more consideration to the courageous people who have gone to the north in order to develop it. This part of the country is not too far away: Northern Ontario is only a few hundred miles from here; it is not like the Arctic. However, many people, when they think of northern Ontario, think it is away in the hinterland. It is not. It is an area that is rich, that needs to be developed. All we need are a few people of good will to help develop it. We are not asking for hand-outs. All we ask is for the opportunity to develop. A situation has developed in Chapleau over the past few weeks because an arbitrary decision was made to cut off something that is vital to the area. This decision should be fought by the government. Certainly, I think that by mentioning this decision in the house we can at least bring it to the attention of the people of Canada and perhaps influence the C.P.R. to change their decision.

**Mr. Jim McNulty (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the requests of the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) and to his very fine address to the house. I am certainly convinced he has a point. I am sure the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) is very sympathetic toward the hon. member's problem. I was assured by the minister that he made representations to the president of the C.P.R. concerning the closing of the shops in Chapleau. The minister assured me also that he will personally investigate the matter immediately, in fact the first thing tomorrow morning.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. It being after ten o'clock this house stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2 p.m.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Tuesday, May 13, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

CONCURRENCE IN THIRD REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS AND STANDING ORDERS

**Mr. Gérard Duquet (Quebec East)** moved that the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Seventh and Eighth Reports of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, in French and in English—Mr. H.-Pit Lessard (LaSalle).

[*Editor's Note: Text of foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT—MOTION TO PERMIT VISIT TO PROGRAMS

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by Mr. MacEachen:

That the Standing Committee on Regional Development be granted leave to adjourn from place to place within Canada for the purpose of examining regional development programs, and that the clerk of the committee and the necessary supporting staff be authorized to accompany the committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—POSSIBILITY OF RENEWING EXTRADITION PROCEEDINGS

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** I have a question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. As the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Rogers, made it very clear in his interview with Senator Fanning that the new United States government is prepared to extradite Harold Banks as soon as the Canadian government makes an application for such extradition, and as the government of Ontario has made it clear it is anxious to have Mr. Banks extradited so that he can face perjury charges and also serve his five-year sentence, is it the intention of the government to make an application to the new government of the United States to extradite Mr. Banks?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I think the Minister of Justice would have to answer this question. I have not been in consultation with him on the matter.

**Mr. Hees:** As the new government has been in office in the United States for some four months, during which time the Minister of Justice has refused to make such an application, is this refusal due to the fear that Mr. Banks might talk about important financial contributions which he made to the Liberal party before he skipped the country to the United States?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member will recognize that his question is argumentative.

### HOUSING

REQUEST FOR GUIDELINES ON URBAN RENEWAL

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** In the absence of the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing, may I direct my question to the Prime Minister and ask him whether the guidelines for urban renewal and public housing will be made available to hon. members prior to the discussion of the amendments to the National Housing Act?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Not prior to the discussion, Mr. Speaker, although it is conceivable that in his presentation the minister may wish to talk about such guidelines.

POSSIBILITY OF REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Almost two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker,

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

I asked the Prime Minister whether there would be any increase in the financial allotment for housing in this current fiscal year and the right hon. gentleman undertook to take the question as notice. I wonder whether he can now tell the house if there is to be any increase in the financial allotment for housing in this fiscal year.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I took the question as notice at that time because we were in an interim position with regard to the existence of a minister. Now that we have one, I will ask him to bring the information to the house.

AVAILABILITY OF HOMES TO PERSONS OF MODERATE INCOME

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** In view of the representations which have been made to the government since the first reading of the amendments to the National Housing Act, may I ask whether the government contemplates bringing in any additional legislation to provide houses for people in the lower income brackets?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** The problem of people in low income groups will, of course, be dealt with during the debate but there is no intention to add in a significant way to the legislation now before the house.

INQUIRY AS TO IDENTIFICATION OF ACTING MINISTER

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** In view of the fact that the list of ministers, giving the names of acting ministers and second acting ministers, with which we have been supplied, does not include the name of the Minister without Portfolio who is in charge of housing, can the Prime Minister say who is the acting minister in charge of housing when the superior minister is away?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** For today, the acting minister is the Minister without Portfolio from Manitoba.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Who is he?

**Mr. Trudeau:** I will ensure that this—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Since the Minister without Portfolio from Manitoba is now a full minister, to whom is the Prime Minister referring?

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

[*Translation*]

## FAMILY ALLOWANCES

INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE CUTS IN BENEFITS

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

Since he stated last week that cuts in government expenditures would severely affect some sectors of the Canadian economy, could the Prime Minister tell the house whether his government intends to amend the Family Allowances Act?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, when I brought that matter up, I did not give any clear-cut example; however, when the time comes to announce such cuts and to request the support of the opposition parties to fight inflation, we shall make the appropriate statement.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Is the Prime Minister ready to accept our full and complete co-operation in this fight against inflation in Canada? We are ready to tell him how to do it.

[*English*]

## IMMIGRATION

DESERTERS—POWERS EXERCISED AT PORTS OF ENTRY

**Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that immigration officers within Canada are not required to exercise the same discretionary powers relating to military deserters seeking to remain in Canada as those immigration officers serving at ports of entry, and in view of the minister's assurance that this delicate and controversial subject would be reviewed in the near future, would the minister inform the house when he expects to announce an alternative government policy?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I am not absolutely certain, but I hope within a very short time.

## FINANCE

ACTION THROUGH INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND TO PREVENT CRISES

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime

Minister. Notwithstanding Standing Order 5 and the deliberate instruction of the Prime Minister to keep members away from this house, and since half the cabinet is away today, my question which should have been for the Minister of Finance is directed to the Prime Minister.

Would the Prime Minister advise the house whether any instructions are being given Canada's delegation to the International Monetary Fund meetings with regard to any further reforms, or controls on the movement of international financial capital, to prevent these recurring crises that we see almost every second month?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is arriving in Ottawa from overseas at six o'clock today. The Acting Minister of Finance is the minister of northern affairs.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, since the Prime Minister is bowing to the superior knowledge of the acting minister, may I ask the second acting minister whether he can inform the house if the Governor of the Bank of Canada or any of Canada's representatives at the International Monetary Fund meetings were able to make a positive contribution to the control of, shall we say, hot money and these recurring financial crises?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, everybody in Canada agrees that we have an excellent Governor of the Bank of Canada who has the confidence of the government.

[*English*]

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Notwithstanding the acting minister's confidence in the Governor of the Bank of Canada, which I think we would share more than he, I am asking about government policy in this regard. It has been suggested at committee hearings, which I presume the cabinet occasionally are aware of, that there is something wrong with our international monetary situation; that Canada, as one of the inner circle of 13, has some positive contribution to make.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance will be back shortly; I am sure he will make an announcement in the house regarding the international monetary situation and I am confident the hon. member will be satisfied with it.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the acting minister advise whether the present policy of the government of Canada is to support the continuation of a two tier pricing system for gold or is the policy going to change?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance will make an announcement in this regard, if necessary.

[*English*]

## CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

### ST. BRUNO, QUE.—DERAILMENT OF PASSENGER TRAIN

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the latest passenger train mishap on the Canadian National Railways line near St. Bruno, Quebec, in which 20 passengers were injured, and in view of the fact that there has been an increase in the number of mishaps involving death or injury on both major railways in Canada, would the minister indicate whether the analysis being made of the causes of such accidents has been completed?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the accident to which my hon. friend refers, an investigation is now under way. As to the second part of the question, I hope to give an answer within a few days. Frankly, I do not know if the analysis has yet been completed.

**Mr. Skoberg:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister say whether he considers the situation serious enough to establish a public inquiry into the safety of train operations?

**Mr. Jamieson:** Mr. Speaker, this certainly is a serious matter, but whether a public inquiry is the most appropriate way of dealing with this I do not know. However I will look into the entire matter and find out what is the best way of dealing with it because, I repeat, it certainly is serious.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport.

Would he be ready to carry on the inquiry in order to determine whether it was not an act of sabotage, as my colleague from Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne) was aboard the train when the accident happened?

[*English*]

## THE ROYAL FAMILY

### INVESTITURE OF PRINCE OF WALES

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the government of Canada has decided to provide for representation at the dedication of the Prince of Wales at Caernarvon next month? Is any determination to be made in this regard?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker; but perhaps the Secretary of State for External Affairs will have a more complete answer.

### REMOVAL OF PORTRAIT OF QUEEN FROM EMBASSIES

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** May I also ask the Prime Minister whether he, as Prime Minister, or the cabinet, has given directions for the Queen's picture to be removed from all Canadian embassies, particularly those in the Middle East?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have not heard of such direction being given, particularly with regard to embassies in the Middle East.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I know reference to the Queen's picture always causes frivolity amongst Liberal members. In that regard they do not represent the people of this country. I ask the Prime Minister, will he look into this question, because the Toronto *Telegram* reports—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, we must obtain our information from the newspapers. We cannot get it from the government.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Selkirk.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

## HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS

### LOUIS RIEL—REPRESENTATION AT DEDICATION CEREMONY

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Prime Minister is supplementary to the one of the right hon. member for Prince Albert to do with the dedication ceremony. Will the Prime Minister say whether the federal government is to be represented at the dedication ceremonies when the memorial to Louis Riel is unveiled in Manitoba?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure under which minister's jurisdiction this question ought to come.

**An hon. Member:** Try the Solicitor General.

**Mr. Trudeau:** In any event I shall have to inquire to see if such plans exist, Mr. Speaker.

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

### MEETING TO DISCUSS TREATY RIGHTS RESEARCH

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Has he taken the opportunity so far to meet the committee of six designated by the national Indian conference, and has he discussed with them the question of adequate financial support for research by Indian people into treaty rights and related matters?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** No, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet had the chance to meet officially the members of the committee. I told them I would be happy to meet them at the end of this month, or at the beginning of next month. As soon as we can manage to hold a meeting somewhere, when communications are slightly better in Canada, I will be happy to meet them.

[*English*]

**Mr. Stanfield:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister undertake to announce a firm decision on the question of adequate support for this independent research before his promised statement in June concerning the Indian Act.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, when I met with the Indians last week, I told them, as I did last December, that the Canadian government was ready to help them to form into an association and take advantage of the most modern means of operation. The statements I made last December and last week are still valid today.

[*English*]

BRITISH COLUMBIA—REMOVAL OF REGIONAL DIRECTOR

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** I have one further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received a request from representatives of the Indians of British Columbia asking that Mr. J. V. Boys be removed immediately from his office as regional director of Indian Affairs for British Columbia? If such a request has been received will the minister tell us what reply he contemplates giving on behalf of the government?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of such a request. I will take it into consideration when it reaches me and I will report to the people who submitted it.

[*English*]

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ADDITIONAL TELEPHONE SERVICE TO HANDLE PASSPORT INQUIRIES—AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs? In so doing may I first of all pay my compliments to the fantastic work and co-operation of those in the passport office; they are doing a remarkable job. However, may I ask the acting Secretary of State for External Affairs if there could not possibly be some relief from the increasing pressure on members of the House of Commons and their secretaries in handling emergency problems. If possible, I ask that there be an additional two telephone lines installed, with a specific staff to deal directly with the problems brought to the attention of members of the House of Commons. In this way members and their secretaries would not have to spend time trying to resolve the problems at the passport office.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not sure if the question is in order, but the speech was such an excellent one—

**Mr. Winch:** Also urgent.

**Mr. Speaker:** I respect the fact that it is urgent. Perhaps the responsible minister might wish to reply.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the subject is being dealt with several times a week by the minister responsible. He will be in the house tomorrow. Perhaps the question can be asked again at that time.

**Mr. Winch:** On a supplementary, may I say that yesterday the minister said he would be here today and give a full statement.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, the minister had to leave for Toronto to represent the government at a funeral.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** I would like to ask the Prime Minister why the government made the decision to amend the passport regulations when it was announced by the Queen's Printer the necessary replacement forms would not be available across the country until the month of July, yet—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I am sure the hon. member recognizes the question in this form is argumentative.

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Prime Minister since he has taken it upon himself to answer. Will the government provide seating accommodation for 50 to 55 people now sitting on the floor waiting on their passports in that office?

## AIR TRANSPORT

CANADIAN PACIFIC AIRLINES AUCKLAND-VANCOUVER CONTRACT

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. I refer to a question by my colleague last Friday concerning the cancellation in the immediate future by the New Zealand government of Canadian Pacific Airlines landing rights in New Zealand. Has the Minister of Transport had an opportunity of discussing this matter with the New Zealand High Commissioner or has he discussed the matter with his colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, with a view to negotiating further landing rights for Canadian Pacific

Airlines in New Zealand? If not, is consideration being given to possible retaliatory steps?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, we did even better to find the answer to the questions posed by my hon. friend. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce was in New Zealand, made personal representations, and I bow to his superior knowledge in this matter.

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** To summarize in a few words a long conversation on the subject, indeed the airline service between Vancouver and Auckland does not exist any more, but the Minister of Transport in New Zealand has undertaken to review the decision of his government. I think we might say that the debate, which was essentially at the level of the airlines, has now become an intergovernmental discussion.

**Mr. Lewis:** God help us.

**Mr. Pepin:** We are now looking at the suggestions that were made by the government of New Zealand, and we hope that this air line route will be restored soon.

## TRANSPORT

### STATUS OF QUEBEC NORTH SHORE AND LABRADOR RAILWAY

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance I wish to direct this question to the Prime Minister. Has the government made representations to the United States government about the tax or legal status of the Quebec North Shore and Labrador railway, a wholly owned subsidiary of the Iron Ore Company of Canada?

**Mr. Speaker:** I suggest that this question should be placed on the order paper.

## FISHERIES

### INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF STRAIGHT BASE LINES

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the fact that there is no conflict between inland waters and fishing zones on the east coast of Nova Scotia, will the minister indicate when we can anticipate some action on his statement of April 5, that base lines will be drawn from headland to headland immediately, and will he say whether the Bay of Fundy and the Gulf of St. Lawrence will be enclosed by these base lines?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries):** Mr. Speaker, the co-ordinates identifying the latitudes and longitudes for these base lines will be published in the *Canada Gazette* very shortly. The question of closing off the several large bodies of water which the hon. member has mentioned would require an amendment to the present legislation dealing both with territorial waters and fishing closing lines, and we wish to separate the closing lines from territorial waters by changing the law.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Fisheries with respect to the west coast and the new fishing limits, on a headland to headland basis, how soon they will become effective? Will it be immediately upon proclamation in the *Gazette* or will it be some time after their announcement?

**Mr. Davis:** My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that they will become effective immediately. However, I do not want to mislead the hon. member because there will be at least one important gap in the lines and this must be dealt with by legislation.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I assume the legislation the minister is referring to has to do with the Queen Charlotte Sound. Is it his intention to introduce such legislation at this session of parliament?

**Mr. Davis:** Mr. Speaker, it will be introduced shortly, but I cannot promise that it will be introduced this session, that is to say before the end of June, 1969.

### RESTRICTIONS IN SAINT JOHN HARBOUR AND BAY OF FUNDY

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary or related question, of which I have given the minister notice, on the matter of fishing restrictions. Will there be restrictions this season on the fishing in Saint John harbour and the Bay of Fundy? If so, when will they be imposed, and what will be the nature of them?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries):** Mr. Speaker, there will be restrictions to two days for both sports fishing and commercial fishing for salmon in the areas the hon. member has mentioned. This is to permit greater

escapement of salmon from the Saint John River which, I might add, is in a desperate condition so far as salmon spawning is concerned.

DAMAGE TO EQUIPMENT CAUSED BY DRAGGERS

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Can the minister advise what action he is taking regarding charges by fishermen in northwestern Newfoundland that draggers are operating in inshore waters and are again causing serious damage to fishing equipment in the area?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries):** Mr. Speaker, we have already dispatched a departmental patrol vessel to that area and we will be getting a report shortly.

GUARDIANS ON SALMON RIVERS

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Is it the intention of his department to reduce significantly the number of guardians on Canadian salmon rivers this coming season and, if so, what is the reason for this particular move?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries):** Well, Mr. Speaker, guardians have been reduced in number, and their hourly rates of pay have been increased appreciably. The problem is partly a budgetary one, but the short answer is that there has been a reduction in the number of fishery guardians on both coasts.

## WATER RESOURCES

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—COMPENSATION TO FISHERMEN FOR LOSS THROUGH POLLUTION

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Now that his colleague, the Minister of Transport, has had a chance to meet with representatives of the fishermen in Newfoundland can he tell the house what action the government will take to reimburse the fishermen who have been displaced as a consequence of the closing of Placentia Bay following pollution of the waters by the phosphorus plant there?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries):** Mr. Speaker, the matter of compensation to fishermen in the general vicinity of Long Harbour is under active consideration. A team of assessors is down in that area at the present time. As soon as I receive a report from them, which I hope will be forthcoming next week, I will be making representations to the government.

**Mr. McGrath:** As a further supplementary question to the Minister of Transport, who was acting for the Minister of Fisheries in this regard during his visit to the affected area in Newfoundland, is he willing to tell the house what action he is prepared to recommend to the government to reimburse the fishermen, and compensate the fishermen who will be displaced by the closing of the bay?

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder if the hon. member is asking this question of the minister in his official capacity in the administration. I would think the question should be directed to the Minister of Fisheries.

NANAIMO, B.C.—POLLUTION OF WEST COAST FISHERY

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. It has to do with pollution of water that is allegedly killing fish on the west coast. Has his department checked on incidents reported near Nanaimo and near Gold River on the west coast of Vancouver Island, where fish are alleged to have been killed as a result of toxic waste and, if so, what have been the results of this inquiry?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries):** Mr. Speaker, detailed checks have been made on one incident, the incident at Nanaimo, and as a result the plant in question has made substantial changes in its operations.

FRASER RIVER POLLUTION

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, has the Department of Fisheries taken any action to clear up the grave pollution problem in the Fraser River, which has been described as a running sewer by the fishermen's union, and if so will he indicate the measures to be taken by his department?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The second question in the supplementary would seem to require a statement of a general nature by the minister, which normally would be made on motions.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

### PRINCE RUPERT, B.C.—TAPE MONITORING OF TELEPHONE CALLS

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Postmaster General. Did he or any of his officials authorize the monitoring by automatic tape recorder of telephone calls made in the Post Office at Prince Rupert?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The question, if it is in order, normally should be placed on the order paper.

## INDUSTRY

### AUTOMOBILES—CANADIAN PRODUCTION SOLD AT LOWER PRICES IN U.S.

**Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Can he advise the house why Canadian made cars continue to be sold in the United States at lower prices than the same Canadian made cars are sold in Canada, keeping in mind the sales tax and the exchange rate?

**Mr. Speaker:** I would think that the question as asked is not in order. The hon. member is asking for an expression of opinion, and when he asks a question in this particular form it seems to me it is not in order.

**Mr. Hales:** Then may I ask the minister if it is a fact that Canadian made cars are being sold at a lower price in the United States than in Canada?

**Mr. Speaker:** I hesitate to tell the hon. member that it is not in order to ask the minister to confirm or deny a statement. Perhaps he might reflect on the situation and find an alternative way to ask the question.

**Mr. Hales:** May I try again, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the house what steps he is taking so that Canadian made cars will be sold at the same price in Canada as in the United States?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** I prefer to answer the second try, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The third, or nothing at all. The hon. member for Selkirk.

## FARM MACHINERY

### REQUEST FOR ROYAL COMMISSION REPORT

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is he in a position to clarify briefly his earlier statement in the house as to whether there will be an interim report from the Barber Royal Commission on farm machinery prices?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, within the time limits imposed I welcome the opportunity to try to clarify the replies I have made to a number of questions respecting this matter, going back to November. Mr. Speaker, an interim report on farm machinery prices in Canada compared with those in England and other countries, prepared by the royal commission, was presented to the Canadian Agricultural Conference in March. It was expected—and this is what I would like to clear up—that a further study of pricing practices would be presented to me in April. However, because of further information which has come to hand the commissioner advises it would be some time yet before he would be able to complete this study.

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

### LEGISLATION RESPECTING INDUSTRIAL INCENTIVES

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government house leader whether he can say when legislation will be presented on industrial incentives by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion? The question is urgent because it is reported there will be a lag in development funds because of the phasing out of existing programs. Is the government house leader in a position to assure the house that we will deal with this before the summer recess?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot give that or any other assurance in this regard. I would invite the Leader of the Opposition to address his question to the appropriate minister, when he is here.

## TRADE

### WHEAT—AUSTRALIAN AND RUSSIAN SALES TO U.K.

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Can the minister confirm whether the sale of 9 million bushels of wheat by Australia and Russia for delivery to the United Kingdom this summer will effectively displace shipments out of Churchill.

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm nor deny that. I will find out.

## AGRICULTURE

AVAILABILITY OF LOWER PRICED PESTICIDES

**Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Since farmers from coast to coast are now approaching the planting season, can the minister indicate whether any action has been taken or progress made by the government in an effort to make pesticides and other agricultural chemicals available to Canadian farmers at a price at least comparable to the price paid by farmers for the same chemicals in the United States.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** I am sure the hon. member is well aware that we do not have any legislation which authorizes us to control the prices of these products. I think the hon. member is also aware that in so far as tariffs and that sort of thing are concerned, there is no great problem in that area.

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

YELLOWKNIFE, N.W.T.—REGULATIONS GOVERNING AKAITCHO HALL

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Some weeks ago I asked the minister whether he would consider tabling a copy of the new regulations governing the conditions at the student's residence at Akaitcho Hall in Yellowknife. I understand he now has a copy and I should like to inquire whether he would be in a position to table it.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I have here the English and French versions of those regulations and the statement on the standards used and on the activity program for the students, which I want to table immediately in both languages, for the information of the house.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

## NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

SERIOUS ERRORS AND INADEQUACIES IN RECORDING OF EXPENDITURES

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I want to answer another question put to me a few days ago.

The hon. member for Skeena asked me a question about the findings of the Auditor-General in regard to the Northwest Territories and the answer is that the Commissioner for the Northwest Territories had meetings with the Auditor General on this matter. I am informed that they both agreed that the accounts referred to by the Auditor-General have been settled by the government of the Northwest Territories.

[*English*]

## GRAIN

ASSISTANCE IN FARM STORAGE COSTS

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the quantity of grain shipped at all points in western Canada during the current crop year will not likely exceed the six bushel quota, would the minister assist in financing the cost of new on-the-farm storage by granting an additional cash advance of 50 cents per bushel over and above the six bushel quota?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** We will take the hon. member's question as a representation.

## HOUSING

THOMPSON, MAN.—AVAILABILITY OF MORTGAGE MONEY

**Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister in charge of housing. In his absence, however, perhaps the acting minister could either answer it or take it as notice. On April 29 I inquired into the availability of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation mortgage funds for the construction of high rise apartments at Thompson, Manitoba. At that time I was advised that the application was under consideration. I wonder whether I might now have an answer as to whether or not the application is approved, or when it will be approved.

**Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services):** There is nothing further to report at this time.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## INDUSTRY

AUTOMOBILES—FORD CANADIAN PRICES

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and is supplementary to one asked earlier. A short time ago, before a committee of the house, the minister indicated he would be having discussions with the officials of Ford Motor Company concerning the prices of automobiles in this country. Could the minister tell us whether he has had these conversations and what the results were?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** I had my conversations and received a very long explanation, which I will give personally to the hon. member.

## AGRICULTURE

POTATOES—SUPPORT PRICE FOR STORAGE STOCK

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. It arises out of two representations made to the minister in recent days, one by the National Farmers Union and the other by the legislature of Prince Edward Island, with regard to a support price for maritime potatoes which are still in storage as of the middle of May, and may still be in storage as of the middle of June. I wonder what the response of the minister has been in this regard.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** We have heard these representations. Indeed not only on one but on several occasions the Minister of Agriculture from Prince Edward Island has made representations in this regard. I am very happy to report there has been a very pleasant and indeed significant increase in the price of potatoes in the last few days.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** I have a supplementary question. In view of the fact that the price increase referred to by the minister has been only a minor one in connection with the price of potatoes, is the minister able to give assurance to the house that, should the price fail to meet the two cents a bushel minimum referred to in both representations, he and his department will take action.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is hypothetical.

[Mr. Richardson.]

[*Translation*]

## NATIONAL PARKS

GASPÉ—AGREEMENT BETWEEN PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Would he be in a position to tell us whether the negotiations between the governments of Quebec and Ottawa concerning the national park in the Gaspé peninsula are completed?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** No, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

## TRADE

WHEAT—PRICE STABILIZATION UNDER I.G.A.

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of representations which were made under the International Grains Arrangement regarding prices in respect of sales of wheat to China, can the minister inform the house whether any progress was made toward stabilizing the prices under the International Grains Arrangement or is there any bargaining in process.

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** These conversations between exporters and importers have been going on for months now and they are continuing. I really do not know what to say that would be useful at this time. I said on Friday last that everybody seemed to be full of good intentions, but these good intentions are not materializing very fast in actual decisions.

WHEAT—SALE BY FRANCE TO MAINLAND CHINA BELOW I.G.A. PRICE

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** In view of the fact that apparently wheat was sold by France below the floor price established under the I.G.A. have representations been made directly to the government of France in an endeavour to get that country as well as other exporting countries to comply with the agreement?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, to speak frankly I do not think it would help very much, but we are going to continue to make these protests. We have made them before and will make them again. The truth of the

matter is that even if they sell at 20 cents or more below what we consider to be the I.G.A. minimum prices, the French authorities seem to do so with a clear conscience.

WHEAT—SALES BY CANADA BELOW I.G.A. PRICE

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Having regard to Canada's strong objection to sales of wheat being made below the I.G.A. price, would the minister say whether Canada itself at the present time is doing just that namely, selling below the price agreed internationally?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** I have already said so on a number of occasions. I announced it publicly, and the purpose is to be competitive. But the number of cents below the I.G.A. price is certainly far from being as wide as in the case of French sales.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I should like the minister to differentiate between an offence being committed because the difference involved is larger or smaller than the amount agreed to.

CANADA-U.S. EXCHANGE OF MARINE PRODUCTS

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. I should like to ask the minister whether he has held a discussion with his United States counterpart in order to have marine products and equipment moved more freely across the Canada-U.S. border. Perhaps if the minister is not in a position to answer, some other more appropriate minister might be able to respond.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question might be placed on the order paper.

## TRANSPORT

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT ON MINISTER'S STAFF OF FORMER LIBERAL MEMBER

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Now that the minister has greater responsibility for Newfoundland, will he be appointing to his staff the only former Liberal member for Newfoundland defeated in the last election who is not now working for the federal government, and who is in the gallery today looking hopefully upon our procedure?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

*Business of the House*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR REMAINDER OF CURRENT WEEK

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, as acting house leader, whether he would be prepared to outline the government's intention with regard to the business of the house for the remainder of the week.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** I would be glad to try to do that, Mr. Speaker. For the balance of this week we would continue with third reading of Bill C-150 until it is completed. I shall not try to predict whether it will be completed later today, or tomorrow; but whenever it is we would then call item 43, Bill C-157, respecting pest control products; followed by item 36, Bill S-15, the Food and Drugs Act; followed by item 17, Bill C-153, the Historic Sites and Monuments Act; followed by item 65, Bill S-23, the Canada Shipping Act; followed by Bill C-120, the Official Languages Act. Then on Thursday—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**An hon. Member:** What about Wednesday?

**Mr. Olson:** We have had discussions through the usual channels, and Thursday would be a day allotted to the opposition, when they will be given an opportunity to express confidence in the government.

On Friday we would continue the order of business that I have mentioned.

**Mr. Aiken:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I believe there has been general agreement that the confidence motion on Thursday be limited to ten-minute speeches, with the exception of the lead-off speaker for each party. Has the government given consideration to this matter?

**Mr. Olson:** There have been some discussions, Mr. Speaker, and if it is agreeable to the house leaders we will agree to that arrangement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, before we are able to agree we would want to know exactly what the subject is. Perhaps we could leave this question until tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** The matter will be held in abeyance.

*Criminal Code*

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### CRIMINAL CODE

The house resumed, from Monday, May 12, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner that Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be read the third time and do pass.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, after all the tenseness we have been experiencing during the past week and even for several weeks, I am ever so pleased to come back, on third reading, to the main points on which we have been and are still insisting so strongly.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had the opportunity to hear—

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Could we have order, please. There are so many conversations in the house that it is difficult for the Chair to hear the speech being made by the hon. member for Champlain.

[*Translation*]

I ask the hon. members to co-operate with the Chair so that we may hear what the hon. member for Champlain has to say.

**Mr. Matte:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and his Parliamentary Secretary, the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Cantin), summed up their views on the omnibus bill yesterday.

They mentioned in particular the fight we put up against the committee report. Mr. Speaker, in reading over what they said, I noticed the tremendous shortcomings in the arguments brought forward by the spokesmen for the Department of Justice.

In my remarks, I would like to point out those shortcomings and prove that even if all the amendments we introduced were defeated, it remains nevertheless that, in my opinion, we are still right. We are still fighting for a good cause and we would like our arguments to be listened to again seriously.

We would like precisely to refer to the very comments of the Minister of Justice who said yesterday that he had been through a full and searching debate.

Mr. Speaker, we wish to thank the minister from the bottom of our hearts for his complimentary remarks to us.

• (3:00 p.m.)

He acknowledges that this long debate on the amendments proposed when the report of the committee on justice and legal affairs was considered, was not as frolicsome as was suggested by several government members and their spokesmen outside the house, such as, for instance, an insignificant fellow like Mr. Marcel Gingras, editor of the newspaper *Le Droit*.

Mr. Speaker, that newspaperman was merely echoing in *Le Droit* the viewpoints of a few members of this house who thought we were simply twaddling on, that we were only stretching time. I therefore wonder who is right. The Minister of Justice or those gossipmongers who even took the liberty of cutting in, like the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) and the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain)?

Mr. Speaker, the minister himself said there had been a full debate; we put some life into it because life was what we wanted to save. We set our minds, our hearts and our souls to this task, and it has been a full debate. You cannot blame anybody for looking after his own interest.

The minister said also that it was a searching debate. Is it the minister who was right, or those members who saw red and forgot to reason and make really acceptable judgments, not only for us because we are members of the Ralliement Créditiste, but for the whole population? I quote the exact words of the minister:

> In answering that remark may I say what ministers often say, namely, that we have had a full and searching debate—and I think I can say that with some justification.

We therefore thank the minister for his comments about us. He also recognized that we had made a fine contribution to this debate for which he is grateful. We thank him sincerely for thinking so and I am again quoting the minister who stated yesterday:

> There have been serious and deep differences of opinion on certain aspects of this proposed legislation. I listened to those opinions with great feeling because I know how sincere and profound are the convictions of members in some quarters of the house, particularly those opinions that are related to measures that affect private morals and the concept of life and death.

I would advise the hon. member for Matane and the hon. member for Trois-Rivières to refer to the minister if they want to have a high opinion on the Ralliement créditiste.

Mr. Speaker, once again I congratulate the minister on viewing our contribution to the debate in that light.

However, when he states that it is the great majority of the people who support the abortion amendments to the Criminal Code, he is mistaken. Nevertheless, on hearing his statement yesterday, I felt he was showing much feeling, much sincerity. So much in fact that I read between the lines because of the numerous restrictions he made, that he was personally opposed to it and that he was abiding by a commitment already taken and which he felt compelled to fulfil. That is what you can notice when you read between the lines of what the minister told us yesterday.

With the support of a strong majority, we cast doubts, right from the beginning, on the validity of the amendment. If we were just expressing the opinion of a small minority with regard to the idology concerned here, Mr. Speaker, we would not have insisted so much to express our views on the omnibus bill.

We did it because we were convinced that we represented the majority, whereas the minister contends that the government does. He has perhaps forgotten to consider the people who took the trouble to write, send petitions, attend committee meetings—even those of the committee on justice and legal affairs—to express their point of view. When he says that the majority wants such a thing, the minister, I believe, labours under a complete delusion, and I would like to mention other evidence I received yesterday on the approach taken by people belonging to constituencies other than those of hon. members of the Ralliement créditiste.

I received a letter from the constituency of the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain), which shows that the majority of the Canadian people, even outside the constituencies represented by the Ralliement créditiste, think as we do. And this is why we proclaim so insistently that our position is justified.

The letter addressed to me yesterday reads as follows:

Dear Sir:

Several citizens in Champlain riding told me that you had consulted a number of people with regard to the omnibus bill and more particularly with regard to the amendments affecting abortion and homosexuality.

You will find rather strange that a voter not of your own riding should write to you to congratulate you and encourage you to hold your position in respect of this anti-natural and out-of-date bill. I live in the Trois-Rivières riding and I must tell you that the position taken by our representative at Ottawa does not reflect the opinion of the majority of his voters. I belong to various social clubs, such as the Knight of Columbus, the Kiwanis and others... and I am in a position to tell you that our member (Mr. Mongrain) did not consult us with regard to these amendments to the Criminal Code.

Yet, he conducted a thorough survey when his political future was at stake. He thinks perhaps that it was more important than the right to live.

If I am writing this letter to you it is to make you understand that in the constituency of Trois-Rivières people are not different from elsewhere and that we recognize that every human being has a right to live. We also believe that moral values must be carefully safeguarded. It is difficult for us to understand the position of our member in this regard. Since he is a fluent speaker, it seems to me he will never have a better opportunity to speak up.

It is precisely for his oratory talent that he was elected and he knows it, but he should keep in mind that the tongue should never be more active than the brain.

The situation is lamentable, Mr. Matte; not only is the government unable to provide Canadians with a decent living but it actually violates the most sacred rights.

Four years under such irresponsible careerists will seem long and difficult to us.

But as long as there are conscientious people like you and members of your party, we hope that a day will come when we will be less ashamed to live in Canada.

Carry on your good work!

Canadianly yours.

This letter is signed by a constituent in the riding of Trois-Rivières. If someone has some doubts about its authenticity I will gladly show it to them and even to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the many examples of what is happening in other areas of the country, other than those specifically represented here by the members of the Ralliement créditiste. This letter reflects an attitude we are familiar with. That is why I chose it; it truly expresses the beliefs of the population as a whole.

• (3:10 p.m.)

When we are told that the majority of the people agree with that, allow us to question the value of the minister's judgment on that point.

We have gone out and met people and we were particularly careful, so as not to be accused of sectarianism, of visiting other constituencies to see what was going on. And since those people have no confidence in their member—which is a shame, by the way—they come to us with their representations, asking us to continue their fight. The final paragraph of the letter which I just quoted, comes back to mind:

—we hope that a day will come when we will be less ashamed to live in Canada.

This is what reasonable people have said, people who want to follow the right path who do not want to flounder at any cost, or who at least would want to do it with much more dignity, in a more authentic spirit of scientific and medical research, taking into account qualified people's advice, people who are far better informed than us about those questions. That is what the Ralliement Créditiste has done.

I am always surprised at seeing the great number of members for whom this seems to remain a religious issue, and who think that we represent in this house solely the opinion of some Roman Catholics, of some priests or of the priesthood.

Mr. Speaker, we may have had fewer representations on that question than on any other. Why? Doubtless because knowing that we are Catholics, people know that they can depend on us to assume our responsibilities in this regard. And we avoided purposely making a religious issue out of this debate.

I am still surprised to see members such as the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), of the New Democratic Party who, yesterday, brought up again considerations—I wonder where they come from—which have nothing to do with the debate we have kept going for several days, if not several weeks.

Mr. Speaker, the minister told us he wished the party discipline to be slackened. In other words, he admits candidly that normally, discipline should be observed. Since there is talk of relaxing discipline, there must be one. If I read between the lines of what the minister says, I conclude that in the face of our insistence, in the face of the alarm we rang throughout the land, in the face of our actions, it has been decided to allow the government members their freedom. That means that they did not have it before and that because of what we did, now that everyone or almost is convinced of the advisability of the provisions on abortion and homosexuality,—I speak especially of those two questions which are the most controversial ones—they are told that they are free. Strange kind of freedom.

The insistence with which the minister comes back to the matter, to specify that discipline has been slackened, justifies all the denunciations we made and will continue to make, not for our own good but for that of the whole population.

The minister suggests also that he finds himself under a compulsion of sorts. I should like to quote that part of his statement which shows what I mean.

Yesterday the minister said this:

Honourable members on both sides of the house, holding deep convictions on aspects of the bill relating to private morals and life and death will at least be able to say to their constituents, "We did our best; we put our views to the people of Canada but Parliament has decided.

This may be the part of the minister's speech which is the most guileless if not the most naïve; he cannot tell us more frankly that he recognizes that these amendments do not make any sense, that he himself objects to them but that, because of his commitment and the matter of discipline, he is not going to give them up. He could not have put it more clearly. In other words, "you are right, you, the Créditistes, you are right to hold your stand." As a consolation prize, you could tell your constituents that you have done your best. You have made every possible effort to win, but you failed. The minister wants to give us this consolation prize when he says: "I agree that your constituents are right to think this way, go and comfort them at once."

As was pointed out by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) immediately after the minister's speech, it is as though the latter had just said that all the members were free, that discipline was relaxed, and he anticipated the result of the vote hoping that it would certainly be accepted.

Therefore there are glaring inconsistencies and I find it extremely unfortunate that we should have to deny a man whose worth, intelligence and logic we recognize the last attribute we thought he had: his judgement.

Mr. Speaker, this discussion, this debate on the omnibus bill caused the minister to lose his good sense.

All those aspects we are still emphasizing are not the result of mere considerations on our part but rather of an actual situation already existing, to the extent that laws will soon be thrusted—I repeat "thrusted"—upon the people, and we are proud of having given

warning, proud of having helped to rouse public opinion. I know very well that the minister's office, the cabinet must be showered every day with letters strongly objecting to this legislation. If it has not happened yet, it will before long.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer also to the words of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice.

On many occasions, I have asked the same question since the beginning of hhis debate. My question which appeared on the order paper read as follows: What are the organizations or individuals who intended to promote the carrying of the omnibus bill, especially the amendments to the Criminal Code, concerning abortion and homosexuality?

The hon. minister replied there was none.

• (3:20 p.m.)

But yesterday, the parliamentary secretary decided to answer, and I admire his frankness since he gave us the same answer I had given at that time and which can be found in the previous debates.

The parliamentary secretary had this to say yesterday:

> We have been asked where the bill comes from. Not so long ago—

And he answered as follows:

> Not so long ago, a man who today is the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) was appointed Minister of Justice and undertook the recasting of the Criminal Code which reflects the laws of present day society.

At last, Mr. Speaker, we got an answer.

Where does the omnibus bill come from? Where do the amendments to the Criminal Code concerning abortion and homosexuality come from? They come from one man, from the present Right Honourable Prime Minister. I had foreseen it as I have already mentioned. I said that any law that comes from the clouds, is bound to reflect the lucubrations of a 50 year-old young man.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary to the hon. Minister of Justice for having answered so candidly and with so much naiveté the questions which I have asked myself since the moment the omnibus bill was mentioned.

The hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mr. Cantin) was also speaking about freedom. He told us—and I am going to quote him exactly, to be sure that I am not speaking in vain, and to assure the house that the fight which we led was not useless, that it was not filibustering, but a fight for freedom—and I quote:

> The philosophy of this bill is simply this; in a society which, because of the social order which controls more and more the individual, interferes with his liberty, our legislation must be redrafted in order to respect to a greater extent individual freedom.

Mr. Speaker, since the French wording of this paragraph is of a rather doubtful quality, we might advise our good friend, Mr. Amédée Gaudreault, to write an article out of it.

Anyhow, I finally understood what the parliamentary secretary meant: that the law promotes individual freedom.

If the problem under study were not as serious, I would feel inclined either to laugh or to cry over it—I do not know exactly what. That is precisely what we have been trying to prove for weeks: individual freedom must be safeguarded. In order to do so, however, it is extremely important to start by protecting the individual from the very moment he is conceived. Individual freedom? Granted! Let us have laws to protect individual freedom, but let us first ask who is the individual. That is the important thing.

Mr. Speaker, all human lives have an equal value. It is not because one is Minister of Justice, parliamentary secretary or Prime Minister, that one has more personal value than the blacksmith, the farmer or the hon. member for Champlain.

If we agree that all human lives have an equal value, I cannot see why we should then ignore the individual in his mother's womb. It is up to us, it seems to me to protect individual freedom. Those who try to prove that through those amendments to the Criminal Code, individual freedom will be better protected, will not get away with such platitudes. Once again, leave them to "Amédée".

Mr. Speaker, at this point we would like to draw the attention of the house to the new amendment we intend to move in order that there might be more time to study the question.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin):

> That the word "now" be left out, and the words "this day six months" be added at the end of the question.

Mr. Speaker, all human lives are of equal value, even if skills and talents vary from one person to another. All human lives have an intrinsic value. That is the basis of our concept of justice, because all human beings

have equal rights. Everyone is equal before the law, everyone has the same right to life. Such right does not depend on physical or intellectual perfection. That we must strive to understand. Even the ugliest person in the world has a right to justice, whatever this person's physical development or mental state.

The life of a widow or of a disabled person has the same value as that of a normal one, and the life of the retarded child or of the infant too young to understand is no less precious than that of a genius.

We must therefore recognize the full value of the child in his mother's womb, as well as his full right to life as a human being. Such is the freedom of the individual, which spreads over every instant of the life span, from the very beginning of the existence of a human being. Any human being has a right to be protected, even during his embryonary stage. He has the same right to be protected as the child already born; his right to live must be protected and respected as far as possible.

Could we justify abortion when a baby might be born with a malformation? Only if we can justify the killing of malformed babies after birth.

Can we justify abortion in the case of a child conceived out of wedlock? Only if we can justify the killing of illegitimate babies in their crib.

Can we justify abortion because the child will be a heavy burden for the mother and her family? That is the argument of the New Democratic party. We can justify such an abortion only if we can justify infanticide for the same reason.

We are indulging in misleading comparisons. The value of that life still in the mother's womb is sometimes wrongly compared with the value of a living person. The only difference between both lives is that the unborn baby cannot be seen and is thus more easily ignored.

We are so anxious to defend the freedom of the individual that we are willing to fight to the bitter end in favor of the freedom of an individual to whom one does not want to pay any attention because he cannot yet be seen. It is an awful thought that this may be the case in a Christian country. I wish to underscore the word "Christian".

The other day, I recalled to Your Honor that, in the house, at two o'clock in the afternoon, we waste two or three minutes—I am sorry, I do not mean that we waste them—but we take two or three minutes to say the Lord's Prayer at the intention of Queen Elisabeth and Prince Charles.

If everybody recites the paternoster, does that mean that we live in a Christian country, yes or no?

Are not 98 per cent of the population Christian? Is it a disgrace to put forward Christian principles? It is not. It is not scandalous to refer to them nor to say that the human being which is inside his moter's womb cannot protect himself, because he is not yet visible, and to decide about his right to live. Mr. Speaker, is that anti-Christian?

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice said yesterday that there should be a clarification of the law on abortion because, at the present time, anyone can procure an abortion, and he even said that we, the Créditistes, could procure them.

Mr. Speaker, there will be abortions and we shall procure one on the government in due time.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Matte:** Mr. Speaker, it is precisely for that reason that we said that there was no need to legislate. But we regret the fact that this government should take advantage of some small gaps existing now in the law in order to extend it an to make all kinds of abuses possible.

We would have agreed upon amendments intended to prevent that a charge be laid against a doctor who would have procured a therapeutic abortion when the mother's life was at stake. But that they should take advantage of that small gap to open wide the door to abuses, that is for us a cause of regret and our reason for denouncing so vehemently this amendment.

The word "health" does not seem to add anythig anything but when we add "when the health" we are falling into abuses. And I have not understood yet why the minister has not taken into consideration all the examples we have given him and in particular those of countries which started with small pieces of legislation as this one. Health, then mental health, and that has always led to abortion on demand for $4.80 in Japan and for $60 a day by a single doctor in England.

Mr. Speaker, people could have said that we had made up those abuses, that they were figments of our imagination. But no, they are the result of accurate statistics, of actual

experience, especially in countries where certain forms of socialism have been implemented and this legislation has been passed since the coming to power of the N.D.P.—Labour government in England.

So as to have a good conscience, the hon. member for Louis-Hébert said that during the election campaign, he had met 200 members of religious orders, at the same time. I do not know why he was so intent on doing that. As for us, we did not bother about it. We let people think freely and we take no special steps to get in touch in a special way with members of religious orders. If he did that, it is because he had doubts. As for us, we did not feel we had to go and see them.

He says they must have voted for him since he won. Out of thousands of votes, how could he know the ones from the 200 members of religious orders who had come to his meeting? I do not know through what insight the hon. member could find out for whom his constituents had voted. As you can see, those are silly arguments to which Amédée could resort.

Mr. Speaker, when I consider all these objections, I feel we should all be more serious and I shall conclude by asking the hon. member for Louis-Hébert, parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice, to explain his last paragraph. I have read it over and over again and I still cannot understand it. I quote:

> We sit here as legislators to protect the rights of society and the rights of the individual.

I do agree with that but just listen to the second sentence of this paragraph, and I quote:

> And the individual will feel increase in need for a private shelter, so as to be better prepared to meet with the self-denials that social order calls for nowadays.

Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot understand all this.

He was speaking about abortion. I first thought that the private shelter he referred to was the mother's womb—I do not know exactly, but, in any case, I do not understand anything about it.

"Self-denials", I do not know at all what he was alluding to, and I would like to get some explanations from the hon. member on this very ambiguous paragraph which puzzles me, and which would mean, as the minister actually mentioned before him, that this legislation is admittedly not a good one. But those who live in parts of the country where the bill is unwelcome would be asked, to be careful, and to practise self-denial. Tell your constituents that even if this law exists, they must not use it.

It would have been so simple, instead of taking so many precautions, not to legislate on abortion and homosexuality, and even if one did, to do so in a really adequate way, in a way that would promote the development of the country, instead of bringing about its decline.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

[*English*]

The question is on the amendment.

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment proposed by my colleague from Champlain (Mr. Matte) is to postpone third reading of the bill for six months, and thus give more people in Canada the advantage and the opportunity to set forth their views and enlighten the government, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner).

Yesterday, I read to the house testimonies received from various parts of Canada. This morning again, I received testimonies coming, not only from the ridings we represent, but also from various regions across Canada.

For instance, from Ottawa, dated May 11—that is, the day before yesterday—I received a letter signed by Mrs. Dale A. Russell, 361 Wilbrod Street, Apartment 6, Ottawa.

[*English*]

Dear Sir:

> Although we are neither French nor members of the Creditiste Party, my husband and I would like to congratulate you and the members of your party for the valiant stand that you are taking on the vital issues of abortion and homosexuality posed by the omnibus bill.
>
> It must be disconcerting to have to bear the brunt of the fight and then to have to be annoyed with accusations made by Mr. De Bané who would do well to reread his history. Perhaps, if there had been a comparable group to the Creditistes in Germany, six million Jews would still be alive.
>
> Respectfully yours,

• (3:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) tried to draw a parallel between our small group of Créditistes and Hitler and Mussolini.

At that time, an honourable minister and two other Liberal members came and said to me: Do not pay any attention to him, he is not too intelligent. That is exactly what we could see.

**An hon. Member:** They are right.

**Mr. Caouette:** They are absolutely right.

So Mr. Speaker, I do not have to argue with the hon. member for Matane, who is fully aware that, in his own constituency the people are in favour of the stand we are now taking in the House. If he is not convinced of that, he will be the next time he visits his constituency.

Mr. Speaker, all this to say that we want the right to live not only for ourselves but for the whole population. We want the hon. member for Matane to live also, as well as the Minister of Justice, and as Mrs. Russell said: "If there had been more Créditistes in Germany, the Jews would probably still be alive."

We have nothing against anybody. We never attacked people who were alive or about to be born, and that is exactly our stand in respect of bill C-150 and above all in respect of the clause proposing to legalize abortion in Canada.

This mornng also, I received a letter not from Quebec or Ontario but from Nova Scotia, the province of which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) was Premier for eleven or twelve years, I believe.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from Mr. Andrew T. Moore, who works for the Andrew T. Moore & Sons, Sales Tax Consultants—people who know something about taxation—of 197 Victoria St. East, Amherst,—Nova Scotia.

Mr. Moore writes, and I quote:

[*English*]

Dear Sir:

With reference to my letter of May 6, accompanied by newspaper clippings dealing with abortion, addressed to you, I hope they have been of some help in your fight to block the passing of the bill now under discussion in parliament. So I am enclosing, herewith, another clipping I came across today.

I just learned from the C.B.C. TV news report that it is anticipated that the Criminal Code bill is to proceed to the third and final reading on Monday, May 11.

It seems that nothing much can be done now to block passing of the bill. But we can express our opinions, so I am enclosing herewith a copy of letter I am mailing to the Premier tonight, along with a cheque for $25 and would appreciate it if you could arrange, some way, to have copies made or mailed to all M.P.'s—

[Mr. Caouette.]

This includes the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner).

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Copies of the cheque?

**Mr. Caouette:** You can have copies of the cheque if you want them but only one is good, the one I have received. You can have all the copies you want.

—or to some citizens who may be interested. If this could not be arranged maybe you could arrange to use the cheque by having the letter published in an Ottawa daily newspaper or pass it along to someone like Richard Jackson, journalist. I am leaving the matter in your hands. I might also mention that I am not looking for publicity but you are free to use my name if required.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, that is another piece of evidence from someone who is not a Créditiste, who may not be a Catholic, but who takes the same position as we have done and are doing today.

When we consider the feedback from the press in general, either English or French, we realize that many journalists support our position.

For instance, in the Monday, May 12 issue of *L'Action* of Quebec City, we can read, and I quote:

Between you and me. A filibuster which is called for.

That is the opposite of what the hon. member for Matane said against us.

Here is what *L'Action* says:

I understand at present, there is filibustering, in Ottawa. And who, I ask you, is conducting those paralyzing manoeuvres? Those scurvy wretches, those M.P.s, those members—

—We could add: those Hitlers, those Mussolinis, to please the member for Matane.

—members of the Ralliement Créditiste who are waging an unremitting war against the part of the omnibus bill regarding abortion.

How guilty, how criminal are those representatives elected in Quebec who dare attack Bill C-150. Especially, since they are delaying the business of the house and postponing the summer recess. According to a despatch published Thursday, a Liberal member would have gone so far as to speak of disgusting methods.

The member for Matane. It is his immortal sayings which are published in the official report of the House of Commons' debates. "Disgusting methods", because we are opposed to Bill C-150. And the hon. member for Matane fancies himself to be intelligent when he speaks like this in the house.

Mr. Speaker, it matters little what terms the hon. member for Matane used, we are here standing and we shall remain standing and fight for the authentic just society in Canada. Considered from every angle, the remarks made by the hon. member fail to move us one little bit.

And I continue to quote the articles:

This really takes the cake. All those who sit in the House of Commons have the right to express their views, have they not?

**Mr. Boulanger:** You have already delivered 200 speeches!

**Mr. Caouette:** I hear the hon. member for Mercier say that we have delivered 200 speeches. He so seldom makes himself heard that he finds 200 speeches amazing.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason that moves the hon. member for Mercier to speechify: To give his voters a load of applesauce in order to be elected. Once reelected, he is stuck to his seat as if with Lepage glue.

**Mr. Boulanger:** I feel that 200 speeches should be enough to bring the matter home.

**Mr. Caouette:** The hon. member for Mercier says that 200 speeches should have brought the matter home. He himself has not yet understood after 200 speeches. Besides, the government knows that it cannot bring anything home to the hon. member for Mercier. That is why he was seated at the far end of the house.

**Mr. Boulanger:** You are not very far from the end of the house yourself.

**Mr. Caouette:** I continue my quotation:

To be considered as serious and responsible, should they be always, automatically, of the same opinion as the government?

Then, we would be applauded.

When we accepted the second reading on the night of the third or last amendment, the liberals were acclaiming us. It suited them. But things are difierent when we are fighting: we are using "disgusting" methods.

I go on with the quotation:

The members of the Ralliement are fighting on a most important matter: abortion. And whether this pleases or not, they are rightfully bringing forth their views, their arguments. In any case, no one has the right to say that they are deliberately and knowingly wasting the time of the house.

● (3:50 p.m.)

—We are not wasting the time of the house when we resort to all the recognized and accepted parliamentary tactics in order to prevent the passage of the clauses and paragraphs of a bill so rightly criticized as Bill C-150.

We have those privileges. We will use them and I wonder who has the right to accuse us of slowing down the proceedings of the house.

Mr. Speaker, we are not wasting the time of the house when we resort to recognized parliamentary tactics.

Many other members of the Ralliement créditiste, as we know, have stated some reservations and made disapproving comments on the said bill. To stick to a quite recent opinion, let us resume the statement of Dr. Noël Walsh, chief psychiatrist at St. Mary's Hospital in Montreal.

Dr. Walsh fears that the passing of the said bill will be a step towards the progressive deterioration of human rights. He pretends that when the bill has become law, it will have harmful effects on women, families and the quality of the Canadian life in general. He says he does not see any valid psychiatric indication to justify abortion.

Nonetheless, those who presently fight in the Commons against Bill C-150, on the matter of abortion, cannot be accused of indulging in a useless and unreasonable filibuster. Their views are worthy of respect.

Even the respect of the hon. member for Matane.

As irritating as their methods may be for some people, they are not disgusting. In fact, do we or do we not live in a democracy? In the affirmative, let us have consideration for those who dare raise their voices, expose the clauses they find dangerous for human rights and for society as a whole.

That has been written in *L'Action,* of Quebec City, Mr. Speaker. They are not Créditistes the newspapermen of *L'Action* in Quebec City.

I could have quoted, this afternoon, articles published in English-language newspapers from Western Canada, which back up our position on this bill. We do not introduce an amendment for the sake of doing so, but in order to put off consideration of the bill as far back in the future as possible and to enable the Canadian people to make representations to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Justice and cause them to respect the opinion of most Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, our attitude is based on logic. The government is snowed under by thousands of letters from people protesting against Bill C-150.

Yesterday, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) told me she also received a great number of letters in favour of abortion. I told her: Bring them to the house and read at least 10 of them.

In all the mail I received, I had two letters blaming us, of the Creditiste party, for our stand in this house, and I had hundreds of

other letters of congratulation from all parts of Canada.

The same is true for the hon. members opposite. If they received letters in favour of the legislation on abortion, why do they not stand up and quote them? Simply because they have none.

The minister received thousands of petitions against abortion, homosexuality and Bill C-150. Some 70,000 signatures from Montrealers have been forwarded to the Prime Minister, and he stated in the house: I have received perhaps 6,000 signatures. It is not 6,000, but 70,000. The arithmetic of the government is poor, when the time has come to count. Numbers are forgotten, and memory is lost. The Minister of Justice himself has lost his memory.

He is a gentleman, a minister for whom I have much respect, but, at one time, he was asking that the bill be divided up according to the various subject-matters. Today, he accepts the bill as written, saying: "We are committed." Committed to whom? When the Minister of Justice says that he is committed, that he has promised to accept the bill as it reads, he demonstrates his personal inability. He admits that he is tied hand and foot, that he is not free to act on his own, that he is not free to assume responsibilities, precisely because he is committed to the Prime Minister, to the government, to the Cabinet and to the Liberal party.

That is a position that we cannot accept. If Canada is a true democracy, and if we say that democracy means government of the people, by the people, and for the people, if it is readily agreed that a member is the representative of people, why not allow Liberal members to vote as they see fit and in accordance with the wishes of their electors? Why not recommend a free vote? That would be democracy.

Then, parliament would decide the matter. When the government sticks to its guns, saying: we are the Liberal party, we are bound, we are committed, then parliament does not rule any longer but rather the governmental majority.

If the government were not in a majority, if it were in a minority, the minister would have to withdraw his bill C-150, because we would never allow it to be adopted by the House of Commons.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Caouette:** The hon. member for Mercier agrees with me. Look at him nodding his assent. It is true, because the hon. member for Mercier thinks the way we do about the bill.

[Mr. Caouette.]

Mr. Speaker—

**An hon. Member:** You can say that because you will never be anywhere but where you are know.

**Mr. Caouette:** That is true. The hon. member for Mercier is our "best man", because he listens to us most of the time.

We might yet succeed in convincing him.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Caouette:** It might be a hard, long and thorny job. It is taking a long time, but it is coming.

**An hon. Member:** It is coming!

**Mr. Caouette:** A least he is a good listener, that is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from Mrs. Gwen Jones, of Bothwell, Ontario. I have no idea of the riding she lives in; it may be a Conservative, a N.D.P. or a Liberal riding, I do not know. Here is what she says, and I quote:

[*English*]

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your fight against legalizing abortion for more reasons (if I may use that word). It is good to know that there are politicians with consciences who will stand up for what they know is right.

I am a Catholic, a convert to the faith, but concerning abortion I feel exactly the same as I did as a Protestant. It is murder against the most innocent human beings. I could sympathize with some murderers of adults but not with anyone who kills an unborn child.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, a doctor, Dr. E. Patrick, of the J. David Rodger, John T. M. Fraser and Edgar R. Harris medical office, in Ottawa, writes, and I quote:

[*English*]

E. Patrick
J. David Roger
John T. M. Fraser
E. Harris

Medical Arts Building
Ottawa 4

Dear Sir:

I enclose a photostat copy of a part of the London Letter in the *Canadian Medical Journal* of April 19th. It struck me as highly topical, interesting from a practical point of view and slightly amusing.

Since the caption contains a good deal of factual information concerning the consequences of the

abortion act in Britain I felt that it should be brought to your attention.

The problem as such does not really concern me in my practice but will be of great concern to my gynaecological colleagues.

Yours sincerely,
E. Patrick.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I have other testimonies, but I won't read more.

I for one did my best to fight against abortion as presented in Bill C-150. My colleagues—as I said yesterday—performed a gigantic work.

We will not make a political question out of it, but we will make a clear and simple question out of it, for the people we represent here.

If I had received letters blaming me, I would read them. In fact, I read yesterday a telegram which does not blame us, but which would like to see deleted from the legislation all clauses on homosexuality and particularly on abortion.

Mr. Speaker, we have received practically no testimonies in favour of—

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Caouette:** Yes.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Since the hon. member is drawing attention to various letters he has received, I wonder whether he would like to read to the house a letter from Madame Mireille Bernier of Orsainville, Quebec, a copy of which was sent to him? It happens to be a letter that ends with the sentence:

In the meantime, thank heavens for Bill C-150.

**Mr. Caouette:** Maybe she was thinking of bingoes.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member will permit me as part of my question to point out that the letter deals solely with the question of abortion. It was a letter to me with carbon copies sent to John Turner, Réal Caouette and Ovide Laflamme. Perhaps the hon. member would like to read it since it comes from the province of Quebec.

**Mr. Caouette:** If I have the copy certainly I will read it, but I do not know when the hon. member received this letter because I have not received it yet.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** About ten days ago.

**Mr. Caouette:** Well, I don't have it.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I have given you a copy, so you have it now.

**Mr. Caouette:** I have it now. Oh, this is what you just read—"thank heavens for Bill C-150". I have some letters which are opposed but, as I said, I do not have three letters in favour from all over Canada.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** You have another one now. Read the first two paragraphs.

**Mr. Caouette:** I can read it, but as the hon. member received the original of that letter maybe he should read it himself. It is addressed to Mr. Stanley Knowles and reads:

Dear Sir:

How very much I appreciated your speech in the house, about abortion. I fully concur that there should be no law for or against such a personal matter.

So she is only saying the same as the Jewish organization which asked us in a telegram to do away with everything regarding abortion and homosexuality. She is for the bill. The letter continues:

The only conclusion we can reach after hearing some of the speeches of the members, is that women are really not responsible enough to decide if a pregnancy is desirable or not.

I would challenge this lady on that.

Some members seem to expect a real exodus of pregnant women towards hospitals, as soon as the bill is passed! If men value the life of an unborn baby, even more do the women who can feel it so very intimately.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this does not alter our stand. Mrs. Mireille Bernier of Orsainville, Quebec, is perfectly free to think that way.

When we look at the results in Japan, in England, in those countries where similar legislation was passed, we note that, today, in Japan, for instance, where the birth rate used to be 24 to 25 per 1,000 inhabitants, the birth rate has now decreased to 9 per 1000 persons.

In England, 58 per cent of those who resort to abortion are young girls, divorcees, widows and women who are separated from their husband.

There are reasons for all that. That is why, we ask the Minister of Justice, to get legislation passed which, instead of legalizing abortion, would allow human beings to live decently, and guarantee mothers that they will not have any problems in bringing up their children. That would be far more constructive than the abortion legislation in Canada as advocated by the present government.

Abortion is required, in many cases, for economic reasons. Even the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway said the other day: The hon. member does not know the poor mothers who have to work and who, at one time or another, become pregnant. It is a source of trouble for them.

There is one thing I know and that the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway knows also, it is the fact that in the majority of cases, the mother has to work. Why? Because the family income is not sufficient. We have seen employment methods for everyone in all the Communist countries of the world. I have seen some in Sweden, and in socialist countries.

In Russia, for example, they say: Who wants to live has to work. This principle applies to women as well as men. In Russia, I have seen mothers 40 and 45 years old come out of coal mines as black as Negroes, wearing heavy steel or fiber glass helmets. And one has to work because the basic principle states that one has to work if one wants to live. That is the Communist principle.

If the purpose of man's life is work, then let us follow the same course.

If the aim in life of a human being is to find his soul and to become great, then let us change our present attitudes. Let us think differently, let us consider training the human being, let us consider respecting him.

When, for instance, families of eight or ten children are piled up in three or four-room apartments in Montreal in high-rise buildings instead of single family dwellings, the introduction of a bill intended to make abortion possible in Canada, is not surprising.

It is not surprising that mothers have to resort to abortion. Why? Simply because they do not have the security they are entitled to because the head of the family does not himself enjoy that security.

Therefore, what does that mean? It means that Bill C-150 is the result of alarming economic conditions in Canada, economic conditions that force human beings to live in unthinkable conditions.

[Mr. Caouette.]

In Montreal, whole families—and the hon. member knows it—live in kennels in certain parts of the city. Perhaps even dogs would not be kept in such shanties and there we see human beings, four, five, six children and their mother who has to manage with only her husband's small income of $50 or $60 a week, when he gets it, with unemployment insurance benefits, of $52 or $53 per week or with welfare, allowances of $125 per month.

Mr. Speaker, considering those circumstances, neither the Créditistes nor any intelligent person would blame the mother of a family who would resort to abortion. But we could blame the government responsible for the present economic situation in Canada, which prevents families from growing normally.

Mr. Speaker, there are causes and effects. If causes are not removed, we shall keep on putting up with the effects and like causes usually produce like effects. There may be exceptions but they are scarce. Whenever one sows potatoes, one seldom harvests carrots. Like causes usually produce like effects.

If we keep on showering praise on the economic administration which announces more restrictions for 1970, an economic administration that cannot find ways of building houses for our families, hospitals will have to expand to take care of the mothers who will have to resort to abortion.

• (4:10 p.m.)

If the minister is not convinced of this, I am, and my colleagues of the Ralliement Créditiste too. Our fight will perhaps come to an end today or within two days. However, we shall do our duty as Canadian citizens, as Christians. We are not mere numbers, we are not animals, we are not wild beasts. We are human beings endowed with intelligence and will. As we are intelligent, we can state facts as they are and as we have will power we can fight what must be fought with all our strength: abortion and homosexuality, contained in that infamous bill, known as Bill C-150.

**Mr. André Ouellet (Papineau):** Mr. Speaker, on this proposed amendment, I should like to say a few words and draw the attention of the hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), who has quoted an editorial published last week end in a Quebec newspaper, namely *L'Action*, to another editorial published in *Le Soleil*, and I quote:

Filibustering at Ottawa

Are the Créditistes—

**An hon. Member:** By Amédée?

**Mr. Ouellet:** No, not by Mr. Amédée Gaudreault. I shall indicate my sources.

A moment ago, the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) spoke without mentioning his sources, but I shall indicate mine. The newspaperman is Gilles Boyer, who states in his editorial, and I quote:

> Are the members of the Ralliement créditiste, on the question of the omnibus bill, re-enacting the scenario that was followed by the hon. members of the Progressive Conservative party, under Mr. Diefenbaker, on the adoption of a national flag? We recall that the members of the Progressive Conservative party, during the Pearson administration, indulged in a filibuster to prevent the adoption of a distinctive flag. The members of the Ralliement créditiste are now about to engage on the same path while opposing the clause of the abortion bill which deals with danger to the mother's health. As speeches follow speeches among the members of the Ralliement créditiste in the House of Commons, it becomes evident that the point is not so much to inform the public as to filibuster. Meanwhile, discussion of important bills is delayed and the members of the Ralliement créditiste will thereafter be the first ones to denounce Parliament's inefficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I must point out to you that when someone on this side of the house starts to speak there are always chatter-boxes on the other side, on the side of the Créditistes who try to interrupt him. They seem to resent it when government members call them to order and tell them that they have been heard long enough. When we speak, they should listen.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. Order. I thank the hon. member for Papineau for having drawn my attention to that section of the standing orders. I should also like to take this opportunity to remind the hon. members of it.

It is subsection (3) of section 12 of the standing orders which reads as follows:

> When a member is speaking, no member shall ... interrupt him, except to raise a point of order.

I should therefore ask every hon. member to abide strictly by the order.

**Mr. Ouellet:** Mr. Speaker to continue with my quotation of Gilles Boyer:

> Thus, there remains scarcely more than fifteen days to consider those three priority bills: on the official languages, on housing and on income tax.

And the reporter went on blaming this filibuster of the Créditistes.

I think that the amendment brought in this afternoon is an indirect way of filibustering the bill now under consideration.



We have been considering this bill for several days.

We spent almost a month studying every clause of this bill in committee and I will point out that the presence of the Creditistes in committee, when this bill was studied, was minimal since they appeared only for certain clauses of the bill concerning abortion. But for all the other clauses they were conspicuous by their absence.

And yet, this bill touches innumerable fields and the amendments to the Criminal Code are all as important as the clauses on abortion.

I think that a six month's hoist would be a strictly diversionary measure intended to prolong this debate which,—as was repeatedly pointed out—has been put to the test of public opinion at the time of a general election, last June.

The Créditistes representatives, throughout the province, have dinned into people's ears their objections to the bill. The only subject that they discussed in their political speeches was their opposition to this bill. And yet I do not feel when I see their little group down there, that they have won their case before the majority of the Canadian electorate.

In view of all these considerations, I think that this amendment should be opposed and that this bill should be passed without more ado.

**Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe):** Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take much of the time of the house but on the other hand I cannot miss this opportunity of stating my position regarding Bill C-150 which is now under consideration.

I am not ready to condemn it completely for it has some very good points. However, I cannot see why the government has denied us the opportunity of voting on some of its items which are very similar and did not split the bill to enable us to do so.

There are some items I would like to vote for. For instance, I am in favour of the breathalizer and of lotteries. I would also like to be able to vote for the measure concerning the carrying of weapons, the improvement of penitentiaries, etc. By doing so, however, I would put myself in the position of having to vote in favour of things to which I have always objected.

I do not think that, in its present form, the bill is commendable. I would even say that it is presented to us in a devious way. It is a

piece of camouflage intended to deceive us and to deceive also the people.

Once again, I regret that the government did not see fit to grant a free vote to each and every member. This question now before us, with all its various subjects, should have been dealt with differently and the members of this house should have been allowed more freedom to assess each case by itself.

Mr. Speaker, before coming to the conclusion I finally reached which is to vote against the bill, I first asked myself a number of questions. I then considered the representations made to me by some associations of my riding and I also took into consideration the opinion of members of the Quebec Association of Physicians and Surgeons, of the Quebec Hospital Medical Boards Association, and also the opinion of the religious authorities in my riding.

Some of the previous speakers have suggested that in dealing with this measure we should let religion influence our decision.

• (4:20 p.m.)

To me, that is difficult. It is not easy for me to judge the measure before us otherwise than as a Catholic, and I rely on the recommendations and advice coming from religious authorities.

First, let us see what the members of the Quebec Association of Hospitals Medical Boards think of the proposed legislation.

On January 22, 1969, as many other members, I think, I received a letter from Mr. Robert Lavigne, physician, president of the Association above mentioned.

Here is what the letter said:

You will find enclosed the views of the Quebec Association of Hospitals Medical Boards on the matter of abortion presently under consideration in the House of Commons.

The report expressed the opinion of all physicians practising in the hospitals of the province.

We hope this will be enlightening and will help you take a position that will be fair and equitable for each citizen of our country.

What are the findings and recommendations of the Association?

I quote from the report that I have here:

We believe:

—that only scientific medical research will bring a real solution to the debate and we favour the creation of any task force.

—that abortion remains, in the present state of medical science, the killing of a living human being.

—that any doctor or hospital must be free to refuse his participation to such a medical technique.

[Mr. Ricard.]

—that this technique involving the life of a human being (the foetus), the decision in this connection should not be left to the patient alone.

And the brief goes on to say:

We object to:

—a legislation that will give false hopes to the people.

—We also demand that the hospitals empowered to perform therapeutic abortions be designated by the College of Physicians of each province so as to make sure that the established standards will be met.

We conclude:

—It is for that reason that the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards is against the proposed amendment C-195 as it stands now and would like it to be amended in order to limit the indications to cases of serious hazard to the life of the mother.

There is a philosophy put forward by some hon. members to the effect that we must live in our times and that the proposed amendments are designed to fill the needs of today.

I would say the physicians considered that question, in the light of 1968 and 1969, and I am of the opinion that if they arrived at the afore-mentioned conclusions, it is because they believe that it is in the interest of the population that it be so.

I received, just a few days ago, a pamphlet sent to me by the Most Reverend Albert Sanschagrin, Bishop of Saint-Hyacinthe.

The pamphlet is entitled "liberalized abortion is worse than crime". In it, we find the teaching of the Church on abortion.

On page 5, one reads this:

Although it did not dwell at length on the question of abortion, Council Vatican II repeated generally but firmly the traditional teaching of the Church on the matter. "God, master of life", writes the Council, "entrusted to man the noble mystery of life, and man must discharge it in deserving fashion. Life must be safeguarded with extreme care from the time of conception: abortion and infanticide are abominable crimes."

Obviously, through those words, the Council condemns any direct attempt to kill the foetus, and not such care as may be required to save the life of a mother which at times, without it having been willed or sought, leads to the death of the foetus.

Is it any wonder that the Church should express itself so firmly on the matter? Speaking as it does, it only echoes faithfully the very solemn and serious commandment of God: "Thou shalt not kill", and bears testimony to the great law of Christian love.

Does it not here touch upon a question which lies at the very basis of true civilization and true progress: respect for life and the human being?

It is obvious that God's command is binding on the conscience, regardless of what legislation applies in the country.

Mr. Speaker, on the strength of this information, which I feel is of the best, I must oppose the measure before the house. When time comes to vote, I shall stand and vote against it. I shall then have the feeling that I have complied with the wishes of the vast majority of my electors.

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to start by making a few comments on the remarks made last night by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), to us.

I think the minister missed a fine opportunity, through the amendment we moved, to prove that he was really against, as he has practically always stated in the house, introducing the bill as a package deal.

And when he argues that it would have been very costly, I can tell him that it would have cost nothing at all. We have a Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) who is very generous, and he does not cost Canada much. We have paper which is provided to us by parliament, and in my constituency, 15,000 letters can be sent within a week.

And with 264 members who might have conducted this referendum, this survey, we would have known exactly what the nation thinks, what the people mean, what they want to say aloud, and everyone, through specific questions agreed upon by the four parties, would have held a referendum which would not have cost anything.

I also noted the statements of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Cantin), who said the vote was free. Well, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) rises, it is common knowledge in this house or elsewhere, that everybody must vote as he does.

But he further added that, this time, there was no question of reprisals. Therefore, we can assume that sometimes, there are reprisals, or it is intimated that there might be reprisals if one does not vote with the Prime Minister and with the government. The Parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice said so himself, and that time, and we believed him.

We also heard, last night, the socialist representative for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), who referred to—

• (4:30 p.m.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I would like to remind the hon. members, that even if they are given much scope at this stage, there is now a specific amendment before the house, aimed at amending the motion under study, by deleting the word "now" and by adding "this day six months". Now, since the motion as amended reads: That the bill be not read now, but this day six months, that narrows the debate considerably.

**Mr. Dumont:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the very matter of a referendum, I was referring to the expression "in six months that the bill be adopted", because after going through all the answers given during the referendum conducted by the members who are paid by Canadian electors and taxpayers, we would then have been in a position to look into the matter during five months, and announce the results in six months.

I shall stick to the amendment which is before us, and explain the remarks which have paved the way for the amendment moved today.

And among the arguments also set forth by others, preventing us from moving the amendments which are before us, we had the representation of the socialist member, who was saying: "People do not want to hear about the omnibus bill; all they want is employment and roads."

And when I saw the member for St-Boniface (Mr. Guay) greeting these comments with loud applause, I thought that the member for St. Boniface was probably applauding, because the Pope had just announced that St. Boniface no longer exists; he was applauding and he could invoke the saints for the six month's hoist. I am quite convinced of it and that is why we, from the Ralliement Créditiste, decided to move this amendment, since the member for St. Boniface seems to agree upon some statements that were made in the house.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to point out a few things about the interpretation of my speeches in the house. When we do not give a written statement, it is unbelievable to read the mumbo-jumbo that is recorded in *Hansard*. I cannot understand why, to record the speeches and correct them for publication in *Hansard*, a tape-recorder is not used that would reproduce exactly—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order please. I recalled earlier that we had a specific amendment now before us, and I do not think this is the appropriate time for the hon. member to express grievances.

**Mr. Dumont:** Mr. Speaker, this is precisely the point. I do not want people to wait six

months before they may understand what I say in the referendum we are asking for, and that is why I want what is quoted in *Hansard* to be clear for all and sundry.

And since I feel that my rights have been encroached upon, I think that at the beginning of my remarks it is very normal, very logical that I should explain that we cannot be really understood. For once, my speech is entirely written out, and I am convinced no one will have to wait six months, this time, to understand it.

I also hope that the newspapermen will be present to note carefully that thanks to our six months' amendment, they will be able to understand too, because as regards the interpretation we made of the omnibus bill, we had, for example, a sort of declaration from Amédée Gaudreault, that parrot at the service of capitalists like Colonel Gilbert, who commands that the Creditistes be held up to ridicule.

Even if we did propose amendments as important as the ones presented today, asking that the word "now" be left out and that the whole thing be examined this day six months, we will still see a representative of the newspaper *Le Soleil*, with a handsome salary, try to make fun of the Créditistes.

But all that does not in the slightest change what we have to say, and we will continue to demand justice for our people, because we are receiving too many requests from people all over Canada to allow the adoption of this bill, which would legalize abortion as well as homosexuality.

By the way, I have here a quotation to answer that other newspaperman called Marcel Gingras. The quotation is taken from *Le Droit* and is very recent, since it is the Monday, May 12 issue:

> Your editorial of May 5, 1969, on the omnibus bill and the Créditistes—

—including the amendment we propose, for the six month's hoist. He goes on to say:

> —informs the people so badly that I cannot help reacting.
>
> How misleading is it to consider abortion as a matter of theology and morality. It is much more a matter of science and of justice.
>
> What is a foetus? It is a human being... in development. This human being develops gradually from its conception to its death; birth is not the beginning of life but a stage in life.
>
> The latest medical books on embryology and on genetics confirm that fact. Last year, 25 doctors out of the 26 witnesses who appeared before the parliamentary committee on health and welfare explained those facts, and a few weeks ago, the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards

[Mr. Dumont.]

> appeared before the committee on justice and legal affairs to move, with slides to support its case, the existence of human life and speak of the development process—

We saw the slides and we heard Dr. Légaré, presented by the Ralliement créditiste, and Dr. Jutras, of Victoriaville who spoke to us through the medium of the slides. This should answer the hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) who said earlier that hon. members were never there to discuss those amendments.

On the contrary, when it was a question of fighting against homosexuality and abortion, the Créditiste members were always present. As we told it ever since the discussion on the omnibus bill began, if those two parts, legalizing abortion and homosexuality, had been deleted, the remainder of the bill would have been allowed to pass, though we did not agree on a few things. In order to allow the house to proceed with its business, we would have let the bill pass.

What the hon. member for Papineau said earlier, convinces us that it is precisely because we were always here when those two parts of the bill were brought forward, because we were making objections supported by evidence, that the population did not want the bill. His earlier argument that we were never here, is absolutely false and I am rejecting it.

I shall continue to read the remark of that person, who wrote in *Le Droit*, and I quote:

> The bill has been studied in committee... but what kind of a study was that! If you look at the 24 booklets of the standing committee on health and welfare, you will notice that the fundamental question was studied very superficially. Individuals and groups came before the committee to give their opinion but, not a single expert was called in. In its last report—that it did not want to be final—the committee asked to be allowed a more thorough study. But it was not allowed to do so since even before the committee was called, Bill C-195—

—which has since become Bill C-150—

> —was drafted and brought down in the house before the first report of the committee on health, in December 1967.
>
> I had the opportunity to attend several sittings of the committee of justice and legal affairs and to read the proceedings of other sittings.
>
> A serious study? No, a farce. The committee, with a Liberal majority, of course, decided to call six witnesses at the most to inform members and still the witnesses were not to discuss the subject matter. The Liberal members did everything possible to prevent the doctors from the Association of Hospital Medical Boards—

I am not saying it: this statement appeared in the newspaper *Le Droit* last Monday.

—to prevent the doctors from the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards from presenting facts likely to dispel the far too obvious ignorance of the members.

And the word "Liberal" was left out. The hon. member for Mercier was treated with much consideration.

Following the committee study, 44 amendments to the Criminal Code were moved. Will a single one be accepted? I do not think so, according to the result of the votes recorded in the official report of the House of Commons' debates.

You propose new rules—

—and there, reference is made to the remarks of the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané).

—propose new rules and rigid ones to control proceedings in the house. I am dumbfounded. Is it not enough that some members are not free to vote according to their judgment on questions of such importance? Do you want also that several others be limited in their right to speak?

• (4:40 p.m.)

—We have such poor democracy and I am very disappointed to see that the media, which in my opinion should see to it that democracy operates at its best, are so anxious to praise a government where men are mere puppets.

Mrs. Marie-Paule Doyle, Lucerne.

And this is very close to Ottawa. There is another statement from someone in Ottawa.

As an answer, we had our ears plugged with three or four statements to the effect that on June 25 the vote gave the majority to a government allowing legalization of abortion and homosexuality.

So, I will quote from the text—because it seems that nobody understands and it has been quoted already—so that Liberal members will know—as it comes from a Liberal—that people precisely did not vote for abortion or homosexuality. They merely voted to follow "trudeaumania".

The chairman of the Liberal Association of the Ottawa-Carleton county, Mr. J. M. McGuinty, relinquished his post on Wednesday, by way of protest against the intentions of the government on abortion.

Mr. McGuinty, who teaches English at the University of Ottawa, considers unacceptable the procedure that was followed for the introduction of the amendments to the Criminal Code in the House of Commons. "Those who voted in favour of the Liberal party at the last election surely were not under the impression that they were supporting abortion", the outgoing chairman stated.

The statement is not ours, but that of the chairman of the Ottawa-Carleton County Liberal Association.

When partisans of the Liberal party make such statements, I think that the hon. member for Mercier, the hon. member for Papineau and the hon. member for Matane should rise and quote them, for, like us, they have read about Mr. McGuinty's resignation in the newspapers—he is a Liberal county chairman. That is why I find it unthinkable that a majority government should wish to silence us when we suggest an amendment which requests a six month's hoist so that all Canadian people could study our bill and, through some kind of referendum, express their point of view after having discovered how things really stand.

"Besides", added Mr. McGuinty, "I strongly blame the government for having refused a free vote to the members of the house. That is simply a matter of conscience". In his opinion, a good number of people do not understand or misinterpret the bill under study. Few people realize that this bill will authorize the killing of an unborn child. According to Mr. McGuinty, the amendments to the Criminal Code should have been made the subject of more consultations among the population, through political agencies, before it was introduced in the House of Commons. "Under the circumstances", he says, "I feel it my duty to tender my resignation as chairman of the Ottawa-Carleton County Liberal Association.

Such cases undeniably prove to us that the majority government through its intransigency is now making a mistake and that it would be most logical to accept the amendment we brought in this afternoon because when legislation comes before parliament I always ask myself the following question: What are its purposes?

And, furthermore, with the amendments we are bringing in, what role can such legislation play in this parliament or in Canada which we want as big as our ambitions?

1. We ask that as a whole it should contribute first of all to the solution of the general problems that even honest citizens cannot solve alone.

2. Protect the legitimate interests of the individuals.

3. See beyond the individuals who, too often, are thinking of their immediate comfort instead of the general welfare.

4. Any legislation must protect the weak against themselves and against the strong

who could take advantage of them, and especially protect the young who are building the future.

5. To support the parents in such a way, because they have the first rights within society, as well as educators, social workers, clergymen who are co-operating with the parents and this, even in the case of older children considered as emancipated.

6. Any legislation must strengthen the respect of every individual for society, the legislature and the police.

7. In short, any legislation must promote the development of the traditional civilization of the country; in ours, whether we like or not, it is the Christian civilization.

The authorities must avoid being partial to individualistic or extravagant views or practices considered by the citizens at large as being abnormal or immoral; they must also avoid relaxing precautions against evils of all kinds; or displaying a naive confidence in the adult mentality of a whole community, or compelling legislators to abnegate publicly their moral and religious convictions to support the party in those fields, or finally promoting the propaganda of perverts, because perhaps later, some will probably want to legalize that advertising method of perverts and nudists.

But can we not foresee that such a legislation, when passed, will miss its aim going beyond it and thus will complicate the role of justice?

We are really threatened by an epidemic, because it is not really a constructive, legal and traditional right, but a rather unsatiated passion.

There is actually a fresh outbreak of those venereal diseases, especially in countries advocating hedonism.

It is therefore essential that all those interested in the common good, especially the young and those who fear that public decency may become again an empty word or some hypocrisy, lodge some protests, either individually or as group, against the legislation in its present form. And if one claims that the present legislation cannot be applied adequately, it should be understood that the very transition from clandestine to almost officially approved status is a particularly dangerous matter, which must be handled with great discretion.

It is suggested in the proposed legislation. A contagious disease does not require only the sympathy of the public and of physicians, but rather severe repression, very painful quarantine, from which everybody will benefit: the sick, the public and the physicians. If some people, by their greediness and their ignorance of elementary decency, remain perpetual children, they cannot be granted all the privileges of adulthood. Besides, barriers will make them less unhappy than would their uncontrolled corruption: in that case, severity is kindness, while weakness or broadness of mind is cruelty and grave imprudence.

Besides, I often ask myself when I think about this proposal to legalize homosexuality and abortion: Have we ever seen contagion cure tuberculosis? On the contrary, sanatoriums were built so that patients could be isolated, as should be done with homosexuals, and thus allow for an earlier recovery and eventual eradication of the disease, as in the case of tuberculosis.

As for abortion, wanted by no one in Canada, as evidenced by the thousands of protests we have received, I hope that finally, through a free vote and the motion that has been proposed, the two amendments on the legalization of abortion and homosexuality will be put off for six months, so that Canadians will be able to study them. Personally, I think that since we are Christians we have been created not to offend God with acts contrary to His commandments, but rather to worship Him, to thank Him for the blessings of our life on earth, to give Him proof by acts of charity, to show Him our gratitude and to thank Him each day of the lives that are ours only temporarily. And the judgment He will pass at the end of our lives will decide of our eternal happiness or unhappiness.

Unfortunately, in this house, the opposite is happening. For instance, it is inconceivable to read in the newspaper *La Presse*, in January 1969, that our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has said that he has been baptized and that he goes to church, and yet he produced this famous omnibus bill in 1967 when he was Minister of Justice.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Having been elected leader of the Liberal party, then Prime Minister on June 25 1968, he passed it on to the present Minister of Justice to have it baptized with the members of the house as godfathers and the same people of our country as godmothers, although 92 per cent are Christian.

I tell you, it is a shame, it is downgrading, and I shall quote from page 5406 of *Hansard* of February 11, 1969:

I would remind hon. members that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), when introducing this legislation, virtually disclaimed any responsibility for the measure. Indeed, he was almost apologetic when he presented the bill to the house. He told us specifically that it was the Prime Minister's bill, and I do not doubt he repeated that three or four times... this bill is not going to take any little trip with the support of my vote, and I take this stand because along with thousands of other Canadians I want to see—

—that bill put off for six months. I think this will throw some light on the matter, because we have in hand a statement issued by the Canadian Episcopate appealing to the conscience of everybody and especially to the conscience of doctors, lawyers, politicians and anyone connected with public life and public opinion, in order that this matter and its consequences be dealt with as carefully as possible.

To give all those people only six months to make a thorough study of the matter, I do not think this is asking too much, for any responsible Canadian, since, right now only one per cent of the Canadian population is interested in the matters of abortion and homosexuality.

Let us put the bill aside for six months. Much more pressing questions should be studied first, so that by withdrawing the bill or leaving it in abeyance for six months, we shall be able to adopt legislations that would enable each Canadian to enjoy a better life in a better Canada.

Further the freedom to vote according to one's conscience and to one's religious beliefs for each hon. member, for those at least who believe in God, not for men who believe neither in God nor in the devil like some kind of atheists. With this bill, the government is trying to abolish the fifth Commandment: "Thou shalt not kill."

So, hon. members, I ask you to ponder these things, before the Supreme Being and to remember that one day you will be called upon to account for your actions and for the way in which you have discharged your responsibilities. The people of Canada have not elected you to office to see you abolish the Commandments.

I would favour a six month's hoist and if, by that time, a majority of Canadians is for the bill, we shall bow to the will of the people. But we know that 98 per cent of the population would reject this bill if this postponement was agreed to and if the protests that, in a democracy, the people have a right to make, reached all 264 members.

If a human being has any rights at all, Mr. Speaker, the most important one, in my view, is the right to life. Without it, he has none. The right to life is the first one on which all other rights depend. That is implicit in any declaration of human rights, but the proposed amendments to legislation dealing with abortion do not recognize this fact.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes that everyone has the right to life, liberty and the security of person.

The Canadian Bill of Rights guarantees the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property.

Those two documents also state that all human beings are equal before the law.

The proposed changes to the Criminal Code deny this equality, by giving to medical committees an arbitrary power which they do not want, an arbitrary power of life or death over as yet unborn human beings. They also go against the United Nations' declaration of the rights of the child which says that children have a right to our protection "before birth as well as after birth."

In Canada, the promoters of the campaign for abortion started a few years ago by asking only for limited changes in the law. One of these, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and I am quoting an elector in my county, once said before a parliamentary committee, in 1967 "that we should set a limit somewhere". Today, however, he is asking us to erase any mention of abortion in the Criminal Code.

Whatever the Minister of Justice may say and whatever his purpose may be, this government bill points to the way of no return.

Do you want to be responsible for putting our country on the way to abortion on request?

Abortion is a crime because it destroys human life. If you want to tolerate the destruction of human life for the benefit of another human being's health, why not do it for other reasons as well?

If you will admit abortion for health reasons, on the strength of what logic can you refuse legalized abortion on request?

Even in a pluralist society, the first duty of the state is to protect human life. When a bill goes against that principle, a member has the obligation of opposing it.

In the eyes of some members, the present government plans may seem erroneously

moderate. In fact, however, it has been proved that similar changes are only a first step. In Colorado, for instance, a similar act has led to a considerable increase in hospital abortions without reducing the number of illegal abortions. Moreover, this is but the start.

A few countries have passed even more permissive legislation, going as far as legalizing abortion on request. Almost all however started by legalizing abortion for so-called health reasons.

This is what was done in Sweden, in 1921. Later, in 1938, abortion for social reasons, "eugenics" and other reasons became possible. In 1946, the act became even more tolerant.

In Poland too, abortion was first legalized for vague medical reasons. In 1956, these reasons went so far as to include social reasons; today, in Poland, reasons for abortion are amongst the most permissive in the world.

Last year, the British permissive act came into effect as a result of a series of legal rulings which, in fact, legalized abortion for health reasons. The first of these rulings was given in 1938 and since, pressures have grown ceaselessly to legalize abortion on request.

Every argument in favour of broadening the laws on abortion is based on one or the other of the following assumptions: a) that the child that is not yet born is not a human being; b) that certain human beings have less value than others and, hence, that they can be sacrificed.

The proposed changes to our laws on abortion were defended as a compromise or accommodation solution. But when it is a question of fundamental values, there is no place for compromise, especially when nobody is forced to compromise. One of these fundamental values is the respect that we own human life itself.

What enlightened person would accept a compromise legislation authorizing execution without trial? This was, in certain places, a popular practice sanctioned by the conscience of the community. In this case, would a democratic government accept to legalize this kind of murder, if that is the wish of the local community?

What the government proposed is a law on abortion left to local interpretation, when it allows the killing of a human being for reasons of health which it feels need not be defined.

[Mr. Dumont.]

By the amendment we have introduced, we could, within six months, have it examined by every intermediary body, every association in order to enlighten the people.

• (5:00 p.m.)

In fact, no later than at the beginning of this week, on my way to Ottawa, I listened to a radio program and the announcer, the son of a judge, was asking this question to the people: "Are you in favour of the stand taken by the Ralliement Créditiste?" I will say in passing that he is a good Liberal. He added: "When the life of the mother is in danger, are you in favour of abortion?"

As asked, the question will necessarily be answered this way: "We want to save the life of the mother". In our teaching as Christians, this is something sacred, a mother who has understood how great is her role, namely giving her life for another life. This is something very noble, very great which, as Christians, we accept and the mothers even accept to give their life, and in the possibility of the mother and the child dying lies the final proof.

During this program I heard the statement of a man who had known very well the lamented Father Lelièvre. He stated that Father Lelièvre had come from France where the doctors had stated: The mother must have an abortion because she is going to die and the son to be born will die too. The mother was saved, the son was born and we have known, in the province of Quebec, Father Lelièvre who preached to us the Catholic faith we are not ashamed to state openly, provided us with closed retreats and did so much for society.

In the face of past experience I say to all hon. members of this house that they should require as soon as possible from an uncompromising Prime Minister the right to a free vote, as the Leader of the Opposition who does not make much noise finally agreed, behind the curtains, to allow his colleagues to vote freely on this omnibus bill. Let them find people who will call upon our prime minister to have the same thing on the part of Liberal members, so that we may at last know exactly the truth.

I also read in *Hansard* the statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), the only female member here. I can say to that lady, if she thinks we believe the mothers are only fit for having children, on the contrary, I say that with a loving heart, we want our wives, for they will continue to produce geniuses throughout

world, to be put on a pedestal, we want to upgrade the mother's role, we want to show to the whole world and especially Canada for Christiandom still exists as an authority—that with a loving heart, we sympathize with her, but we sympathize also with our wives and also because the wives, the mothers, in short the person who has understood that the most significant thing is to give birth to someone, to another life, that we understand each other and will go far while setting an example to the whole world.

In concluding, if all the members from outside of Quebec are under the impression that we are causing too much trouble to the federal Minister of Justice, let us turn over these amendments to the Criminal Code to the Minister of Justice of the province of Quebec.

The Exchequer Court of the province of Quebec could adopt, apart from the Christian and catholic principles we are defending, legislation against abortion and homosexuality in accordance with our beliefs and the federal parliament would not have to bother with the problems of the predominantly Catholic people that we are in Quebec. Besides, I cannot see why the government, and especially the Quebec Minister of Justice, so touchy as regards the Ste. Scholastique airport, for instance, did not protest, on behalf of the government, against this shameful law intended to downgrade Canada and which points to a degeneration of our people.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, I support the amendment and I say to all members that a decision will be made after the vote is taken on a logical amendment that does not altogether do away with the bill. We simply ask that everything be postponed for six months. Considering the thousands of protests we have received from everywhere, we urge all Canadians to join forces in order to be tomorrow the inspiration of the whole world by rejecting this shameful bill and by asking that it be postponed for six months. At that time, indeed, everybody will agree to take into account thousands of protestats which will keep coming in for the next six months and to remove this act from our Canadian statutes forever.

**Mr. Boulanger:** Mr. Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. Does the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) wish to direct a question to the hon. member for Frontenac?



**Mr. Boulanger:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. member for Frontenac allow a question?

**Mr. Dumont:** Surely.

**Mr. Boulanger:** Since I was going to speak in a few minutes and I have a notion that I will lose my turn, I shall wait a little. I wanted to ask him a question then, but I will do it now.

When you were talking of the supreme sacrifice of a mother who must give her life for another life, would you be ready to do the same?

**Mr. Dumont:** Mr. Speaker, this is a very good question. We do not have the opportunity to hear very often the hon. member for Mercier; he would rather whisper, but for once, he asked a logical question. I even tell him that I would be prepared to die because it is my role to defend the cause of Social Credit, which will ensure freedom and security to one and all.

[*English*]

**Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Cardigan):** Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to speak at any great length on this amendment. As a matter of fact, I am prompted to speak for only two reasons. My first reason is to make it clear on the record why I am voting against this bill. My second reason, also an important one, is to try to correct some possible misconceptions which may have arisen following the minister's statement yesterday. I refer to one portion of his statement as it appears at page 8575 of *Hansard* where the minister said:

> I have drawn these matters to the attention of hon. members to emphasize the fact that, despite what has been said, where the amendments proposed before the standing committee that gave this bill detailed scrutiny were constructive and were improvements they were accepted by the government.

I am a member of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. It was my privilege to sit through practically all of the sessions during which this bill was discussed.

I have reviewed the minutes of the proceedings as they are reported and I find there were a total of 44 amendments submitted to the committee. The minister said yesterday there were 42, but I think if he rechecks he will find there were 44. Of the 44 amendments which were submitted, 30 were passed. It is interesting to note that of the 44 proposed amendments submitted to the committee, 28 were submitted by supporters of the government and 16 were submitted by members of

this party. Of the 28 submitted by supporters of the government, 25 were allowed to pass. Of the 16 submitted by members of our party, only 5 were allowed to pass. I have examined the 28 amendments that were submitted by government supporters and I find, they were very minor. I think everyone is prepared to admit that the gut issues under discussion before the committee with respect to this bill involved the sections dealing with abortion and homosexuality.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Would the hon. member permit a question? Is he prepared to recognize that the statistics he has cited indicate that members of the government party did their homework in preparation for the study of this bill?

**Mr. McQuaid:** I am not so naïve to believe that was the reason these amendments were passed. I have not been in this house very long, but I have been in politics long enough to realize just what goes on within the government caucus. The real issues in this bill were the clauses which dealt with abortion and homosexuality. Twelve of the 16 amendments submitted by our party dealt with these gut issues. I suggest that is the reason they were not adopted and were defeated by the government majority on that committee. I am not finding fault with the committee system. As a matter of fact, I want to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Tolmie) who chaired the committee. He did an exceptionally fine job and was very fair in his rulings. I find no fault with the committee system and I am not complaining about it. I am merely pointing out that the 28 amendments submitted by government supporters were minor amendments. Not one of them dealt with what I call the real gut issues of this bill.

I agree that one of our amendments, introduced by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave), was adopted by the committee. Of the 16 submitted by our party, only 5 were allowed. I have worked it out on a percentage basis. Of the amendments submitted by government members, 89 per cent were passed by the government majority on the committee and only 31 per cent of those submitted by our party were passed. As I say, of the 16 amendments submitted by our party 12 dealt with what I consider to be the gut issues of the bill, but only one of them was allowed to pass.

• (5:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Would the hon. member permit another question? Will he admit with respect to the amendments which were proposed by government members, which I will not admit were merely minor, that they gained the support not only of government members on the committee but pretty uniformly of members from all parties on the committee?

**Mr. McQuaid:** I think that is a fair statement, Mr. Speaker, although I must say that some of the amendments submitted by government members were passed on division. However, to my way of thinking the most significant thing is that all of the amendments dealing with the gut issues of the bill, with the exception of one, were defeated by the government majority on the committee.

On the very first day the committee met, March 4, the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacEwan) moved a motion that the committee agree to prepare and make four separate reports in relation to (a) abortion, (b) homosexuality and gross indecency, (c) lotteries and gambling and (d) all the remaining clauses. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness why was that motion not allowed? If it had been a lot of the discussion we have been subjected to during the last 12 or 15 days could have been avoided. I suggest that his request was not unreasonable because if ever there was a bill introduced into this house that could be conveniently broken down into sections and reported in that way this was that bill. The suggestion of the hon. member for Central Nova provided a very convenient breakdown of the bill. If it had been accepted and if a free vote had been allowed, much of the discussion we are having today could have been avoided, and the house could be carrying on with other pending business which urgently needs to be dealt with. In all fairness to the committee system, I suggest that so far as the consideration of this bill was concerned the substantial amendments submitted by us had about as much chance of surviving as the proverbial snowball in hell.

Let me return briefly to the second reason which prompted me to enter the debate at this time. That reason is my desire to make it abundantly clear on the record why I cannot support the bill. I agree with many of the provisions of this bill. I would like to see many of them enacted as law because I think they are of substantial value to the people of Canada. I speak of such things as the tightening of the regulations with respect to firearms, the breathalyzer test, harassing telephone calls, bail, parole, our system of trial

by jury, and probation. These are all very worth-while amendments and they are changes I would like to see incorporated in the law.

But the unfortunate part is that in order to approve these very commendable and worthwhile amendments I also have to vote approval of a law which, when enacted, will make a direct attack on human life, and this is why I cannot find myself able to do so. This is rather unfair. This is one of the reasons the bill should have been divided, so that I could have voted against those things with which I do not agree and voted for those parts of the bill which I would like to see enacted as law.

This bill has been called a high point in penal reform. Some portions of it do constitute a high point in penal reform, but I say that those portions which will make it easier to secure abortions are indeed a tragedy and represent the government's abdication of its responsibility for the protection of Canada's unborn citizens. Modern medicine and biology leave no reasonable doubt at all but that abortion does destroy human life. If somebody can satisfy me that abortion does not destroy human life, that to abort a woman even in the early weeks of pregnancy is not murder, then I would be inclined to think the other way. But everything I have read to date indicates without question of doubt that life does begin at conception. This has been attested to by every standard textbook on the subject that has been printed.

Many times during this debate the argument has been advanced that less stringent laws are needed in order to halt the traffic in illegal abortions or backroom butchery, as the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) called it the other day. Very lurid stories have been recounted of quack abortionists preying on innocent women at a staggering cost in maternal life. But I suggest that the facts are quite different. There is not a scrap of evidence to support the very inflated guesses, apparently used for their shock value, as to the number of illegal abortions and the deaths that result therefrom.

There are no statistics in which we can have confidence as to the number of criminal abortions performed in Canada, but we have statistics as to the number of deaths which occur as a result of criminal abortion. These statistics are prepared by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and I suggest they are reasonably accurate because on every certificate of death a doctor is required to state the cause of death. From an examination of these statistics, Mr. Speaker, one can see that for the years 1964, 1965 and 1966 the number of deaths in all Canada by reason of illegal abortions was only 27.

I share the concern of some hon. members over the fact that there are some illegal abortions. I do not think we can deny this. But I submit that the provisions of this bill are not necessarily going to stop them, and this is conclusively proven by the figures obtained from those countries where abortion has already been legalized. As a matter of fact, on the contrary there is evidence that permissive laws increase the number of illegal abortions rather than cut them down. If you want an example all you have to do is to look at what is taking place in Hungary.

The argument is also advanced that by widening the laws on abortion we will improve the status of women. This argument was advanced by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. I seriously suggest to hon. members that you do not improve the status of women by destroying the rights of other human beings, and when we widen the laws on abortion this is actually what we are doing. We are endangering the lives of other human beings because, as I say, it has been conclusively proven by medical evidence that a foetus is a living human being, and I suggest that to destroy it is nothing more or less than cold-blooded murder. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that it will be a dark day for Canada when this proposed amendment passes, as I presume it will pass by reason of the large government majority.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Air Canada—strike of mechanics—availability of alternative modes of travel; the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir)—Shipping—change in registration of *Cape Breton Miner;* the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose)—Post Office Department—Prince Rupert—monitoring telephone calls.

• (5:20 p.m.)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### CRIMINAL CODE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner that Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be read the third time and do pass, and the amendment of Mr. Matte.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilles Marceau (Lapointe):** Mr. Speaker, after long discussion, and interesting exchange of views, we are nearing the time when we shall have to make a decision regarding the bill under consideration.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we should try to do away with emotionalism and appeal, to reason, if possible.

I do not for a moment suppose that my decision is the only one that might have been made on that legislation. I do not delude myself into the belief either that I have the monopoly of truth, and I am ready to accept the arguments of those who take a different view of this legislation.

Even if we do not share the same political allegiance, we should have enough respect for each other to realize that we are here for the same purpose, that is, to help the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, in the next minutes, I should like to give you the reasons which, in my opinion, may explain the choice I shall have to make. So as to avoid any misunderstanding I must say that I am a Catholic, a practising Catholic not as perfect perhaps as I should be, and not always setting the example as I should, but as a church-goer, I recognize in the house that the Catholic doctrine as set forth by Vatican II is quite clear. In fact, it boils down to this: Life must be safeguarded with extreme care from the very moment of conception. Any direct destruction of life in the mother's womb is immoral. No civil law can change the moral law which we must obey.

Mr. Speaker, it should be recognized, I believe, that the bill under study raises several moral problems. And at this time we have to ask ourselves whether we are in this house

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

to protect some religion, to endorse some beliefs, or to pass legislation.

This question, Mr. Speaker, can be readily answered. We are here to vote pieces of legislation. In some respects, they may come in conflict with the religious beliefs of some people. Yet, it is then we have the opportunity, faced with different opinions and beliefs, to stand united and cast aside our partisanship and our intolerance towards other Canadians who do not share our views.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time we made some sincere effort and showed that we want Canada to extend from sea to sea, a country where people will have the right to live according to the beliefs they think are the best.

I have followed the debate with great interest and I feel that my friends from the Ralliement créditiste cannot accuse me of having turned a deaf ear to them.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, as a representative of a Quebec constituency, that I was proud at times to see people from my own province who were able to rise and deal eloquently and convincingly with such an important subject and thereby show that there still exist people willing to defend themselves and above all, to fight for moral principles.

However, I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that my admiration may have stopped there. I would have hoped that the members of the Ralliement créditiste would have made this essential distinction, between religion and the law, between sin and crime.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the intervention made a moment ago by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Ricard) who, in a few sincere words has given us the answer to all the objections raiced by the opposition. He said in a flight of oratory that he could not distinguish between religion and the law and that therefore he had to leave the matter to the religious authorities.

Mr. Speaker, when one mixes religion and the law, one shirks one's responsibilities as a legislator.

Mr. Speaker, I have wondered whether as a Christian legislator, I should vote for or against what the Church approves or disapproves.

Consequently, I attempted to make some research in order to find documents that might enlighten me and help me to take a honest decision, a decision consistent with an opinion of my own, arrived at with the help of serious works of reference.

Thus, I chanced upon a statement made in 1966 by English bishops and concerning abortion. After giving a brief summary of the Catholic doctrine of which I spoke a moment ago, here is an excerpt from this text, and I quote:

A number of citizen do not accept the Catholic position. We do not doubt their sincerity and we understand perfectly their wish to bring to the present legislation amendments that would protect women against those who are called "back-alley abortionists".

Catholics do not want their convictions to become the law of the land. They only ask that doctors, nurses and those who could be affected by the bill, should not be requested to act against their conscience.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when my friends of the Ralliement Créditiste are trying—quite sincerely I know—to force their views upon us, they are going much farther than the bishops themselves.

I have already stated that I was against abortion and against any measure which could encourage homosexuality in any way. I was basing my opinion on moral and religious grounds. I am still of the same opinion.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I have carried my research further and I found two texts from which I would like to quote a few excerpts. I believe they have helped me reach a decision. The first is taken from a document prepared by a committee of theologians of Laval and was published in the June 13, 1968 issue of *L'Église du Québec*. This is a summary of what it say:

Civil law must serve the commonweal of the body politic. It must undoubtedly draw its inspiration from the fundamental imperatives of unwritten law, but it cannot adjust itself to them to the extent of prescribing all that is relevant to it and of forbidding all that is contrary to it. In other words, political commonweal does not require that every moral fault be considered as a violation of the law.

It must also be pointed out that a so-called permissive law may be preferable to a limitative law if it promotes the commonweal while respecting the various religious faiths, opinions, mental habits or customs.

Finally, another part of this text seems to apply more particularly to the present case. It is said and I quote:

All citizens do not share the same opinions on morality standards. The legislator does not legislate for a given group, but for the whole political community. It follows that we can, as a matter of conscience, as Catholics, disapprove amoral acts while admitting that a legislation which condones them may be justified.

The second text I would like to quote, and which also seems to give us general guidelines on the decision we have to make is the evidence given by the Canadian Catholic Conference before the standing committee on health, welfare and social affairs. I will not quote the whole evidence, but only extracts which helped me to answer the question I posed myself as a Christian legislator: What should be my position about that bill?

I quote:

To place the role of the legislator in its true perspective, and avoid any misunderstanding, we will call upon the teachings of the recent Vatican II Council—

—This Constitution is predicated upon a simple and evident truth, that the same persons are at the same time members of the religious community, the Church, and of the political community. The political community and the Church are both "at the service of the personal and social calling of the same men."

The ideal then is that they should seek for the good of all a sound co-operation, taking into consideration the circumstances of time and place.

I continue with the quotation.

The Church is aware that its role and responsibilities are totally different from those of the political community. It is thus important that members of the congregation always clearly distinguish "between the actions they take in their own name, as citizens, alone or as a group, and the actions they take in the name of the Church in agreement with their pastors."

However, in the political community—according to the teachings of the Council—Christians must act in their own name, as citizens."

In view of the economy of salvation itself, members of the congregation will learn to distinguish clearly between the rights and duties which fall on them as members of the Church and those which lie with them as members of the human society.

Here is a quotation which seems to me, Mr. Speaker,—with all due respect—very much to the point.

I go on with the quotation:

Besides—is it even necessary to stress the point—the teachings of the Church do not pervade the technical aspects of social and political matters. It still remains the responsibility of the legislators to devise concrete means to adopt their convictions to the often complex situations of daily life. They must not wait passively for the Church to come to their rescue in this regard; but on the contrary, they must—in co-operation with their colleagues—seek effective means to promote the commonweal, more particularly through the drafting and the enactment of wise and fair laws.

In the light of the texts of Vatican II that I have just quoted, the answer to the question I asked at the beginning of my remarks

seems to me obvious enough. As a matter of fact, I find it further in the quotation:

A Christian legislator must make his own decisions. The criterion of his actions as a legislator is not first and foremost the interest of a religious group, but rather the commonweal . . . Members of Parliament have a temporal responsibility. They may vote, and in practice they often do, according to what the Church prohibits or approves, because the things prohibited or approved by the Church are often closely related to the common good.

But they have no obligation to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I think that faced by the rules of conduct laid down by the Bishops, I feel quite at liberty to state before this house that even if I am not in favour of the moral and religious aspects of the two most controversial parts of this bill I can, as a Canadian member of a pluralistic society and out of respect for those who do not share my religious beliefs, allow them to use a legislation which they find to their advantage.

I do not think that this leglislation, as the minister said, will be forced upon anybody in our constituencies. It will remain optional and left to the decision of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that my religion forces me, to say to a pregnant woman who does not share my religious beliefs but who thinks she has a right to get an abortion: "You are not a Roman Catholic, I will not allow that law to help you".

• (5:40 p.m.)

I think that in dealing with homosexuality, it was not mentioned that in spite of the amendments, gross indecency is still a criminal act which may be punished by five years in jail.

And the amendment which will enable consenting adults to do certain acts in private, only confirms the inviolability of private life. When the attention of the members of this house is drawn to the cases in which such a principle has led to inevitable abuses, too much stress is put on isolated facts, which may unfortunately be too numerous, this may cause us to forget the principle upon which all the people in this house agree upon, namely that the private life of people is sacred.

Everything that happens in private is not necessarily moral, but the law, and especially the Criminal Code, must not be brought into play. People must certainly keep on following the dictates of their conscience, so that this act will not become overly permissive.

It is obvious that this act will have to be used in moderation and construed in the most restrictive manner.

[Mr. Marceau.]

Before concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the conclusion of an editorial by Mr. Claude Ryan in *Le Devoir* of April 23, 1969:

In a few words, Mr. Ryan gives us some guidelines in connection with the bill which seem to me very appropriate, and I quote:

Human law may allow many things, and, all things considered, it is better that it should allow more than less.

But the real criterium of the human life is still the conscience of the citizens rather than the law. We may always, if we are not satisfied with that legislation, continue to act according to our conscience. It is at that level that we finally find the quality of a civilization.

I therefore believe, Mr. Speaker, that I have stated some grounds serious enough to indicate to the members of this house that I am firmly convinced that with that basic distinction between morals and the law, the Canadians can apply a legislation which they consider right.

The future will tell us the results of that action. I think that we belong to a government which was elected, because the people were confident that we would take forward-looking action and decisions, in short, that we would assume our responsibilities instead of dilly-dallying three or six months.

When we were elected, the population knew that we would adopt this legislation. I think it is my duty to endorse this policy but I repeat what I said earlier: from a moral point of view I accept the religious teachings. I find it said that we must choose among the various moral convictions of Canadians, but we have to consider the beliefs of the majority of Canadians and the previous votes of the house.

I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I waited to see what would be the results of the previous votes on abortion and homosexuality. They clearly indicate that a great majority of members of the house voted for abortion and for what is called homosexuality, but what, in fact is a measure to protect the private life of people.

From what I learnt, I have to convince myself that I live, not in a province, but in a country, that I have to accept its customs and beliefs and that I may, while having strong moral reservations, give the government a support which I hope will be of some use.

I shall not be among those who will hide behind the curtains when the vote comes. I do not think my constituents would be proud

of me if I decided to be away and to take a long trip at the time of voting.

I shall be there and shall vote as I feel best. It may be a mistake but at least I shall have the courage to take a stand after having duly pondered over it and considered some aspects of the question.

I now take advantage of the circumstances to congratulate the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) for his way of dealing with the government members while the bill was under consideration. I am one of those who, at a certain time, have voted against an amendment the hon. Minister of Justice had approved. That amendment was rejected and the minister accepted this decision. This proves that freedom does indeed exist, inside the Liberal party. We are subject to attacks which, I think, are unfair. The Minister of Justice has done a very good job indeed and if the law is passed, I think it will help to improve the condition of every Canadian.

[*English*]

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, I have some short comments to make on two or three of the more controversial aspects of the bill. First of all I should like to speak for a few minutes on abortion. I will not put forward any ideas or enter into a discussion of the philosophy underlying abortion or whether or not it should be legalized. In my experience, which has been considerable in this field, there are two groups of people: Those who are in favour of legalizing abortion and those who are against it. There is no middle ground. We can only say that both sides tolerate each other. I may say that I belong to the group of people who believe that abortions should be permitted under certain circumstances.

I should like to congratulate the minister on making changes to the bill as it came from the committee and, specifically, on changing the definition of a hospital where abortions may be performed by the addition of the words, "approved hospitals". This is a good change because without it a good many Canadians would not have been able to have this service at a hospital of their choice, since not every hospital is necessarily accredited. It might well be that the term "accredited hospital" should have been entirely removed.

I should like also to comment on the establishment of an abortion committee consisting of three members. I feel this is unnecessarily cumbersome and is not in the best interests of Canadians. Having decided that abortions should be legalized, and they have always been legal under certain circumstances, we are now setting up a cumbersome mechanism to control them. Previously, most hospitals required an attending physician plus a consultant in good standing to rule on whether or not abortions should be performed. At present in all hospitals there are standards committees, which are becoming more highly organized, to guard against deviations from normal practice. Any physician who tends to perform what is considered to be too many abortions is told that his standards are too lenient. Under the proposed law there will be a three man abortion committee, apart from the attending physician who looks after the patient. This is a very cumbersome method because it involves so many people. As a general rule in medicine consultations are taken between two doctors, and this works quite well. The addition of two more doctors will result in complications and a duplication of functions. I suppose the idea behind this provision is that it would be best for three people not associated with the patient or the physician to decide whether or not an abortion should be performed. However, I should point out that there is nothing to indicate that three people will do any better than the two normally required, namely the physician who knows the patient and his consulting colleague. The medical efficacy of such a method is open to question. I would also like to point out that the fact the attending physician is not to be a member of the committee means that the person who knows best whether or not an abortion should be carried out will have no say in the matter.

• (5:50 p.m.)

So, I feel that this is a retrograde step which will not be in the best interests of the patient. Under modern medical practice the lives of very few patients are endangered by abortions, although the opposite has been argued. There are, however, a great many places which fall within this terminology "endangering a patient's health". Here, many factors need to be taken into consideration; it is a matter of relativity. I feel the transfer of responsibility from the patient's own physician to an abortion committee is not a good step from a purely medical point of view. The committee procedure now suggested is necessarily cumbersome and makes it harder to arrive at a decision. This, to some extent, endangers the life of a patient and it certainly increases the complications which may arise. Abortions should be carried out before the

eighth week of pregnancy has been completed. From a practical point of view very little time is provided for a patient to present herself, have a bed found for her in a hospital and collect three people to decide whether or not it would be in her interest to carry out an abortion. Physicians are busy people; they move around a great deal in hospitals and outside them, and many of them are away at any given time.

Delay in carrying out this procedure would no doubt lead to some increase in mortality and to a considerably greater increase in morbidity, or associated complications. In my opinion, abortion committees will not function well in practice. It is well known that bad laws are always circumvented and then to become sealed off to prevent them from causing too much difficulty. I feel the abortion committees will take either a hard line or a soft line approach. I am inclined to think that for practical purposes the procedure will often consist of the patient signing a consultation form on her way past the hospital desk and that much of the value which the Department of Justice no doubt believes this amendment to contain will be lost. As I say, the committees will probably not function very well in practice and it might have been better to have retained the original idea of acting on the advice of a physician and one consulting colleague. In countries such as Sweden, where liberal abortion laws exist, complications are considerably higher in areas in which cumbersome abortion committees have to be consulted.

Then again, cumbersome abortion laws tend to discourage patients from seeking care along ethical medical lines; they tend to gravitate to the so-called criminal abortionists —abortionists who are often very good from a purely medical point of view. As a society I am sure we would like to have these patients cared for in our hospitals where those who are entitled to receive this service will be able to do so under the control of reasonable laws. My own feeling is that this abortion committee arrangement is too cumbersome. There is no evidence that it will lead to a reduction in numbers of abortions. In the case of country hospitals it will be difficult to find four physicians to fulfil this function, particularly since many of them do not feel they are able to serve on such committees.

In essence, the legislation before us brings about no significant change in the abortion laws apart from the provision for setting up these committees. Nothing has been said about population control, a subject which I believe we shall eventually have to consider. Nor does the bill permit abortion at the request of the women concerned—something which various groups in our society consider to be reasonable.

Again, this new abortion law does not in any way increase the chances of abortions being performed. There is no reason to suppose the number of abortions will be greater in future than those already being carried out in accordance with certain ethical standards. Perhaps the necessity of abortion laws draws attention to the failure of our society to prevent unwanted pregnancies. Perhaps the legislation which has recently been introduced in this field will do much more to look after the problem than either this bill or the discussion which has taken place during the last week or so. The piece of legislation we are considering does not in any way alter the indications for abortion, while making it much more cumbersome to have abortions carried out. Indeed, the amendment concerning abortion might well have been left in abeyance for all the value it really represents.

I should like to speak for a few moments, now, on the breathalizer test proposal which has been hailed as a great advance by many people. In England, presumably, such a provision was very effective in cutting down the number of accidents, and the introduction of the system into this country has received widespread support.

I am in agreement with this proposal but at the same time I do not believe we can expect it to have any marked effect in cutting down the number of accidents. I would refer hon. members to a news item which appeared in the Winnipeg *Tribune* of April 5, 1969, under a London dateline. This article reads:

> The ministry of transport has reported a heavy increase in road accidents and the worst monthly toll of deaths and injuries since breath tests for suspected drunken drivers were introduced 16 months ago.
>
> Provisional figures hurriedly published in advance of the Easter weekend disclosed that 600 people died on the roads in January, 102 more than in the same month last year. The total casualties were 27,700, a rise of 3,815.
>
> "People are less frightened than they were of the breath tests," said a spokesman for the automobile association. "At first they thought policemen would be waiting round every corner. Now they know they aren't—and driving standards have fallen."

I would therefore caution those who feel the introduction of breathalyzer tests will improve our driving standards. I think their main value will be found at the scene of

accidents in deciding on allocation of blame. With these concluding remarks, Mr. Speaker, I shall resume my seat.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South):** Mr. Speaker, the third last speaker, the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), pointed out that in the committee several amendments were introduced by members of the government and passed, but that few of those introduced by members of the opposition passed. As a member of that committee I wish to say that I felt all reasonable proposals passed.

Some of them did not pass for two reasons. The majority of the amendments that dealt with abortion were, I suggest, not really amendments at all but sought effectively to destroy the purpose of the abortion provisions. If those particular motions dealing with the abortion provisions had been accepted, I suggest our law would have been placed 120 years behind the times. The social legislation of this country would have been made to appear rather backward. A period when we are rethinking the basis for legislative interference with individual freedom is no time for a particular group to try to impose their personal beliefs on the rest of the nation.

I wish to speak on some of the principles that are involved in this bill. First, I should like to deal with the breathalyzer provisions contained in clause 16. Although I have spoken in the house and in committee in favour of many of the amendments, and intend to support the bill on third reading, I am gravely concerned about the lack of protection for the individual in certain parts of the bill. I ask myself: Is it sufficient for us to believe that very few will be incorrectly convicted under these provisions?

Under the new section 222, which is commonly referred to as the ability impaired section, one may be charged with the indictable offence of driving a motor vehicle while one's ability to do so is impaired by alcohol. Upon conviction for this offence one may be fined up to $500 or imprisoned for up to three months, or both.

Under the new section 223, which is the section that makes the breathalyzer test mandatory, a police officer may, if he believes that the driver of a vehicle is committing or has committed an offence under the ability impaired section, demand that the driver take a breathalyzer test.

The proposed section 224 deals with the weight given to the reading resulting from the breathalyzer test and provides that, if such test reading indicates that the alcohol in the blood exceeds 80 milligrams of alcohol in 100 millitres of blood, the accused is guilty of an offence and liable to a fine of up to $1,000, to imprisonment up to six months, or both.

Now, what can happen? I have worked out some examples to demonstrate my proposition. If one is charged with having one's ability impaired, the evidence of the prosecution could be that of the arresting officer, who would probably say that from his observation made at the scene of the accident the driver appeared to be impaired. This would be supported by the breathalyzer test, which gave a reading, say, of .09 grams.

By way of defence, the accused could call the evidence, say, of three witnesses to confirm that he consumed only one ounce of alcohol up to the time of the accident, and that he behaved in a completely normal manner.

If the judge believed that evidence, he would accept as a fact that the accused had consumed only one ounce of alcohol, and thus, by implication, he would disbelieve the evidence produced by the machine. In other words, if the accused and his witnesses were believed, the accused could be acquitted, the inference being that the operator of the machine had erred in his testing technique or that the machine was defective.

An arresting officer could, and in many cases would, lay charges under both sections—that is to say, the ability impaired section and the breathalyzer section—for the obvious purpose of obtaining a conviction under the latter should the accused be acquitted under the former. Both charges would be tried together in the usual way, and the same evidence would apply.

Consequently, the judge could very well find himself in this impossible situation: that while he acquitted the accused on the first charge of ability impaired because he found as a fact that the man had consumed only one

ounce of alcohol, and that therefore his ability was not impaired, he would have no choice but to convict on the second charge because the evidence as to the amount of alcohol consumed and the driver's condition would not be relevant. In other words, the court would be powerless to relieve under the section; the machine would be all powerful. This situation could not help but bring justice into disrepute because an acquittal on the first charge necessarily discredited the breathalyzer test which was relied upon on the second charge for a conviction.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Let us suppose the same person or his friend who knows the story is picked up one month later under the same circumstances as just described; that is to say, the driver had consumed one ounce of alcohol and had become involved in an accident. The arresting constable advises him that he is to be charged with ability impaired under Section 222 and demands a breathalyzer test under Section 223. This time the accused, remembering the earlier conviction based upon the findings of the breathalyzer, simply refuses to take the test. For this refusal he is charged under Section 223. That is, for failing to take the test he could be found guilty of an offence and fined up to $1,000, or imprisoned for up to six months, or both. Let us say he refuses to take the test because he believed the operator to be incompetent, the machine to be defective, or both. He is now worse off. Section 224A provides that if he refuses without reasonable excuse to take the test the court may draw an inference from that refusal which is adverse to the accused. This evidence by way of inference could very well cause the magistrate to disbelieve the evidence of the accused or his witnesses that he had only one drink. He could then accept the evidence of the constable and convict the accused under Section 222 and, again, under Section 223(2) for failing to take the test. The result would be, Mr. Speaker, that the breathalyzer test, supported as it is by Section 224, would have been all powerful and indirectly would have brought about two convictions because of the attempt to avoid it. Is this not putting too much power in the hands of the arresting authority? At best it puts a premium on the evidence of the arresting constable and, perhaps, too much emphasis on the importance of a single scientific test.

Although I accept, and believe that the public is ready to accept, the philosophy of creating a statutory offence for operating a vehicle with a stated amount of alcohol in the body, just as it has accepted as an offence an infraction of an arbitrary speed limit, I believe that the evidentiary aspect is faulty. In our endeavour to improve safety on the highways we must be careful not to net the innocent. Can we be reasonably certain that there is sufficient protection for the unusual case and for the innocent? The consequences of an erroneous conviction could be most serious to an accused from an insurance, employment or social standpoint. Other innocent people could be affected. Suppose a man is convicted of ability impaired, mainly because the breathalyzer machine gave a reading of 0.09, and his insurance company denies liability under his insurance policy. It may be that claimants against him for injuries arising out of a collision are unable to recover the full amounts of their just claims. It could also be that the breathalyzer was in error, but because the accused was detained for some hours he was powerless to be examined by other witnesses or to arrange for some other type of chemical test to refute the breathalyzer test.

I believe the breathalyzer is subject to error and, in some cases, serious error because of lack of skill or care by the operator or defect in the machine, as evidenced by the fact that it is customary to take two or three tests several minutes apart. I believe the accused should in all cases be given the opportunity to be provided with a sample of his urine or blood for a comparative or back-up test.

Dr. R. N. Rabinovitch, a medical doctor and renowned authority on the subject, who gave evidence before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs in November, 1966 holds that it is wrong for the blood alcohol level to be determined by analysis of breath only. The late Dr. Ward Smith, who was then an expert with the Department of the Attorney General for the province of Ontario, in his letter to Dr. Rabinovitch on May 10, 1965 when referring to the consideration that the blood level should be determined by analysis of breath only stated:

> I am sure that you would deplore the situation; I do, possibly for different reasons.

Under British legislation the breathalyzer test is used as a screening test; that is to say, the reading indicates whether the arresting authorities should demand a blood or urine test. In England, after considerable original research, the Highway Safety Act made it a statutory offence to drive a vehicle with a certain amount of alcohol in the body. There

has been a reduction of accidents but more care was taken to protect innocent people.

The Canadian Bar Association, after lengthy study, some of it in conjunction with the Canadian Medical Association, recommended the use of the breathalyzer for purposes of prima facie evidence. However, they recommended the individual be given protection by making it mandatory that he be supplied with a sample of his breath and, in addition, that he be entitled upon request to a sealed sample of his own blood or urine. The Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, which received many briefs and heard many witnesses, in its fifth report to the House of Commons on February 9, 1967, recommended among other things that there should be legislation making it unlawful for anyone with a blood level of 0.08 per cent to drive a motor vehicle; that the blood level should be determined by an analysis of breath, with the provision that at the request of the accused there be blood and urine tests as confirmation. In addition the Committee recommended that the accused be offered a sample of the material; and, further, that all witnesses who had anything to do with the testing and handling of the sample should be available for cross-examination at the trial of the accused.

I believe it to be universally acknowledged by all experts that the breathalyzer operator should not rely upon one sample of breath only. The custom may be developed to take two or three samples, but the legislation does not so provide. Further, under Section 224, although the accused has the right to be supplied with a specimen of his own breath, there is no provision for the sealing or handling of that sample. Because the accused or another could tamper with this unsealed sample the court, of necessity, would be most suspicious of an analysis carried out by the accused. For example, there is nothing to stop the accused or his friends from breathing into the bag after the accused has taken the test. As I say, the court of necessity would be most suspicious of an analysis carried out by the accused.

I believe it would have been better for us to provide that in the event the accused is detained for more than one hour—thus preventing him from arranging for his own test—the arresting authorities offer facilities for a sample of his urine or blood to be taken and preserved for him. Surely, the provision for such a further test would induce the operator of the breathalyzer machine to use utmost care.

This safeguard need not be unduly cumbersome or expensive. The arresting authorities would simply be required to offer the accused facilities for the taking of either a urine or blood sample and to hold the same for up to 48 hours in order to give the accused time to retain a solicitor and carry out whatever test might be deemed advisable. The arresting authorities should have the choice as to whether it would be urine or blood because, in many cases, a doctor would not be available to take the blood. Granted blood would be better, but in many cases it would be difficult to obtain. It would be up to the solicitor for the accused to create the chain of evidence in respect of the handling and testing of the sample. It is said by acknowledged experts that the blood test is subject to only a 5 per cent error and the urine test only a 10 per cent error, if properly carried out. Generally, both tests are more reliable than a single breath test.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I appreciate the fact that under the proposed legislation the accused might be offered a sample of his own breath, but is one sample sufficient? It is most difficult to provide for sealing. In any event, if the sample were defective, either through the fault of the operator or a defective machine, it would be of no help to the accused. Although the accused is not entitled to demand the test, he may request it. If he is released within a reasonable time, he may arrange for his own test. If this is done, over the next few months we will collect some statistics to assist us in determining whether the breathalyzer is always reliable.

In conclusion, may I say in all other respects I enthusiastically support the bill. I regret the delay of its passage through this house.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on this amendment which suggests a six month's hoist. I think that this is a good way to try to stir the people's interest so that they may also make their opinion known to the members.

I think that after hearing all these speeches and, all these debates, I think there are still some members who are not aware of what is going on in their riding.

We are members of parliament in a democracy. We try at least to respect the will of the majority of the people who live in our ridings. We must act first at the level of our

ridings, since the legislation should reflect the image of the population for which it is intended. I think it is our duty, our first duty to meet these people and to discuss with them. We are not sure of their intentions.

With regard to the omnibus bill, it is precisely what we have done and it is for that reason that we fight so that our ideas might prevail. I think that no one could blame us for the job we are doing. All hon. members, those of the New Democratic party and the others, put up a good fight when they want an idea to prevail. They have the right to fight. When some say for instance that we want to impose our will upon the house it is completely untrue. We can argue steadily and without flinching, but with no desire to force our ideas upon others. I know full well that I would be unable to impose my views upon the members of the New Democratic party because they are too democratic and do not reach the socialist level of the members of the New Democratic party. I know that, even if I tried as hard as possible, the fight would be lost in advance.

But still, I am not going to tell you that the New Democratic party wants to force me to accept their will. No. Their members are fighting for their ideas and rightly so. But do not blame us for the fact that we want to fight for our principles, to defend our social and religious principles.

Even if some wanted to argue that the law has nothing to do with morals, I say quite simply that in our position, as Christians and Catholics, if we remove morals from the law entirely, we had better return to our constituencies and not come back here, because we would never be able to reflect the image of our constituencies, of our province, and even the image of our country.

Of course, the different ways of thinking across Canada lead to a lot of controversy. The more so since the government has certainly made a mistake—it is mainly responsible since it did not divide the bill—because it gave us a grab bag of laws, mixing guns with homosexuals and all sorts of things. The bullets are so different that it is not possible to understand anything. That is why it is rather difficult for us to consider this bill and to vote.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I was listening this afternoon to one of my good friend, the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau), who had a hard time summing up this famous bill and the proposed amendments. The hon. member for Lapointe made no bones about it. He said very simply, in his own personal way, as he felt it deep down inside, that he was against abortion. How I would like to read his speech. According to his religious principles, he is against abortion. But I cannot understand him when he says he is against the bill but that he will vote for the bill because the majority of the government members are for the bill, on account of the pluralism that prevails in Canada.

I wonder whether on account of pluralism we must assume such an attitude. We must acknowledge pluralism. One should fraternize with Negroes, but do we have to paint ourselves black? Will I have to paint myself black because I sympathize with Negroes, in our pluralist society? No, one must keep his own personality, his convictions, and I believe that is what makes up the population as a whole. One must defend his own convictions, be himself, and not vote for the others because they vote in such a way and because they are in majority.

Ask the same thing to the members of the New Democratic party and they will never accept. Never will the members of the New Democratic party, when they fight for something, take such an attitude. They will feel left out; they are right because they are convinced of their ideas. Even if the whole parliament were against them, they would still argue and what is more, they would vote until the last for their ideas.

That surprised me somewhat on the part of the member for Lapointe, for the end of his speech—which I followed with great interest, wondering how he would manage because I knew he personally was opposed to it—was rather nebulous. But when it comes to his conclusions, I am at a loss because he claims to be against it. He can vote against it. I admit, however, that the act will pass just the same because of the government majority. But I will not be kept from using my own personal right to vote, according to my belief and the principles I fight for. I feel that is quite normal. I would even say that it is logical for a man to vote according to his conscience and according to what he thinks of an act, and not to vote against what he believes, because the majority is in favour of it.

It could then be said that we are lead like sheep, and I do not want people to think that I followed like a sheep the way of the majority.

I have spoken several times on some of the amendments. I have spoken as best I could, using all the arguments at our disposal. This evening, I shall certainly not read again all the arguments in favour of our amendments, and again, in favour of this one. But I do feel that we have given varied enough arguments not to be accused, for instance, of favouring religion too much, or again, too little. First of all, I will not separate man from his religion although some claim that the law should be separated from religion. To my mind, man is a complete entity, a thinking and religious being, and the whole man must absolutely function as one.

We have pleaded religious as well as scientific arguments. We set forth as proof the testimonials of renowned doctors. I did not have the opportunity to sit on the committee but I believe that out of the 44 amendments moved, 30 were passed. Moreover, 89 percent of those 30 amendments had been submitted by Liberals. I do not know exactly what happened, but when we hear, for instance, another member confess that those amendments were all adopted by the committee by a majority—he did say by a majority, and he was right to say so—we realize that a strong majority on the committee was in favour of the bill.

As a matter of fact, if we consider the committee, the representatives of the N.P.D. and the Liberals made up a strong majority, and when the smaller group, on the other side wanted to object, they still were a 100 per cent majority.

All this should make it clear that a majority in the committee does not mean a majority of the people. I submit that the committee did not necessarily represent the majority of the people. And that is why we are opposed to the bill.

To start with, unfortunately the bill was not divided and we shall have to vote against the whole package. Had it been split, the debate would have been much more straightforward and sincere.

But as we were denied everything, from the beginning, we have tried to defend our position by all possible means, through medical evidence, in particular that of the Quebec Association of Hospital Medical Boards. They were against, when they dealt with abortion. Quebec physicians feel that any abortion is a homicide and we have led this debate because we too are convinced that abortion is homicide, and as we uphold the principle of life to which we believe that every human being has a right.

It is on these grounds that we maintained our firm position in an effort to show to the house that not only the Ralliement des créditistes and its members, not only the letters we received from all sides were against abortion, but that even science, organizations, Church authorities at the highest level were against also, and we kept bringing up all kinds of evidence in an effort to convince the government.

Did we succeed? I think that positions were so firmly held at first, that it was very difficult to change an order once it had been given.

This afternoon it was suggested that it was already accepted, that their election campaign was based on the omnibus bill.

I am at a loss to understand what they mean, because in my election campaign I did not say a word about this omnibus bill, and I had only two meetings in my constituency.

And when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) came to my constituency, he did not speak about this bill either. He came to Saint-Félicien by helicopter and stayed ten minutes, and girls were brought in by bus from Dolbeau and all over, from Saint-Félicien, and there was a ten-minute kissing-fest and then he flew away. He did not speak on the omnibus bill at all, unless he told them in secret: "Get ready, I am going to abort you".

But he took off right away, and we saw him disappear.

Let no one try to tell me that information on this matter was given to the people during the election campaign, Mr. Speaker. That is merely a joke and that joke, I believe, was part of what was called Trudeaumania.

I did not take any notice of it because, in my district, we lead quiet lives with our families and when strangers come, we say hello to them, we are polite, but let them go their own way.

What I mean is that the Prime Minister did not breathe a word about the bill on homosexuality in my district. He did not have much time in the area to speak about it. One cannot rely on that. I prefer to rely on the testimony that I have received from my district and on the testimony given by doctors about abortion.

**The doctors of the Quebec hospitals believe that any abortion is an act of homicide, because the foetus is a human being.**

Those are not my words, they are the words of a whole medical association. We cannot be accused of trying to moralize, this is a medical opinion. The doctors tell us that it is homicide—

**Mr. Boulanger:** Manslaughter!

**Mr. Gauthier:** Manslaughter, well, that is really the limit! I hear the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) say that it is manslaughter. Can you imagine that, to take so many precautions to have an abortion, and then call it manslaughter.

**Mr. Marceau:** That is a grim joke, to please you, because we know you are a funeral director.

**Mr. Gauthier:** A grim joke! Do not take that as a joke.

**Mr. Boulanger:** It was said in jest.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Frankly, it is not funny at all.

• (8:40 p.m.)

And I continue with the physicians' statement:

In the present state of medical science, the foetus is a living human being with the right to live like all other human beings.

They make themselves clear, do they not?

Even before the courts, the foetus is already considered a full-fledged human being—

**Mr. Duquet:** That is not true.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I hear the hon. member for Quebec East say that this is not true. He repudiates the evidence of all important medical associations—

—since it is entitled to succession rights and the State allows itself to consider the non-therapeutic abortion a criminal act subject to life imprisonment.

It is universally recognized, by all serious obstetricians, that cases where a therapeutic abortion would really save the life of the mother are extremely rare, and that they grow less and less frequent with scientific advances.

On the other hand, an abortion aimed at improving the health or welfare of the mother or at preventing the birth of a possibly malformed baby becomes an act of social euthanasia. If a malformed being is allowed to be killed in his mother's womb, why should it not be possible to do so after birth?

Because we do not see, because the person is concealed, it is no longer a murder. Indeed! If one knows there is a man behind a glazed door and shoots just the same, that is not murder. Because there was a door in-between.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

Mr. Speaker, I think that the physicians are very clear and specific in this respect. I will not have the time to read all of this evidence, but I want to point out that when they comment on the government legislation, the physicians have this to say:

Even if we believe that doctors who have allowed the few therapeutic abortions that have been carried out, are certainly not criminals, according to the unanimous opinion of doctors, nevertheless, we feel that the proposed legislation will increase the number of illegal abortions.

And then, some suggest that this measure will reduce the number of illegal abortions.

You had the opportunity these past few days to hear such evidence. You have other testimonies here, namely that of the Alliance for Life. I think every member has received copies of all those reports. I think the Alliance for Life wrote to us every second or third day; they tried to keep us posted and to pass on information to us, and what was said about the health of the mother?

The Alliance for Life and the committee on justice and legal affairs have now reviewed the proposed changes to our abortion laws. However, because of the censorial measures applied to procedure, such review was brief and superficial.

In addition, few members seemed familiar with the 24-volume evidence tabled earlier before the committee on health, welfare and social affairs. It is quite significant, however, that the medical practitioners called upon as witnesses reaffirmed what was said before the committee on national health, welfare and social affairs, that abortion destroys a human life. That was the undisputed opinion of every doctor who appeared before the committee on justice and legal affairs.

Mr. Speaker, in another part, under the same date of February 18, 1969, the Alliance sent in another report on the nature of the human being destroyed. There is no need to read this because the members know enough about it by now and have heard enough quotations during the past few days. But I should like to draw your attention to a paragraph dealing with human conscience, because we have been told that this was a matter of conscience, a matter of religion. No, Mr. Speaker, there is more to it. It is said to be a matter of conscience since we are men with a conscience, but we are human and we are able to bring forward scientific evidence in support of our arguments. And what is said in respect of the conscience? Here again,

it is the Alliance for Life that writes this, and I quote:

To determine what is destroyed by abortion is not a matter of opinion or conscience—

"Is not a matter of opinion or conscience."

—but it is a provable fact. Nor is it a matter that lawyers can solve, setting forth a legal concept based on false and outmoded ideas—

I do not say that for my good friend from Lapointe, but it is written here and I am not the one who wrote it. It is not for the lawyers to solve this matter.

We prove nothing by quoting ancient philosophers who lacked our present scientific knowledge. Instead, let us face the facts substantiated by modern observation.

Today, medical and biological sciences leave no reasonable doubt as to the fact that abortion is the destruction of a human life.

And further, it says:

Scientific evidence shows with certainty that any human life begins when the ovum is fertilized—

I read that because somebody said tonight that it was after eight or nine weeks. He said that after nine weeks, it was too late, that there was a risk of destroying a human life. According to him, Mr. Speaker, at eight or nine weeks, there is no human life. On that particular point, scientists tell us, and I quote:

—when the ovum is fertilized by the spermatozoid . . . Consequently, to destroy a child at any stage of his formation, from conception to birth, amounts to the destruction of a human being.

I think the member who said that at five, six, seven, or eight weeks, the foetus was not a human being, will necessarily change his mind if he goes by those scientific data.

The fact that life begins at conception is recognized by any academic text-book of biology and by any good encyclopedia. The new being—the offspring of human parents who is developing in a human womb—can only be a human being. It is logic itself. As for us, we are pleading in favour of that potential human being, if you want, in order that it will not be destroyed, because it actually exists as soon as it is conceived. I do not say so myself, because I know nothing about medicine. I have some knowledge of biology and other things but I know more about anatomy than medicine.

All this evidence was brought in not to make the hon. members lose their time, but to convince them that our ideas, our arguments were based on something, and if we succeed in convincing a few people, we will be pleased, but if we fail, we will certainly not assume the responsibility for the passing of this bill.

After the testimony of physicians, we brought in other evidence: requests of parents. It has already been mentioned in the house that 70,000 Catholic parents of Montreal wrote to the Prime Minister and to other ministers to try to make them change their mind. In my opinion, all those testimonies, according to the behaviour of this ministry, fall off them like water off a duck's back and, when the question will be put, nothing much will be changed. Nevertheless, we must state the views of the people. We are the voice of our constituencies, the voice of the people, and we make it our duty to communicate such ideas to the house.

Catholic parents in Quebec have also taken a stand against homosexuality and abortion in the Quebec newspapers. There are others here; we have brought this additional evidence. According to the *Journal* of Montreal, and I quote:

In the opinion of the president of the press gallery, the omnibus bill would put the law into the hands of the underworld.

This means that the newspapermen have also read the omnibus bill and saw its dangers.

And we go on with the evidence. We have even some from the Comité d'action Hull-Gatineau on abortion, who are against it, as well as against homosexuality. I think that all hon. members, especially those from that region, must have received it.

**Mr. Boulanger:** And against bingo.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I am not aware of their opinion about bingos, but I know that they are against abortion and homosexuality.

Now, all of us, all the Catholics, have the statements from the Catholic bishops of Canada. I need not quote everything, for I believe that all the Catholic members here have read their teachings and know what to think of abortion. We have also had communications from the Anglican Church, the English Churches, in which they asserted their opposition to the bill. The Catholic Church had this to say, and I quote:

Reminder from our bishops. The Catholic Church considers as unforgivable abortion and infanticide.

• (8:50 p.m.)

And further on, in another article, dated January 30, 1969, there is a letter of protest addressed to the Minister of Justice (Mr.

Turner); I believe he received this one. It says:

Catholic hospitals consider their position difficult as far as the legislation on abortion is concerned.

I think that all those letters of protest, let alone the protest from individuals, Mr. Speaker—and God knows we have many of them—should not be overlooked.

I have conducted an inquiry in my own constituency and I have received about 1,500 answers. Everyday we are getting more. Today I just received one from a lady from the city of Jonquière, in the county of Lapointe, a Mrs. Hélène Bélanger, "C.D'A. ASS," 461, rue Sainte-Marie, Jonquière, in case you would like to go and see her. The other day, when I asked the hon. member for Lapointe whether he had some news, he told me he had not. I did not receive any protest, he said. I quote:

Dear Mr. Gauthier,

While noting your statements on the omnibus bill, I thought that you could ask the hon. member for Lapointe about the fate of the 1068 signatures of protest from the city of Jonquière alone which I handed to him recently.

If you want figures concerning possible misuse of the therapeutic abortion legislation, I can produce them.

**Mr. Marceau:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe that my hon. friend mutilates the facts and does not say the whole truth. At the beginning of last month, I received a petition prepared in 1968, before the election and before the Prime Minister's statements on the purpose and the aims of that bill. I have inquired in my constituency. I met some people who recognized that they had been misled by the information they had been given and that some explanations provided since led them to change their minds, I challenge the hon. member to prove the contrary.

[*English*]

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I would remind the house that according to our Standing Orders, and particularly to citations from May and Beauchesne, debate on third reading should concern itself with the provisions of the bill. I do not want to interfere with the right of the hon. member—would the hon. member resume his seat, please—but I wish to remind the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) and other hon. members that debate on third reading should be restricted to the contents of the bill. I have some misgivings about whether the exchange between the hon. member for Roberval and the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) is in order. I would invite the hon. member for Roberval to return to the contents of the bill.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, this is what I have been doing right from the beginning; produce evidence from doctors, from bishops and from individuals who are against this bill. It was the natural thing to do, because this is a letter I received on May 8. I did not have to ask the hon. member for Lapointe for an answer to know his opinion. But, the letter says this, and it is duly signed.

**Mr. Marceau:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I think my hon. friend is unfair. I am ready to answer everyone who signed that letter and explain my position to them.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rondeau:** There is no point of order.

**Mr. Marceau:** Besides, it is a Conservative organization.

[*English*]

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Valade:** Throw him out.

**An hon. Member:** Where is the Sergeant-at-Arms?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I point out to the hon. member for Lapointe that if he is rising on a point of order he should cite the relevant Standing Order and the procedure to which he objects. I again caution him and other hon. members that to use points of order in this way serves only to diminish the importance of this procedure, and they are an important part of our procedure. The hon. member for Roberval.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gauthier:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This does something to me. I read such evidence as I read all the others. Strangely enough, he did not protest against the bishop's letter. However, when I just read a letter from someone asking me what has been done with the 1068 signatures she sent to the hon. member, he objects.

I shall answer. Here is the newspaper article. I shall answer and this is additional proof to let us know how many people there are in our ridings, in our areas, who are officially and directly against the omnibus bill.

I do not have time to read everything, but some are from Ontario, from the hon. minister's riding, but I do not have time to read them all. There are some from nearly all the provinces.

I have another one here from a Mr. Chabot, of Roberval:

Allow me to congratulate you for your fine speech as well as that of Mr. Caouette on Bill C-150 (Autobus).

He made a mistake, he wrote the autobus bill instead of the omnibus bill.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Gauthier:**

I would have been harder still on Mr. Lewis and other Liberal members in favour of that famous bill which has taken several weeks of your time.

One must refer to *Hansard* to see all the tricks they use with those amendments and numbers to deceive voters. All the way I would have said no, do not kill the children. Reference has been made to 400-bed hospitals or at least 200 ones, what a joke. That guy Trudeau—

Mr. Trudeau—

—and many members will deplore the fact that population is decreasing in Canada due to the pill, etc. It is not by killing foetuses that the population will increase. There is only one simple way to increase the population: by granting allowances for each child.

Besides, they talk about mothers and unmarried mothers. Abortion can be procured when the mother's life is endangered. Where have there been such cases? There are very few. Caesarean sections are performed in good hospitals. Abortion is much more dangerous for a mother than a normal delivery.

I shall not read it all. Besides, I had not checked all the words, that is why I had to skip a few bad ones.

Mr. Speaker—

• (9:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate because for many years the maintenance of safety on the highways has been part of my duties as a police officer. I hasten to add that I have no doubt whatsoever that the misuse of alcohol is one of the main causes of the high rate of death on our highways. It is not the only cause. Perhaps the prime cause is the general disregard for human life which is only too prevalent in our society. The wonderful opportunities we have to enjoy the full life, only too often are frustrated by carelessness. Alcohol is one of those things which dims a finer perception of our opportunities. There is no question at all in the minds of many of us who saw the wonderful film which was shown to the members of the committee and others concerning the disastrous effects of the misuse of alcohol on a person's ability to control an automobile.

It has been one of the prime facets of British and Canadian justice that we give the benefit of the doubt to the accused. I would like, therefore, to see the permitted level of alcohol set at one one-thousandth or .1 per cent. This would eliminate many arguments that we have heard that we should give the driver the benefit of the doubt. Some people think that they are in control of themselves after they have had a number of beers or a number of double whiskies. Be that as it may, there is no doubt at all, according to the film, that when you have .08 per cent of alcohol in your blood you are impaired. I would like to go that much further and say that we should set it at the nice round figure of .1 per cent, then all doubt whatsoever would be eliminated. This would be fair play taken to a very fair point. You would not have to worry whether your cough medicine had an alcoholic content, whether you had eaten more Christmas dinner than usual, or whether you had lost track of one drink.

I do not speak from hearsay. As I said, for some 15 years it was my job to be intimately connected with the results of the misuse of alcohol. I went out after the complaint came in; after the empty bottles were thrown out into the ditches and after most of the evidence was gone except for the wreckage. All that remained was the dead bodies and the sight of those people who might never walk again or who might never again have the proper use of their limbs. It is certain that the wreckage of automobiles and of public and personal property is immense. I hate to have to remind hon. members that the loss of human life in this great democracy of ours amounts to some 5,500 lives a year, more people by far than have lost their lives in all the wars since Canada entered Confederation. This is a disgrace to us.

So I am glad to see that this amendment to the Criminal Code is attempting to fill this

terrible gap in our law and to put some real teeth into our law. However, let me say again that I would like to remove all doubt about the permitted amount of alcohol in the blood when driving by setting it at a figure of .1 per cent. Then, there would be no argument about it whatsoever. If the police were able to establish that you did have this percentage of alcohol in your blood, there would hardly be any need for more evidence before the courts.

Some people argue that breathalyzers or blood tests are an invasion of our privacy. I am inclined to agree with that. But I must say that if one were to weigh the right to privacy against the terrible toll of human life, then I am sure that those of us who think we should drive with reasonable care and regard for other people believe that this small invasion of our privacy is well worth giving up if we are to remove this blight of modern civilization from our highways which results in the loss of the lives of hundreds and thousands of people.

So, I add my one small voice to those in favour of the better features of this bill. These people have put a great deal of time and effort into the preparation of these amendments in the standing Committee. I think we should certainly give them a fair chance. If we find that this law is too severe, it should be toned down. I believe that at present there is something seriously wrong in the law. I think we must take a bold step forward and make sure that people who murder on the highways are no longer permitted to do so by sloppy laws, by weak courts and by a poor administration of the law.

Here, I would like to add one or two words of warning. It is not good enough to have stringent laws; it is not good enough to have a well thought out and a well meaning Criminal Code setting down the permitted percentage of alcohol in the blood unless there is a police force which is well trained and respected to enforce those provisions.

• (9:10 p.m.)

One of the most important things any police force can do, in my opinion, is to spend about 90 per cent of its time on prevention rather than trying to deal with the ill after it has occurred. Preventive police work is what we need. Although the public may be careless and hard to train, and slow to recognize its rights—I speak in this part of my talk to the policemen—those who are entrusted with the work of law enforcement have no excuse for ever forgetting that they are the servants of the public, not their bosses. They are expected to keep their tempers in all situations. After all, it is not they who are drunk; it is not they who are breaking the traffic laws; their job is to see that everybody gets home in the best of humour.

On several occasions during my training and during my service I saw policies laid down which had a dramatic effect on the safety of the community in which I lived. During 1938-39, in the city and environs of Winnipeg, a world traffic safety record was established of 228 days without a single fatal accident. This was in greater Winnipeg, a city with a population of some 400,000 people. How was such a record established? The reason was this: the police took the lead in courtesy; they treated the public as if the public were their friends and as though they were there for one purpose only, to make the highways safe for the people. They stopped drivers with kindness and courtesy whenever they saw an infringement of the traffic rules and asked the public for its co-operation. This approach to the enforcement of the law, a new one at that time, I believe, had such a dramatic effect that it spread to everybody in the area and for two-thirds of a year not a life was lost. These things must start with the police; the public will respond when they find that the policeman is their friend.

The civil authorities which hire and discipline the police and set the general tone of the force have been somewhat guilty over the years. There are some municipal police forces which demand, particularly of young members, that they work on some kind of quota system. Rookie constables are sent on the beat with a traffic book and unless that book is filled with tickets before the end of the patrol they are not considered to be efficient policemen. This has one of the worst effects on the enforcement of law that I know.

There is hardly a man who has not been stopped at some time or another for driving at 61 miles an hour in a 60 mile zone, perhaps been treated roughly by the police and given a ticket instead of a warning. I am not saying this is general but at times it is certainly the case. There are certain roads in Canada which are known as revenue lanes. Wherever this practice occurs it should be put down with rigour by the people who know about it. If reasonableness is shown, the public will respond. The public generally wish to be law-abiding. Occasionally they break the traffic laws, as each of us has done on more than one occasion by hurrying home, forgetting

our duty as good citizens. The best treatment people can get is close scrutiny by the police, a sympathetic hearing, and a firm and fair warning. Then, when citizens flout the law, they should receive proper and severe treatment at the hands of a magistrate who has heard the case carefully and reached a decision on the facts, fortified by an act which has some teeth in it.

In a case where a man insists on driving when drunk, under the new section in the amended Criminal Code a magistrate will have some authority to see that he does not drive in such a condition again. If there should be future offences, the magistrate can make sure that it becomes increasingly difficult for him to operate a motor vehicle in Canada. I commend this provision. A great deal depends, I repeat, on the attitude of law enforcement authorities and of the policeman on the beat. It depends on the co-operation of the civil authorities generally, of mayors, police departments and of the officials directly concerned at both federal and provincial levels. Any commotion at the expense of the public will backfire. Where the police are fair, the public know it; where the police are held in little esteem by the public it will probably be found that the blame does not lie on one side alone. I know that in the area in which I served the co-operation of the public was always good. The police took a fair attitude and people responded to that kind of treatment. One can expect respect for law and order when it starts with the law enforcement officers and the law enforcement bodies themselves.

I suggest we renew our efforts. To review the Criminal Code is not enough. We still need a program of education. Programs such as the Youth and Police programs which were set up in Saskatchewan back in the middle 'forties cost the people of Canada very few dollars in terms of what they got back. I would remind hon. members of such things as this: a certain town in New Brunswick had at one time the highest juvenile delinquency rate in Canada. A young policeman started a boxing club there. The club produced some fine young amateur sportsmen but, and this is more important, juvenile delinquency in that district sank to an all-time low. In fact, instead of a special session of the juvenile court meeting in that town every week, the court found little work to do and was eventually closed. Thanks to a little leadership by some law enforcement officers, this club became a centre in which growing young men took an interest in manly sports; the policemen became the best friends these boys ever had. Programs of this type are money in the bank in terms of citizenship in Canada and wherever they have been dropped they should be reinstated.

To turn to another subject, I say we should have held a conference with all the provinces long ago in an attempt to secure uniformity in our traffic laws. I was a traffic policeman for some 15 years, yet it confuses me when I drive across Canada and am expected to conform to at least 15 different traffic codes—each of the provinces has its own, as do most of the larger cities. In Ontario the motorist can turn right at a red light; indeed, he can be fined if he occupies the righthand lane and fails to turn right on a red light. In Quebec, if you turn right at a red light, you are committing an offence. This is confusing enough to a Canadian, but what must it be like to a motorist from another country who finds that the rules in Moncton are different from the rules in Toronto and different again from the rules which apply in Winnipeg or Regina? This is a disgrace to our country. A country with a small population like our own could well agree to standardize traffic laws. I suggest to the minister, when he has pushed this omnibus bill through, that he would make himself very popular if he gathered together the attorneys general of the provinces of Canada and settled the question of uniformity of traffic laws once and for all. I think that is a good place to leave it, Mr. Speaker.

• (9:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, we have now before us an amendment tending to defer consideration of this bill for six months.

I feel pretty sure that, after having perused all the information which all hon. members have received, after having read also the briefs submitted to the standing committee on justice and legal affairs and after hon. members have heard this arguments brought forward in the house, this amendment would be welcome so as to give the hon. members an opportunity to meditate, since before such an important vote, it is normal that all members could listen to the people who have not been made aware of the importance of this bill.

We have read briefs, but it would be good for all members to have an opportunity to hear the people's views and to ponder. That is

the reason why we have moved this amendment in order to postpone for six months the study of this bill.

One has to listen, to think, in order to act more advisedly, because the action we will be taking in this house by passing this bill will be most serious and will have serious consequences for our whole population for centuries to come.

Here, in the house, we have not heard any serious, logical and worthwhile arguments that might have induced us to pass hastily such a serious bill.

But we have noted that the party in power introduced this bill and that only two of its members were ready to support it, more or less brilliantly, the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) and the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané).

That leads us to worry even more, considering the arguments put forward by those honourable members.

We believe the house should set this bill aside, in order to give the people greater opportunity to make their views known to their respective members, after which we could vote on it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we have proceeded the wrong way. Before trying to pass such a bill, we should have taken every possible means to eradicate the causes why pregnant women do claim abortion today.

The government should have, for instance, come up with proper pieces of legislation which would have resulted over a short period of time in less women seeking abortion. For example—and I should like here again to support my arguments on the evidence and experience of experts in this field—the government could have set up an education program in this connection.

I would like to back up my statement that Canadian youth and Canadian people in general have been given a bad sexual education. I refer to Dr. Mongeau's book dealing with abortion. I find on page 120 the testimony of a young girl, a Montreal bachelor and mother of a child, who had this to say with respect to sexual education for the young people:

"It is highly urgent that sexology and psychology be taught in primary schools. Those are everyday facts. Otherwise, young people will keep on hiding to read books and novels which are leading them astray and we all know that. How ignorant are Quebecers! I must say that, having myself been left without such an education by my mother or at my school, I became fond of sought-after books with more or less provocative titles."

[Mr. Rondeau.]

Then, Mr. Speaker, the government could have introduced legislation with a view to completing the education of young Canadians on this topic.

Secondly, the government could have, and still can, train specialists in this field. Those specialists could, through the knowledge they would transmit to the public and to those who would claim their services, avoid that more pregnant women resort to abortion, and I refer again to the same book, on page 115, where it is stated, and I quote:

—that undesired pregnancies were for the most part pregnancies which, later on, after proper counselling by psychologists, are wanted and fully accepted.

Mr. Speaker, by means of training centres, educational centres, we could prevent a very great number of abortions and educate the young people who, because of a lack of education in that matter, will resort to the easiest means, namely abortion, once this bill is passed.

A little further, in the same book, Dr. Mongeau said that the government should, through some program, educate people as to family planning.

On page 116, he says:

Therefore, family planning reveals itself one of the most effective instruments to fight abortions—

In my opinion, before wanting to resort to abortion in the case of a great number of pregnant women in Canada, we could use planning, the most effective instrument against abortion.

And a little further, in the same book, it is said, and I quote:

As a matter of fact, we have come to a situation very well described by "Le Conseil Supérieur de la Famille" in their brief on birth control:

"Let us point out finally that a serious social discrimination is created as to contraceptive knowledge: the most gifted married couples, through fortune and education, have access to such knowledge, even though it is sometimes difficult to get necessary advice from doctors. The poor and less educated people are almost deprived of the information and advice they would need".

Now, Mr. Speaker, we could still, by such means, avoid a great number of abortions and the government, instead of introducing such a legislation, should adopt a prevention policy, providing for the education, the training of specialists in our society, in order to prevent more abortions. But the government is not doing so.

As regards the information the public would be entitled to get from those various agencies, we can read the following:

Another organization has taken a non-equivocal stand on this problem: the "Conseil des Oeuvres de Montréal", in the so-called "Opération Rénovation sociale". As for birth control, we think it is high time that information clinics would be made available to the public.

And further on:

We think that only a team made of specialists of various professions would really answer the needs of the couples who come in quest of such advice.

The team should comprise, on a regular basis, a doctor, a nurse, a social worker or a psychologist. It could require, for consultation, the assistance of a psychiatrist, a gynaecologist and a moralist.

I go on quoting:

Such clinics—

—of information or education should be—

—geographically well distributed in the country and free—

—and available to pregnant women in Canada. And, page 118, while still tackling the subject of information for pregnant women, we read:

A study conducted in the Netherlands has demonstrated how important were these clinics in reducing abortion.

It is a crying shame, that the government has no family policy. The only bill it has submitted to the house aims at killing the foetus without giving those defenceless beings the opportunity of being born and of living on their own.

Many other arguments have helped us in our fearless fight. They were of a scientific nature.

A doctor in England, speaking of how ridiculous abortion is, says this, and I quote:

If we were to kill the foetus for all kinds of reasons and social considerations, why should we not kill old people as well for equally silly social reasons?

He also said this:

• (9:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

A doctor in England suggested that an age be set beyond which doctors no longer would strive to keep patients alive—why?—

[*Translation*]

Doctors could stop taking care of them so that those persons could die as soon as possible. Why could not the same arguments be used as for abortion? Why?—

[*English*]

—because they are overloading the health and welfare system;—

[*Translation*]

Why? Because, today, old people are the ones who overload the social welfare budgets. They are the ones who get the most money, in old age pensions.

[*English*]

—they are taking up beds so that young people cannot be admitted for needed medical treatment;—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, if we had to accept abortion for any reason pertaining to social order, for any imaginary discomfort or illness that women can have, why should we not forbid the doctors to cure the sick who are over 55 because those people are the ones who occupy the greatest number of hospital beds?

[*English*]

—they are traffic hazards; they degenerate into persons of neglect and squalor and they are a fire risk to neighbours.

[*Translation*]

They have become dangerous people in regard to traffic.

These are also social considerations which are as intelligent as the imbecile and stupid considerations that the Liberal government is now presenting to the house.

A little further, we read that we could kill the old because they have also become a fire hazard for their neighbours. We know that old people, through carelessness or because they are all shaky are dangerous and represent a fire hazard for their neighbours. These are, Mr. Speaker, stupid, childish and non humanitarian considerations. They are in the same line as those which are called upon to try and make us accept abortion.

I continue the quotation:

[*English*]

—'we can set an example of our respect for the sanctity of human life to a world that is sorely in need of a higher regard for human life and a higher standard of human conduct'. Now, when it concerns the preservation of the life of unborn children, parliament seems to take an about face. There does not seem to be the same high regard for human life on the part of some.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to accept the arguments of the government. We care a lot about the old as human beings. However, the government feels more deeply about animals than about orphans, or unborn children.

Sometime ago in this house the Minister of Fisheries displayed great humanitarian feelings for baby seals which cannot see. But how come the Minister of Justice does not have

the same feelings for human babies who cannot see either and cannot protect themselves because they are innocent, defenseless beings?

[*English*]

If we kill unborn children, then why not older people and call it mercy killing. In this way we can easily set aside our duties to care for older people—our generation does not want to be burdened with those who are sick or unable to work. We are doing them and ourselves a favour.

[*Translation*]

If children cannot defend themselves nor make a living, why feel differently about aged persons who at their time of life cannot make a living either.

The Créditistes deeply respect aged people; we have a tremendous admiration for all those who have developed Canada. However, we have as much admiration for those who after us will have to develop Canada, build it, lead it up on high. Other people will envy it. We do not like to live in a country in which we are told that if the legislation on abortion is approved, in ten years, 22 million foetuses at least—this is an assumption for at present there are 22 million Canadians—will have been destroyed through abortion.

But the arguments brought up in this house, Mr. Speaker, were weak and unfounded.

I have here such arguments called upon in England, for example, to obtain an abortion. This evidence was given on the C.B.C. on Monday November 25, on the program *"Dossier"*, under the title "Morality and Sex".

A Young English woman explained for us the procedure to be followed in Great Britain in order to obtain therapeutic abortion:

"You go and see a medical practitioner who declares that you are pregnant. Of course, there is nothing he can do except acknowledge the fact, and then ask:

"Do you want to see a psychiatrist?

You must answer "Yes". The doctor sends you then to a psychiatrist who asks:

"Is having a baby liable to make you a prostitute?

Answer: "Yes!"

In that case, abortion prescribed!

It may be somewhat hypocrite and very much in the British tradition to modestly disguise abortion as a crypto-psychiatric problem.

However, Mr. Speaker, in his book on abortion, Dr. Serge Mongeau gives us indications in order to prevent abortion by education, training, especially of the young generation, and he writes the following:

Abortion is mainly the result of economic conditions.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

And here is what he writes on page 120, and I quote:

—the factors which bring about the rejection of pregnancy originate more from the social structure than from a decision not to have children based upon personal reasons. We have seen it earlier, our society is far from being hospitable to children.

Mr. Speaker, this proves that not only they do not want to improve the standard of living of the family, but that they want to reduce the number of children in order to bring it in line with the income of the father who is on welfare, on unemployment insurance, and who is taxed, robbed and exploited by this government and by other governments.

Further on it is said:

"Between the age of 20 and 40, the average income of a married man generally doubles, but his charges increase fourfold".

Children should be more welcome in our society. We could have a policy oriented more towards the family.

Every child born in a family requires a share of the family income for food, clothing and education. The needs grow with each child that is born, but the incomes do not grow proportionally, as is pointed out by two authors (Charbonneau and Mongeau).

Here is what he says when he speaks of the—

—downgrading of the family standard of living with the increase in the number of children, if the income is fixed; a childless labour household, with the husband only working, has been taken as basis; it was estimated that the standard of living would decrease as follows:

22 per cent with 1 child
36 per cent with 2 children
46 per cent with 3 children
53 per cent with 4 children
59 per cent with 5 children
63 per cent with 6 children

• (9:40 p.m.)

This is what Dr. Mongeau suggests in connection with abortion, on page 123. He says precisely what we, members from the Ralliement créditiste, have always stated, although he is not a member of our party. And I quote:

We should see to it that each citizen gets a minimum income, that a family allowance scheme is really of assistance to the parents—

To provide, first of all, an average income for each citizen, secondly, a family allowance scheme commensurate with the cost of living, thirdly—

—that at the very least, the medical care necessitated by pregnancy, delivery, and the first months of the child's life, is free charge, and, that education at all levels, become accessible to everyone.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have repeated this often in the house, if we want to fight abortion effectively, if we want to raise the status of our families, as well as the condition of the father of family, we must, first of all, amend our laws, provide better housing, ensure an education for our young people and, finally, secure for them a good future.

When we look at the thousands of young Canadians who, in a month's time, will leave the schools and universities, we are wondering what the future holds in store for them. They have no future. Look at the number of talented young men, students, engineers who have graduated in Canada and who are going to the United States to organize their future. Why? Because we have no future to offer them in Canada. Moreover, we cannot house them.

Mr. Speaker, we are investing an average of $55,000 to transplant a heart in a man who, even if he survives, will never be useful to our society. Why not invest $200 when a baby is born as a reward, and in order to help the mother meet her needs at the time of birth.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration is also spending hundreds of dollars at present to bring in immigrants, and to get them adjusted in Canada. Why not spend that amount to enable a native-born citizen to live and earn a living?

Parliament is here, Mr. Speaker. We are in this house to protect the weak. We are here to protect honest people against bandits and hooligans. We are here to protect workers against trouble-makers. We are here to protect fœtuses against the egoism of adults.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in Canada there is no problem of over-crowding and when we sang throughout Canada in 1967 the Expo theme song which told about our country with its wide-open spaces, were we sincere, since Canada is empty? If our country is empty, why pass a bill on abortion to empty it even more, because the population will be thinned out, as it is in Japan at the present time. In Japan, an abortion costs $2.75. In 50 years from now, as reported in an article published on April 20 in *Dimanche Matin,* the Japanese people will be exterminated. Why copy some legislation which has proved unsuccessful elsewhere in the world?

We have fought against that hateful bill which is not defended by moralists, sociologists or scientists. It is regrettable to note that the government, in its stubborness, is unfortunately ready in the future to do away with more than 50 per cent of the population. Such is the meaning of the legislation on abortion. I do not think that Canada is ready to indulge not in a luxury but in a hateful slaughter of part of our future generation. We need our population and our scientists as well as the brains of our future generations.

If, regretfully, we had to accept abortion because pregnancy is a cause of nervousness or neurosis, it would be a catastrophe.

There are reasons other than pregnancy why some people are neurotic in Canada. For instance, there are the taxes of the Liberal and other governments. To avoid cases of neurosis in Canada, before legalizing abortion we should abolish taxes, because this way we would be striking at the root of the evil.

The Prime Minister is a bachelor. As for me, I have seven children. We would be very unhappy if the Reaper took one of them from us.

We should also think about the childless couples who have the charitable intention of taking children in adoption. If, regretfully, we must allow abortion on request, even the couples who have no children of their own could not adopt any a few years from now.

There is only one reason for abortion laws, Mr. Speaker, a financial one. If, instead of being a financial burden for the parents, a newborn child brought joy to the family, and the country, we would not be debating in the house a bill as immoral and illogical as this one.

If the federal government offered $200 at the birth of every new Canadian, and the government of the province where the child is born gave $100, we would not have to talk about abortion anymore in the house.

Always for the sake of money we are getting ready to legalize the most dastardly form of crime there is. I am speaking about abortion, the worst crime Canada has ever known.

I have voted against this bill until now and I shall continue to do so.

I have a few more words to say. I shall also vote against homosexuality. In my view, homosexuality is a sickness that must be treated like any other. As for those whose homosexuality is a vice—there are two kinds of homosexuals, and, apparently, the Liberals have not consulted any medical works on the matter—whips are still being sold.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we should want to give Canada such an immoral law, one that goes so much against the feelings of the majority of Canadians. We are

convinced, with all due deference to the press, that the majority of Canadians share our feelings, because we receive letters of congratulations every day. It is impossible to read them all in the house. We would like the bill to be set aside for six months, in order to give hon. members time to think before voting.

• (9:50 p.m.)

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) moved an amendment this afternoon which would delay the coming into force or the enactment of this legislation or omnibus bill, Bill No. C-150. In other words, its passage would be delayed for six months from the date the house will have passed the amendment moved by the hon. member for Champlain.

If we move an amendment, I for one am in favour of it without any reservation, and I feel it is my duty to do so. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Champlain, which would delay the coming into force of this legislation, is based on serious reasons on our part for such a delay.

Mr. Speaker, we do not believe that the Canadian people have been consulted in any way, directly or indirectly, in this regard. Many hon. members on the government side, especially the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) and a few others, have tried to have the house believe that the population had been consulted during the last election campaign, and that the result of that campaign had proven beyond any doubt that by supporting the party in power, the electors supported the omnibus bill.

Mr. Speaker, those members who hurl such wanton statements on the floor of the house. do not reflect public opinion.

To elect a government is one thing, but to pass a law legalizing abortion and allowing abortion on demand, is something entirely different. And it is rather irresponsible to assert that both things are necessarily linked and that the people who voted for the Liberal party also voted for the omnibus bill. I do not think it is honest to throw about such untrue statements.

According to some government members, such as the hon. members for Matane, Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) and many others, the house is wasting its time. They said it as eloquently as they could, that is they flung abuses at others. They wanted to make us say and they wanted to say to the Canadian people that the house was wasting its time.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

If this were true, Mr. Speaker, and at the beginning of these remarks I really intended to call attention to these unfounded statements, this parliament would not mean anything and we would all be wasting our time here since who would vote legislation? We would only need to make a decision, elect four or five men, appoint them if need be, let them decide, and close parliament down. A lot of money could then be saved to the Canadian people.

Now the house of commons is exactly the place where we must legislate, study legislations section by section, line by line, scrutinize them earnestly and in depth in order to detect their various implications. Parliament is the best place to analyze bills and state our views.

In that respect, I believe that the Ralliement créditiste up to now has not unduly taken up the time of the house, but on the contrary, it has saved time for the Canadian population, while trying to ward off the misfortunes that this omnibus bill might bring about. And it is precisely in order to save more time that we want to postpone for six months the enactment of that legislation.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. It being ten o'clock, it is my duty to put the questions to be debated at this time.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### AIR CANADA—STRIKE OF MECHANICS—AVAILABILITY OF ALTERNATIVE MODES OF TRAVEL

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I asked the acting Minister of Transport, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Richardson), if he would cause to have re-examined the government policy which now prevents our second national air line from being truly national. In other words, I was asking for a change in policy so that Canadian Pacific Air Lines would be allowed to operate in Canada east of Montreal. Then a few days later, after the present Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) was ensconced in that position, I asked the

same question of him. It is because of the answer to that question that I make this appearance this evening.

Incidentally, sir, it is interesting to note that when I raised this question previously in the house, in October, 1967, it was just after another minister of transport, the present outgoing minister, had been appointed to that portfolio. So the present minister is forewarned that if I ask the question in another year's time that will be the handwriting on the wall for him.

• (10:00 p.m.)

There is no area of Canada more hard hit by the present strike of Air Canada than the area from which I come. We do have a regional carrier, Eastern Provincial Airways, and Nordair, trying to make up some of the vacuum that has been created by the Air Canada strike, but this is virtually impossible. There are thousands of people living in Atlantic Canada who are absolutely frustrated by the strike that has now gone on an unconscionably long period of time. So, I am suggesting it is time the government should re-examine its policy to enable another large company—and it will of course have to be a large company that can satisfy the requirements of Atlantic Canada—to operate there. The former minister of transport twice removed, the Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, advised me in the Transport Committee a few weeks ago that there would have to be a change in government policy before the air transport committee of the Canadian Transport Commission could entertain an application from Canadian Pacific Air Lines. He was very specific on this point and made it several times. Unfortunately, because of the delay in printing the proceedings of that committee, I cannot quote his statements this evening. However, when the report does come forward the transcript will clearly show that Mr. Pickersgill said the government must make a direct change in its policy in this field before Canadian Pacific Air Lines can operate in Atlantic Canada.

What about air travel as such? The figures that appear at page 3216 of *Hansard* for October 17, 1967 indicate that each year the number of people using Canadian air lines increases by approximately 1,000 per day. So, there is an ample number of customers to justify increasing the number of air companies serving Canada. There should be business for Canadian Pacific Air Lines in Atlantic Canada. On the date to which I referred, I suggested they should have not only some of the major runs to Atlantic Canada but also some of the runs which would not necessarily be profitable although in the public interest. In other words, Canadian Pacific should not just have the cream but should operate some of the milk runs as well. Believe me, there are lots of milk runs in my part of the country.

I have no quarrel with Air Canada but I do not like having most of our eggs in one basket. I have no quarrel with Eastern Provincial Airways or Nordair in what they are attempting to do. I have some suspicion that the Newfoundland government, in respect of one of those air lines, may be one reason we are not getting Canadian Pacific into Atlantic Canada. The minister can bury those suspicions simply by announcing that the policy is to be re-examined to enable Canadian Pacific to become a truly second national air line in this country.

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member for having missed his first few words. I believe I got the gist of them however. If he wants better transportation, particularly air transportation, for Atlantic Canada he will not find any argument from me on that score. I suspect he knows I am rapidly discovering it is not simply a matter of providing additional service on the trunk or main routes. The whole of the Atlantic region and perhaps some other parts of Canada as well are involved. The problem is to rationalize the air transport in the less lucrative areas with the necessity at the same time to have rapid transport on the main lines.

I would be less than honest if I did not say I have a little different outlook on this matter than I did when I participated in the late shows and berated Air Canada. I want to assure my hon. friend, however, that I am very aware of this problem. I think it involves a good deal more than bringing Canadian Pacific into Halifax. We must look at the matter as it relates, for example, to Prince Edward Island. The north and south route is becoming important. Then, there is the matter of extension of service into the northern parts of the Atlantic region and Labrador. All these matters, I am advised, have been under study for some time. I can assure the hon. member that his representations are well in the front of my mind. I am not unsympathetic to them and will do everything I can to try to devise a policy, and present it in this house if this is the appropriate forum, so that we can get the better transport that both of us agree is necessary.

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

SHIPPING—CHANGE IN REGISTRATION OF "CAPE BRETON MINER"

**Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I posed the following question in the house:

Is the minister aware that Upper Lakes Shipping Limited is presently making application to change to foreign registry the registry of the vessel *Cape Breton Miner*, construction of which was subsidized by the Canadian taxpayer? Further, is the minister in a position to advise whether this change can be prevented in order to save the jobs of 39 Canadians who will be replaced by cheap labour—

I was referring to jobs lost to members of the Canadian merchant navy. At that time I said the question could be directed either to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) or the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey), as I felt they were both involved. The Minister of Transport was absent on other business, so I thought the Minister of Labour would answer the question. Mr. Speaker agreed with me that there was a sense of urgency in the question and felt it should be dealt with in our proceedings at this time.

In 1967, according to volume II of the Public Accounts, Upper Lakes Shipping entered into an agreement for a government subsidy of more than $2,200,000 in shipbuilding contracts through the federal government. The whole question of transfer of registry from Canadian to foreign ownership should, I believe, be opened up; it is a matter upon which the government should make an inquiry and take a decision.

It is a scandal when ships paid for by Canadian taxpayers and constructed through government subsidies are allowed to fly a foreign flag in order to avoid hiring Canadian seamen. This is simply a device to avoid paying decent wages in line with Canadian standards. It is surprising that the union, the S.I.U., has not seen fit to protest.

The transfer of Canadian shipping to Panamanian and Liberian or other foreign registries has in recent years become a public disgrace. It is apparently being done with government connivance and approval. Not only does the government wink at what is going on, but apparently it gives full approval to the progressive destruction of the Canadian shipping industry. This is seen in the fact that in spite of such foreign registry, the companies and ships involved continue to receive from this government treatment reserved for domestic shipping.

They cannot have it both ways. If they are registered as Liberian or Panamanian vessels with foreign crews, they should be treated as such by the laws of this country and should be compelled to meet all requirements and conditions pertaining to foreign shipping. In fact, they are not so required and continue to enjoy all the privileges of Canadian shipping; for example, free and unrestricted access to Canadian ports, and apparently free access to subsidies. Canadians are becoming fed up with the abuse of registry implied in these activities.

I ask the minister or whoever is going to reply for him—I believe the house is entitled to an answer—how many such transfers have taken place in the last 18 months? I think we should have this information, and I hope it will be forthcoming in order to throw light on a situation which is causing great concern among seamen generally. The transfer of registry as a device to avoid paying Canadian wages, while at the same time accepting Canadian subsidies and being granted all the privileges of Canadian registry, should not be tolerated one moment longer. I hope that the minister or his parliamentary secretary will be able to deal with these points, because I can assure the minister that I do not intend to let the matter drop here.

I should like to read into the record a wire I have received from the mayor and members of the North Sydney Town Council. It reads as follows:

We advise the vessel "Cape Breton Miner" owned by Upper Lakes Shipping Co. will shortly be changed from Canadian registry to foreign registry (Liberia). Understand Canadian crew will be displaced following this change.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Strongly deplore situation which allows this to happen to vessels built with contribution from Canadian taxpayers. Urge legislation be amended to require such vessels remain under Canadian registry for all time.

I should like to mention also that the North Sydney Longshoremen's Union, Local 1259 I.L.A. sent a letter to the Prime Minister which reads as follows:

Dear Prime Minister Trudeau:

We, the executive, and members of Local 1259 I.L.A. wish to protest the change in registry of the ship "Cape Breton Miner" from Canadian registry to Liberian and also change of crew from Canadian to Chinese. We understand it was the Canadian taxpayers' dollars that helped finance the building of this ship, and also the taxpayers' money that paid the subsidy to transport coal from Cape Breton to Ontario markets.

We protest the action of Great Lakes shipping on all these counts and feel action should be taken by the Canadian parliament to prevent such things happening in the future.

Yours very truly,
George H. MacDonald,
President.

I hope that whoever replies to this letter of grievance will be in a position to elaborate a little on what the government may have in mind with regard to the situations I have mentioned.

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I was given notice of this question today. I was not in the house when my hon. friend raised it initially. I made some inquiries in the interim, and while the basic facts appear to be as they were represented by my friend, as yet in any event, the registry of shipping has not been advised of this intention. There has been no formal representation or application for this transfer or no indication that it is coming. I have had, as has my hon. friend, representations from the area, and I assume there is no reason to suspect that this is not the action that is contemplated now.

So far as the general statements that were made by the hon. member are concerned, I think I have to say that the situation is not precisely as he has stated. In the first instance, the vessel's owners have met with the requirements laid down in the current legislation with regard to retention of ownership for a period of years in return for the subsidy. I believe it is five years after the subsidy is given that the vessel must remain under Canadian registry. It is also extremely difficult to determine whether, as one of the representations stated, these vessels should remain under Canadian registry forever. I suspect there would be some argument from the Canadian shipbuilding industry on this score, as well as from shipping interests. I mention this simply to highlight one of the difficulties that exists in the whole shipbuilding industry in Canada, that is that there is a wide diversity and conflict of views among the different groups that make up this important industry.

All of this aside, I am in complete sympathy with the plight of a crew that is replaced in this fashion. I would like to be able to give a commitment and to say that we could change the situation or that there was some way in which we could prevent this kind of thing from happening. I would be less than honest, though, if I did not recognize and point out to the house the interlocking difficulties that arise here. I will be more than pleased, and in fact I have already initiated some inquiries, to see whether or not we can, if it is in the best interests of the country or of the seamen concerned, make some more stringent regulations in this regard. But again I can only emphasize that it has been my experience that we have to anticipate the reactions to this kind of action, and I hope these will not be detrimental. In other words, I hope that by closing one door we would not be opening up a situation which would be of even greater seriousness or which would be detrimental to Canadian industry or Canadian workers.

I have taken note of the hon. member's representations and I make an undertaking now to look into this matter as quickly as possible, first of all in the light of the particular incident to which he has drawn my attention, and secondly to determine whether any review is possible under the circumstances I have outlined.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—PRINCE RUPERT —MONITORING TELEPHONE CALLS

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank Your Honour for letting me bring this matter before the house tonight because, although it is perhaps not an issue of national character it is one of real local urgency. On the other hand, if this local dispute is a valid example of the general stupidity of Postmasters across Canada, then I think the boiling cauldron of postal unrest which is apparently beginning to show signs of some tranquillity will erupt once again to the discomfort of the minister and of all those employed by the department. Therefore, this is a very serious matter indeed.

I understand that labour-management relations in the Prince Rupert Post Office, to which I refer, have been delicate for some time. Unprovable allegations of racial discrimination have been whispered about arising from the fact that the president of the local happens to be of east Indian ancestry. This accounts for some of the difficulties in labour-management relations at this post office. What led to the current controversy were, the tactless and stupid statements made by the postmaster, Mr. Doug Layton, in the course of an address to the local chamber of commerce reported as a front page item in the Prince Rupert *Daily News* of May 6. I

should like to quote this report in part. The headline reads: "Poor Habits Delay Mail".

Mail delivery delays here have been caused by staffing problems, misleading date times and missorting, Postmaster Doug Layton told the Chamber of Commerce Monday.

"The staff here is not the best," he charged, "but they have not slowed down since the strike as they have in big cities like Vancouver, Montreal and Toronto."

Any reasonable individual would wonder what might prompt Mr. Layton to publicly make a statement so provocative and so contemptuous of the people who are his subordinates. Was he trying to defend himself from the blistering criticism of the postal service so familiar to the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) himself? Was he attempting to ingratiate himself with the local wheels in the chamber of commerce? I do not know what his motives were. Maybe he doesn't know himself. All I know is that he engaged in singularly unenlightened management practices and cast a shadow on all the postal workers, offending them and insulting them in general, whether they were guilty or not, in and before the community in which they work.

Naturally, there were was an immediate reaction from the slandered workers concerned. A meeting with the postmaster was demanded and on May 6 and 7 the following exchange took place as reported to the C.U.P.W. by the local president, Mr. Sangha. I have tabled the whole letter, but in the interest of brevity I will read only the last two paragraphs:

The Postmaster did not deny that he was misquoted by the reporter. A suggestion to have a meeting with the Chief Editor and the Reporter and have us as observers was apparently rejected. Finally, we demanded a complete retraction or correction by 3.30 on May 7th, 1969 so that the whole matter can be referred to the District or National Office for the necessary action. Nothing came out of this demand, but consequently in today's *Daily News* the attached "Letter to the Editor" has appeared. If you examine the wording close enough you might find out why we are still completely dissatisfied and mad.

Since you are fully aware of our daily abnormal situation in this particular Post Office, and the inhuman attitude of the Postmaster towards all the employees, we hope the National Office will institute the necessary action in order to clear up and resolve our past, present and the future problems.

The following is the complete text of a letter which appeared in the *Daily News* of May 8:

A recent report on a talk I gave to the Chamber of Commerce has perhaps cast a rather poor reflection on the local Post Office staff.

[Mr. Rose.]

It was not my intent to do this and I rather resent when local or federal Post Office employees are criticized collectively for incidents over which they have no control.

Unfortunately, locally due to such a high staff turnover for various reasons we have been forced to use partially and untrained staff on many occasions. This has caused some internal problems but I hope few external problems.

Should you the Public have complaints about the service or the service given by postal employees then I expect you to make them known to me so that these may be cleared up when it is possible to do so.

D. B. Layton
Postmaster

I suggest in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons for the "high staff turnover" and the "untrained staff" referred to is the rigid, inflexible, even medieval attitude and management practices of the local postmaster himself. Something should be done about this immediately, because in this case control rests undeniably with the minister himself. Some time before May 12 the Postmaster had an automatic recording device installed on the receiver of the only phone in that post office in order to monitor all incoming and outgoing calls. Incidentally, this is the only phone in the office, and the office remained locked this afternoon. Did the Postmaster General authorize this delightful innovation? Did the British Columbia director authorize it? I think not. I think that this was the brainchild of a narrow minded local boss who, not being content to vilify his employees in public, now wants to spy on them in private.

• (10:20 p.m.)

The standing committee on justice and legal affairs has recently had before it four bills concerned with wiretapping and devices for eavesdropping, spying and invading privacy, to the revulsion, I think, of most members of parliament. This is done—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) rose in the house today because I was under the impression, having discussed the matter with him last evening, that he was going to give me time to investigate some correspondence he had shown me last night. We are now faced with the situation where a man in Prince Rupert, who cannot defend himself here, has been accused—

yes, accused—of what amounts, in the member's own words, to "unprovable allegations of discrimination being whispered about".

It may be that the head of the union is an East Indian, but I do not think that that is any basis for alleging that the postmaster is thereby discriminating. There are on many occasions differences between union leaders and management, and certainly this is true in cases where the two people concerned are of the same race and language. I think the hon. member has taken a deplorable position, especially in view of the fact that he has said that the allegations are unprovable and are only "being whispered about".

First of all, let me make it clear that neither the Postmaster General nor any of my officials authorized any telephone calls to Prince Rupert, or to anywhere else in this country, to be monitored with an automatic tape recorder. Since my hon. friend has obtained most of his information, and legitimately so, from one source, I expect it was also explained to him that the tape recorder was never attached to the phone while the union leader was in the office. The postmaster himself was expecting a personal call which I presume the person making the call wanted recorded.

With respect to the speech given to the business community in Prince Rupert, the postmaster did praise to some extent the performance of those who work for the post office. The postmaster there is apparently quite proud of being postmaster, as I am extremely proud of being Postmaster General. I am also proud of my 48,000 employees. However—and this is usually the case with most speeches—that part of the speech which praised the performance of the people who work for me was not recorded or published, because that sort of thing does not make news. However, many other things were recorded.

In his speech, for example, the postmaster pointed out the necessity for more co-operation with the business community, who could improve delivery of their mail by mailing in the mornings because there was a one o'clock flight from Prince Rupert. If they failed to do so, the next flight was at eight o'clock the following morning. As we all are, the Postmaster was quite frank in his criticism; he mentioned that he had the normal number of new people on his staff, and that he had difficulties in training them.

Motion agreed to, and the house adjourned at 10.26 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Wednesday, May 14, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### LABOUR, MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Fifth report of Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration—Mr. Caccia.

[*Editor's Note: For above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

ASSISTANCE TO MELVILLE PULP AND PAPER

Question No. 1,413—**Mr. Schreyer:**

1. What amount of federal aid has been extended to Melville Pulp and Paper Company Ltd. in each of the past five years?

2. How much of this assistance was in the form of (a) grants (b) loans and at what terms (c) accelerated capital cost allowance?

3 Who is the principal owner or majority shareholder of Melville Pulp and Paper Company Ltd.?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion as follows:

1. None.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

*APPOINTMENT OF LEVEL SIX POSTAL OFFICERS

Question No. 1,624—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many new level six postal officers have been appointed since January 1, 1969 and how many more is it proposed to appoint?

2. What salaries will these postal officers (level six) be paid?

3. What is the reason for this increase in postal officers (level six) and what are the duties of these officers?

4. Do the level six postal officers get mileage payments when they travel in their own cars and, if so, how much?

5. How much money has been allocated for payments of expenses for level six postal officers in the coming fiscal year?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, as the answer to this question is quite long, would the house agree to its being put on the record and deemed to have been read?

1. The need for additional supervision within the letter carrier function was foreseen and planned for in 1967. The need arose particularly from the new walk evaluation system which was being developed. To meet the need, 280 positions of Postal Operations, Level 6, were allocated. Of these 146 have now been filled.

2. Level 6 salary range: $6,973, $7,196, $7,419.

3. The basic structure of supervision in the letter carrier group was reviewed because of changes in work which had been introduced. The most significant of these changes had to do with a new walk evaluation system, developed and tested with the cooperation of the Letter Carriers' Union and implemented following agreement in principle between the union and the department. The system was designed to meet the need to ensure an equitable work load for each letter carrier and to offset any adverse effects resulting from substantial changes in the nature of a walk.

These officers are required to perform duties in accordance with the job description found on page 24 of the Classification Group Standard, Postal Operations Group, Operational Category, which has been made available to the unions.

4. Yes, if no public transportation is available or convenient. Mileage allowance is paid in accordance with Treasury Board Travel Regulations and the rates are as follows: (a) For each of the first 5,000 miles with proof of commercial insurance: 13 cents per mile; without proof of commercial insurance: 12 cents per mile. (b) For each of the next 3,000 miles with or without proof of commercial insurance, 12 cents per mile. (c) For each mile in excess of 8,000 miles, 9 cents per mile.

*Questions*

5. No funds have been allocated specifically for the use of these supervisors. Postmasters have authority to approve the use of privately owned motor vehicles by all supervisory officers who might be required to do so in the performance of their duties where no public transportation is available or convenient. Such expenses will be paid out of a general travel fund.

[*English*]

POSTAL RATES REQUIRED TO MAINTAIN RATIOS

Question No. 1,787—**Mr. Kaplan:**

Has the Post Office Department estimated what postal rates must be set to maintain the present ratios as between classes of mail service and provide six-day service without additional deficits and, if so, what are such rates?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: The saving in cost in reducing to 5-day delivery service in urban areas is approximately $10,000,000 annually. While it would be difficult to estimate the effect on all postal rates of restoring this service, it would be necessary to increase the letter rate by the equivalent of ½¢ a letter to offset the cost of the additional delivery service.

HIRING OF ROD SERVICES EMPLOYEES

Question No. 1,830—**Mr. MacInnis:**

1. (a) How many employees of Rod Services have been engaged by the Post Office Department as at March 21, 1969 (b) of the Rod Services employees hired to date by the Post Office Department, how many were hired according to normal Civil Service qualifying and eligibility procedures and how many were appointed by Order in Council?

2. In what positions were Rod Services employees taken into the Post Office Department?

3. (a) In the case of Rod Services employees hired by the Post Office Department, were they hired through the Public Service Commission according to Civil Service regulations and normal Civil Service procedures and did they qualify for Civil Service employment in the normal way (b) were any hired as prevailing rates employees and, if so, how many and how did they qualify?

4. (a) Is it the intention of the Post Office Department to offer positions to the remaining several hundred Rod Services employees and, if so, how is it proposed to qualify them for employment according to Civil Service regulations (b) is it the intention to waive normal Civil Service procedures and eligibility lists in this instance and, if so, for what reason?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. (a) 27; (b) These 27 were hired under the Public Service Employment Act and Regulations.

2. Mail Service courier positions.

3. (a) See 1 (b); (b) No.

4. (a) The Post Office Department advises that transportation studies are under way in the Department covering all aspects of city mail transportation requirements to determine the most effective means of providing these services; (b) No.

PRE-DOCTORAL CANADA COUNCIL GRANTS

Question No. 1,926—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. In the academic years 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70, how many applications for pre-doctoral Canada Council grants were received?

2. In those years, how many were granted?

3. In those years, how many were turned down for lack of funds rather than lack of merit?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. The numbers of applications for pre-doctoral fellowships were as follows: in 1965-66, 931; in 1966-67, 1053; in 1967-68, 1,435; in 1968-69, 2,504; in 1969-70, 3,603. It should be noted that the figure for 1965-66 includes 168 applications under the pre-master scholarship program which was discontinued that year.

2. The numbers of pre-doctoral fellowships granted were as follows: in 1965-66, 323; in 1966-67, 429; in 1967-68, 949; in 1968-69, 1,554; in 1969-70, 2,165. The figure for 1965-66 includes 33 awards under the pre-master scholarship program which was discontinued that year.

3. Such statistics are not known. The Council in allocating funds for doctoral fellowships takes into account the possible number of applicants from the universe of eligible doctoral candidates and the requirements of its other programmes. The members of the selection juries in assessing the applications rank the candidates in order of merit within a quota system, the formula being that of a competition and not of an examination. It is not possible, therefore, to determine the number of deserving candidates not being offered awards in a given year for lack of funds.

NEW REVISED STATUTES

Question No. 1,937—**Mr. Chappell:**

When will the new Revised Statutes of Canada be available to replace the 1952 edition?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Manuscript for the new Revised Statutes of

Canada is now being sent to the Canadian Government Printing Bureau for composition of the draft Statute Roll. The production schedule calls for completion of master proof by October 31, 1969. Distribution would be expected to follow in two to three months if the Report of the Commissioners and draft Statute Roll are acceptable to the Governor in Council.

GRANTS TO INDIAN FELLOWSHIP CENTRES

Question No. 1,952—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. Does the Department of the Secretary of State through the Citizenship Branch make grants to Indian Friendship Centres?

2 Are such grants made in accordance with the terms of agreements with the various provincial governments?

3. If so, what is the nature of such agreements and by what means could they be modified?

4. What are the names and locations of Friendship Centres to which grants have been made in 1968 and what amounts respectively were paid by the federal government to each?

5. Is it the intention of the government to re-valuate the useful work accomplished by these Friendship Centres with a view to increasing the amounts paid thereto?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** 1. Yes.

2. Partly. Agreements exist with three provinces. The other provinces have not signed agreements although they contribute to the centres operating within their boundaries.

3. The federal and provincial government share costs on a 50-50 basis. The agreements can be modified on the initiative of the provincial government with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

4. Friendship House, 744 Fraser Street, Prince Rupert, British Columbia, $4,000; Port Alberni Friendship Centre, P.O. Box 23, 121-2nd Avenue North, Port Alberni, B.C., $4,000; Vancouver Indian Centre Society, 1655 West Broadway, Vancouver 9, B.C., $8,000; The Canadian Indian Centre of Toronto, 210 Beverly Street, Toronto 5, Ontario, $13,000; Indian Youth Friendship Centre, 138 Front Street, Port Arthur, Ontario, $5,000; Thunderbird Friendship Centre, Geraldton, Ontario, $2,000; Parry Sound Friendship Centre, Parry Sound, Ontario, $4,000; Skookum Jim Hall, Whitehorse, Yukon, $1,000.

Grants to individual centres in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan have not been finalized. The maximum amount under the agreements with Manitoba and Alberta is $30,000 and in Saskatchewan $20,000.

5. This matter is under consideration.





*USE OF CANADIAN AIRSPACE BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Question No. 1,972—**Mr. Lewis:**

1. What is the policy of the government in relation to the use of our airspace for military purposes by foreign countries?

2. Under what authority do United States military aircraft have permission to fly in Canadian airspace?

3. What is the extent and nature of the control that Canada has over United States military aircraft flying in Canadian airspace?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is as follows: 1. Military aircraft of foreign countries wishing to use Canadian airspace require Canadian government authorization.

2. Order-in-Council PC 2307 of April 17, 1952.

3. Aircraft belonging to and operated by the United States armed services are permitted to fly over, land in, and take off from Canadian territory on the basis of reciprocity, and in compliance with orders and directions issued by the Minister of National Defence under the order-in-council cited above.

[*English*]

*POSTAL DELIVERY ON HOUSEHOLDER BASIS

Question No. 1,982—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Is free postal delivery provided on an individual householder basis in the urban centres of Canada?

2. Is there a special charge for individual boxes in rural post offices?

3. If the answer to parts 1 and 2 is "yes", what is the reason for the difference in the cost of service as between urban centres and rural centres?

4. Has there been a recent increase in the cost of post office boxes in rural post offices and, if so, how much?

5. Is the Post Office Department planning to provide improved postal service to rural communities by either (a) putting all householders on free rural route delivery, or (b) where this is not possible, providing free postal box service to those who have to drive long distances to pick up their mail?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, as the answer to this question is also quite long, would the house agree to it being put

on the record and deemed to have been read?

1. Yes. In communities of more than 2,000 householders.

2. Yes.

3. The Post Office Department provides free, three basic types of delivery; general delivery, rural delivery and letter carrier delivery. Because lock box service is an optional service, a fee is charged patrons who wish to avail themselves of this special service. Lock box fees in the urban centres are higher than in the rural centres because salary and accommodation costs are generally higher in the urban centres.

4. Box rental fees were increased effective 1st February 1969 in both rural and urban centres. The fees charged in rural post offices prior to and after the increase are shown hereunder:

| Service | Former Fees | | Present Fees |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Patrons Residing in Non-Letter Carrier Delivery Areas | Patrons Residing in Letter Carrier Delivery Areas | All Patrons Renting Boxes in Non-Letter Carrier Delivery Post Offices |
| Style of Postal Box | $ | $ | $ |
| A | 2.00 | 6.00 | 4.00 |
| B | 3.00 | 8.00 | 6.00 |
| C | 5.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| D | 8.00 | 15.00 | 15.00 |
| E | 10.00 | 18.00 | 20.00 |
| Bag Service | 10.00 | 18.00 | 20.00 |

5. (a) Yes, if requests are received from patrons concerned who qualify under existing criteria governing rural mail delivery. (b) No, as previously explained, this is an optional service.

[*English*]

ATTAINMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ARTISTIC STATUS

Question No. 1,994—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. Is it the policy of the Canada Council to assist Canadian artists in attaining professional status?

2. If so, what criteria are followed by the Council in making such awards?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. The Canada Council's assistance to individual Canadian artists is mainly directed to the professional artist who has been practising his art for a good many years, and to the artist in the earlier stages of his professional career. However, (a) the Council also includes some young persons specially recommended by senior artists for very exceptional talent, and others taking advanced instruction in master classes; and (b) the Council gives assistance to organizations which provide national services in the development of young artists, such as the National School of the Theatre, the National Ballet School, the National Youth Orchestra.

2. The essential criterion used in making awards to persons mentioned in (a) above is that, in the opinion of the Council's expert advisors in each discipline, they have begun to show artistic merit and exceptional promise in their field.

SUBSIDIZING OF NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE PROGRAMS

Question No. 1,995—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. Has the Canada Council allocated any funds to subsidize artistic programs being presented at the National Arts Centre during the two weeks following the opening of the National Arts Centre on June 2, 1969?

2. If so, what is the amount that has been allocated for this purpose?

3. Is it the intention of the Canada Council to continue to subsidize performances at the National Arts Centre and, if so, to what extent?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. The Canada Council has made the following grants which provide some direct or indirect contribution to the total costs of the National Arts Centre's opening Festival: (i) to the National Ballet Company, as a part of the company's new 69-70 season, for part of the production costs of the ballet *Kraanerg* which will receive its première in Ottawa; (ii) to the Théâtre du Nouveau Monde, as a part of its regular 69-70 season, for part of the production costs of a musical version of Aristophanes' comedy *Lysistrata* which will receive its première in Ottawa; (iii) to the Vancouver Playhouse towards the costs of bringing to wider attention in Ottawa *The Ecstasy of Rita Joe*, a play by the Canadian author George Ryga which was presented during Vancouver's last season with assistance from the Canada Council; (iv) to the National Arts Centre for part of the preproduction cost of the new opera *Orphée* by the Canadian composer Gabriel Charpentier; (v) to the National Arts Centre for part of the preproduction cost of the new play *Party*

*Game* by the Canadian dramatist Jack Winter.

2. The total amount allocated for: (a) new productions for the 1969-70 seasons of two established companies is $65,000; (b) touring of a new Canadian play is $15,000; (c) two new productions to be presented by the National Arts Centre itself is $20,000.

3. The Canada Council will treat the resident organizations of the National Arts Centre like any such organizations in the country which present arts to the public, and will determine the amount of its subsidy in accordance with the kind of assistance it gives for similar work throughout Canada. In addition, some of the Council's assistance to organizations elsewhere for touring may be of indirect benefit to the National Arts Centre.

CANADA COUNCIL CLASSIFICATIONS

Question No. 1,996—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. How does the Canada Council define "professional" persons or groups?

2. Have any persons or groups not defined by the Council as "professional" been given awards, grants, or other assistance during the last five years?

3. If so, who are these persons or groups and what are their names and addresses?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. (a) Ideally, a professional artist is one who gains his whole livelihood by the exercise of his art or skill. For economic reasons, this ideal cannot always be achieved in Canada, and in some art forms very rarely anywhere in the world. The status must therefore be extended to artists who earn only a part of their livelihood by the exercise of their art and the remainder usually by related activities, but who are dedicated to an art rather than to the enjoyment of a pastime. For practical purposes the Council also includes some young persons specially recommended by senior artists for very exceptional talent, and others taking advanced instruction in master classes; (b) The Council defines professional groups as: (i) those which employ persons described in (a) above; or (ii) provide those same persons with their means of communication to the public; or (iii) provide services on a non-profit basis to such persons.

2. (a) No persons not defined in 1(a) above, or not representing the organizations listed in (b) below, have been given assistance; (b) The Council has given assistance during the last 5 years to some organizations which provide professional services, on a national or large regional scale, to persons who are expected to reach professional status. These include: National School of the Theatre, 407 St. Lawrence Blvd., Montreal; National Ballet School, 111 Maitland Street, Toronto; National Youth Orchestra, 57 Bloor Street West, Toronto; Vancouver Opera Workshop, 856 Seymour Street, Vancouver; The New School of Art, 602A Markham Street, Toronto 4.

In addition, the Council has given limited assistance during the last 5 years to some organizations which, on a national or large regional scale, provide services to persons not necessarily expected to reach professional status, and to some major choral groups. These include: Dominion Drama Festival, 170 Metcalfe Street, 8th Floor, Ottawa 4; L'Association Canadienne du Théâtre Amateur, Centre Culturel, Cité des Jeunes, Vaudreuil, Que.; Canadian Federation of Music Festivals, 116 Edmonton St., Winnipeg 1, Man.; Canadian Society for Education through Art, c/o The Winnipeg School, Division No. 1, 1577, Wall St. E., Winnipeg 3, Man.; Maison des Étudiants in Paris, 31, boulevard Jourdain, Paris (XIV$^{e}$); Federation of Amateur Cinematographers (travel grants only), Box 273, Youville Station, Montreal 11, Que.; Festival Singers of Toronto, 49 Wellington Street, Toronto 1, Ontario; Toronto Mendelssohn Choir, 49 Wellington Street, Room 38, Toronto 1, Ontario; Bach-Elgar Choir of Hamilton, P.O. Box 411, Hamilton, Ontario; Calgary Festival Chorus, c/o Mr. Michael Bancroft, Q.C., Suite 701, Britannia Building, Calgary 1, Alberta; Vancouver Bach Choir, 121 Rickman Place, New Westminster, B.C.; The Ottawa Choral Society, P.O. Box 952, Ottawa 4, Ontario; The Cantata Singers of Ottawa, c/o Mr. Brian Law, c/o St. Matthew's Church, Carling Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario; La Chorale de l'Université de Moncton, Université de Moncton, Moncton, N.B.; The Handel Society of Music of New Westminster, 12657-98th Street, North Surrey, B.C.; The Orpheus Choir of Toronto, 52 Cheritan Avenue, Toronto 12, Ontario; Tudor Singers of Montreal, P.O. Box 603, Station H, Montreal 25, P.Q.; Chamber Singers of U.B.C., Music Department, University of British Columbia, Vancouver 8, B.C.

3. Addresses given in 2 above.

APPLICATIONS TO CANADA COUNCIL FOR GRANTS

Question No. 1,999—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. Does the Canada Council keep a record of all applications for grants or assistance?

*Questions*

2. Does the Canada Council acknowledge by letter, or otherwise, written applications for grants or assistance and if so, is a record kept of such acknowledgments?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

AWARDS TO "TOWN FOOL"

Question No. 2,000—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. How many awards have been given to a person known as the "Town Fool" of Vancouver, B.C., and what is the total amount of these awards?

2. Is the above-mentioned "Town Fool" categorized by the Council as a "professional" Fool or an "amateur" Fool?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. One of $3,500.

2. Mr. Joachim Foikis has revived an ancient form of art which was practised by professionals in the middle-ages and the Renaissance. His case is unique and experiments of this kind do not lend themselves to the usual distinctions.

AWARDS TO "PIANO SMASHER"

Question No. 2,001—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. How many awards were given to a person known as the "Piano-smasher", and what is the total amount of these awards?

2. Is the above-mentioned "Piano-smasher" categorized as a "professional" Piano-smasher or an "amateur" Piano-smasher?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: 1. One travel grant of $284 was paid to a Vancouver art gallery to cover the cost of the return air fare from New York to Vancouver for the artist Ralph Ortiz.

2. Mr. Ortiz is considered to be a professional artist.

RESTRICTIONS ON CANADA COUNCIL GRANTS

Question No. 2,016—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

Is the Canada Council restricted to awarding grants or other assistance to "professional" persons or groups and, if so, by what authority?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the Canada Council as follows: The Council is not restricted by law. But the limited funds available to the Council for the arts force it, in the economic interest of Canada's professional artists and their public, to give much less assistance in the non-professional field than the Council would wish.



*TICKET SUBSIDIES PAID BY CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Question No. 2,021—**Mr. McCleave:**

Did ticket subsidies have to be paid by the Centennial Commission to (a) the Don Messer Jubilee (b) any other group mentioned in the answer to question 639?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, ticket subsidies were awarded under a cost sharing program agreed to between the Centennial Commission and the participating provinces.

The Commission paid its contribution directly to the provinces which managed themselves the aid program concerning such tickets.

CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY OVER NORTHERN REGION

Question No. 2,028—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Are negotiations being conducted between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America with respect to sovereignty over Canada's northern region and, if so, what exactly are the details of the negotiations between the two countries?

2. Are there oil deposits in the islands which are the subject of such negotiations?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1. No.

2. In view of the negative reply to part 1 above, the reply to part 2 addresses itself only to the general question whether there are oil deposits in the Canadian Arctic islands. There have been no oil discoveries to date in these islands, but geological conditions prevailing in Canada's Arctic archipelago are similar to those in other oil-bearing regions.

[*English*]

VIOLENCE IN TELEVISION PROGRAMMING

Question No. 2,100—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Is the Government of Canada considering a study of violence in television programming and its effects on viewers, especially children?

2. Has the C.B.C. ever undertaken such a study and, if so, what were the results, and will this report be tabled in Parliament?

3. Is the C.B.C. presently undertaking such a study and, if so, when is it expected that this study will be completed?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** 1. No. I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: 2 and 3. The C.B.C. is not engaged in any formal

study of violence in television programming. The C.B.C. defined some years ago a general policy in this field for the guidance of its program officers. The Corporation has been and still is fully conscious of the problem.

Feature films and program series on a number of occasions have been refused because of their violent character. Assurances have been received from U.S. network officials, in informal discussions, that officers concerned with program standards and practices are under strict instruction to be on guard against the undue and unnecessary exploitation of violence in television programming. In the last new months, in the light of studies developed recently in America or abroad, a review of C.B.C. policy has been taking place.

*GANDER—ALLEGED DENIAL OF LANDING RIGHTS TO R.A.F.

Question No. 2,110—**Mr. McGrath:**

Was the United Kingdom denied landing rights for RAF planes at Gander International Airport during the Anguilla affair and, if so, how long did this prohibition remain in effect?

**Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs):** No, Mr. Speaker. Landing rights at Gander for British military aircraft, which derive from long standing reciprocal arrangements between Canada and Britain, were not denied to Britain during the Anguilla operation. However, it was indicated to the British government that the Canadian government would prefer that alternative arrangements be made, should this be possible.

COMMENTS ON CANCELLATION OF DON MESSER SHOW

Question No. 2,115—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. What amount of mail or number telephone calls has the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation received with respect to the cancellation of the Don Messer show and how much was (a) favourable (b) unfavourable?

2. What attempt was made to assess the importance to the viewing public of the Don Messer show prior to its cancellation?

3. In what way were the performers informed of the show's cancellation?

4. In light of public reaction, what provision is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation making for either the resumption of the Don Messer show in its regular format or production of a new show with the same basic cast?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: 1. Approximate total national mail and telephone calls as of May 1st:

| | Favourable | Unfavourable |
|---|---|---|
| Mail | 45 | 5200 |
| Telephone Calls | 45 | 1400 |

2. The week-by-week reactions of the viewing public to the Don Messer show, and indeed to all C.B.C. network programs, are kept under continuing study by the C.B.C. research department. In the case of the Don Messer program, one of the factors taken into consideration was the gradual decline in the size of the audience in recent years, particularly from mid-season on; another factor was the age structure of the Don Messer audience. This and other relevant information was fully reviewed prior to the show's cancellation.

3. Don Messer was informed of the network decision verbally by the producer in Halifax and by letter from the network office.

4. The decision already announced relates to the national network (English) only; possible alternatives are still being examined but no decisions regarding these have yet been reached.

WYNYARD, SASK.,—LEASING OF OFFICE SPACE

Question No. 2,116—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Is the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development leasing office space in the Town of Wynyard and, if so, from whom is this space leased?

2. What is the amount of space being leased?

3. What is the term of the lease?

4. What is the amount of the lease rental and any other charges?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** 1. Yes, from Wynyard Stern Motors Ltd., 1370 Mathers Bay, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

2. 1610 square feet net.

3. Terms of lease: February 1, 1969 to January 31, 1970, and month to month thereafter.

4. Lease rental: $3600. per annum ($2.24 per sq. ft.); Other charges: Cleaning—$125. monthly by a separate contract not with the Lessor. Electricity—$13. monthly (approximate average).

APPLICATION OF INCOME TAX TO TRADE TOOLS

Question No. 2,126—**Mr. Gleave:**

Is the government considering designating the amount that a workman pays for his tools as deductable for income tax purposes in the following trades (a) automobile mechanics (b) carpenters and woodworkers (c) plumbers (d) miners?

*Questions*

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** This is a matter of Government policy. If the Government should decide to propose an amendment to the Income Tax Act to grant a deduction for expenditures of this kind it will be announced at the appropriate time.

BASIS OF DON MESSER SHOW PERFORMANCES

Question No. 2,140—**Mr. McCleave:**

How many years has the Don Messer Show been carried on national television (a) sponsored (b) sustaining basis?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the C.B.C. that the program has been fully sponsored since it was first carried regularly on the national TV network in the fall of 1959, except for two seasons in 1966-67, when it was sponsored on 35 out of 40 occasions, and in the current season when it was sponsored on 34 out of 40 occasions.

PILOTS FOR ZAMBIA

Question No. 2,150—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. Has the Government of Canada been asked if it would train pilots for the Government of Zambia?
2. If so, has the Government of Canada agreed to do so, does it intend to do so, or does it intend to not grant the request?
3. Does the Government of Canada supply any military aid to Zambia?
4. Does the Government of Canada supply any military aid to Portugal?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Insofar as the Department of External Affairs is concerned: 1. Yes.

2. This request is at present under consideration.

3. Yes, the Canadian Government has trained a small number of infantry officer cadets over the past few years and one officer has attended the Canadian Forces Staff School.

4. No, not since Canadian NATO mutual aid to Portugal was terminated in 1961.

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,151—**Mr. Coates:**

What are the names and salaries of the Chairman and General Manager of the National Capital Commission?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** The annual salary of Mr. A. John Frost, Chairman of the National Capital Commission is $26,500.

[Mr. Gleave.]

The annual salary of Mr. Eric W. Thrift, General Manager of the National Capital Commission is $22,680.

IMMIGRATION APPEAL BOARD

Question No. 2,154—**Mr. Coates:**

What is the name and salary of the Chairman of the Immigration Appeal Board?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** The name of the Chairman of the Immigration Appeal Board is Miss Janet V. Scott. The salary of the Chairman is $22,000 per annum.

TRAINING OF MILITARY CADETS

Question No. 2,193—**Mr. Burton:**

1. What was the total amount of money spent by the Government of Canada during 1967-68 fiscal year in the training of military cadets?
2. What was the total amount of capital and operating expenditures incurred during 1967-68 fiscal year in conjunction with each military college operated in Canada?
3. What was the total amount of money spent in 1967-68 fiscal year on scholarships and other assistance for members of the armed forces to attend university or other advanced educational institutions?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Estimated costs for 1967-68 are as follows: 1. $13,608,000.

2.

| Name of Service College | Capital | Personnel Operating and Maintenance |
|---|---|---|
| Royal Military College | $40,000 | $ 5,080,000 |
| College militaire royal | 20,000 | 3,456,000 |
| Royal Roads | 6,000 | 2,224,000 |
| Totals | $66,000 | $10,760,000 |

3. $3,489,000.

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

PUBLIC WORKS OUTSIDE CONSULTANT STUDIES

Question No. 1,256—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. For the fiscal years 1966-67, 1967-68, what outside consultant studies have been undertaken or are presently in progress sponsored by the Department of Public Works?
2. What was the cost for each outside consultant study prepared for the Department and were the contracts from the Department awarded by competitive tendering and, if not, for what reason?

Return tabled.

SUPPORT OF GRADUATE STUDENTS

Question No. 1,496—**Mr. Lewis:**

1. (a) What is the current government policy with regard to the support of Canadian graduate students engaged in graduate programs at universities outside Canada (b) what is the current policy of the Canada Council with regard to the support of Canadian graduate students engaged in graduate programs at universities outside Canada (c) what is the current policy of the National Research Council with regard to the support of Canadian graduate students engaged in graduate programs at universities outside Canada (d) do any of the current policies in (a), (b), (c) above represent a significant change from previous policies governing the same subject and, if so, in what respect and for what reasons?

2. (a) How many Canadian graduate students (i) were engaged in graduate programs outside of Canada (ii) were engaged in graduate programs in Canada, in each of the following academic years: 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69 (b) for each of the same years, in each of the categories (i) and (ii) above, how many of the students received assistance in the form of loans, bursaries or scholarships from the federal government or agencies created by the federal government (c) how many students in each of the categories (i) and (ii) above is it anticipated will receive assistance from the federal government or agencies created by the federal government in the academic years 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72?

3. Approximately how many places for graduate students (a) in the arts and social sciences (b) in the physical sciences, natural sciences and engineering (c) in total, will be available in Canadian universities in the academic years 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72?

Return tabled.

BY-LAWS IN PURSUANCE OF CANADA COUNCIL ACT

Question No. 1,998—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

Have any by-laws been passed by the Canada Council in pursuance of Section 10 of the Canada Council Act and if so, what are these by-laws?

Return tabled.

MONTHLY INCREASE IN MONEY SUPPLY

Question No. 2,095—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. What has been the increase in the money supply, month by month, in 1968 and 1969 to date?

2. What was the percentage increase in the money supply for the following years: 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969?

Return tabled.

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 136 and 150 for the production of papers are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house that notices of motions Nos. 136 and 150 be deemed to have been adopted?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

FARM CREDIT LOANS TO INDIANS

Motion No. 136—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of an agreement between the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Farm Credit Corporation to provide for long-term loans to Indians farming on reserves as announced by the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on May 1, 1969.

Motion agreed to.

HAGUE CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW

Motion No. 150—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all conventions and agreements signed by or on behalf of the Government of Canada at the conclusion of the 1968 Conference at the Hague on private international law.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Forest:** Notice of motion No. 118 is acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations concerning privileged papers and authorization of the government authorities concerned.

[*English*]

INDIAN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Motion No. 118—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all the educational programs referred to by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in answer to Question No. 1,448, appearing in *Hansard*, April 23, 1969, Pages 7844-7845.

**Mr. Speaker:** Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that notice of motion No. 118 be deemed to have been adopted?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

*Motions for Papers*

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Forest:** Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call notices of motions Nos. 91, 121, 122, 123, 135, and 148?

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

[*English*]

QUEEN ELIZABETH TELESCOPE

Motion No. 91—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the cost-benefit study on the Queen Elizabeth telescope project referred to by the President of the Treasury Board in *Hansard* on March 19, 1969, page 6842.

**Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, I had a conversation with the hon. member for Winnipeg North and explained to him that there was no such document as requested. I would therefore ask that he withdraw his motion.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, the minister did have a conversation with me, but having checked the *Hansard* reference it seems obvious to me that the minister created the impression that a cost-benefit study had in fact been prepared. The minister now says one has not. Since there is this difference of opinion and I am dissatisfied, I should like this transferred for debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to Standing Order 48 this notice of motion is transferred to notices of motions (papers).

**Mr. Speaker:** Number 121.

**Some hon. Members:** Stands.

**Mr. Speaker:** Number 122.

**Some hon. Members:** Stands.

**Mr. Speaker:** Number 123.

**Some hon. Members:** Stands.

KATES, PEAT AND WARWICK POST OFFICE STUDY

Motion No. 135—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study commissioned with Kates, Peat and Warwick by the Post Office Department on September 23, 1968, and completed November 19, 1968.

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Communications I wish to report as follows: I understand that the Minister of Communications has discussed this notice of motion with the hon. member and the hon. member has agreed to withdraw his notice since the document does not contain information of interest to the public that would justify the expense involved in preparing the document for publication. The minister will shortly make public the list of specific studies under way into the Post Office, which was, I believe, the circumstance which originally interested the hon. member in this document.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed that the motion shall be dropped?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

WHITE PAPER ON WOODS REPORT

Motion No. 148—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all communications from Veterans and Veterans organizations protesting the government's long delay in presenting the White Paper on the Wood's Committee Report and the government's replies thereto.

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Veterans Affairs, I wish to report as follows: The hon. member for Brandon-Souris has let us know that the communications he refers to in his motion are those directed to the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of National Defence and the office of the Prime Minister. The minister will therefore be happy to request that a search be made and to return any communications that have been received protesting the alleged delay in presenting the white paper on the Woods Committee report.

**Mr. Speaker:** Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the parliamentary secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that notice of motion No. 148 be deemed to have been adopted?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### HOUSING

FUNDS TO PERMIT MUNICIPALITIES TO SERVICE LANDS

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the government to introduce legislation which

would provide money from the federal government through provincial governments to enable municipalities to buy and service land for housing development?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is anticipating somewhat the housing debate. That legislation is before the house and we have indicated that it will be announced as one of the next items on the order of business. I therefore hope the hon. gentleman will be patient until the minister makes his speech when presenting the legislation to the house.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I am a very patient man but this point is not included within the bill. By way of supplementary question may I therefore ask the Prime Minister whether the government is reconsidering its rejection of the land bank proposal of the Hellyer task force? Will the Prime Minister say if the government is considering some modification of that proposal when the matter is presented to the house?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Of course, Mr. Speaker, everything will not be in the bill. Part of this matter will be government policy. Part of it will be implemented without there being any need for changes in the legislation. Those are the matters the minister will be discussing with the house when he presents the bill next week, hopefully, for second reading.

REQUEST FOR PRIORITY IN DEBATE OF LEGISLATION

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Prime Minister which arises out of the announcement of house business made yesterday. It is apparent that the first piece of major legislation to be dealt with is the official languages bill. While we in this party are anxious to promote linguistic equality in this country I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he will not consider giving top priority to legislation dealing with housing, industrial incentives and agricultural matters which demand immediate attention, if the house is to deal with them during the present session of parliament?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we have considered the matter and realize the importance of these economic matters. Two factors have entered into our decision here. The first is that the minister is a new minister, and we wanted to make sure that he had time not only to familiarize himself with the workings of that part of the government's operation, but also that he had time to present the kinds of changes the opposition is suggesting we should consider in our housing policy. The second is that, although some people are waiting for action in these economic fields, it is also true that other people have been waiting for 100 years for the government to act in the area of languages.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

## GRAIN

REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION TO ASSIST PRAIRIE FARMERS

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Considering the serious situation on the prairies as a result of declining quotas and reduced prices, has the government proceeded far enough with its review of this problem to be able to assure the house that some legislation will be introduced or that some announcement of policy will be made during the present session to cope with the matter?

**Mr. Speaker:** I am doubtful whether this is a valid supplementary, but the question having been asked, I will allow it.

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** I would like to ask a supplementary—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I recognized the question. Perhaps the minister responsible might wish to reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** If I may repeat the question, Mr. Speaker. I was asking the question because we are dealing with the house business for the balance of the session. I ask the Prime Minister if the government intends prior to the end of this session to introduce legislation or make any announcement of policy with a view to helping the prairie farmers.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has commented upon and answered this type of question many times in the past week. I have nothing to add.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## TRADE

### WHEAT—SALES AT PRICES COMPETITIVE WITH FRANCE

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Prime Minister would take this suggestion: In view of the fact we have a billion bushels piled up in the prairies and nothing is being done or said to help the situation, would the Prime Minister now consider trying to make a deal with the proper sales staff through the Wheat Board to sell this grain by matching the price at which France is selling wheat, in order to get some cash on the farms?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, just two days ago the right hon. member for Prince Albert was chiding the minister for selling the wheat at a price below the grain agreement.

**Mr. Woolliams:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister is again misrepresenting that statement by the right hon. member for Prince Albert. The Prime Minister knows that is a lie.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I have no intention of sitting down because you say so.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sure the hon. member is using words which, as an experienced counsel and member of the house, he knows he cannot use. It is obvious no member can accuse another member, even if he is the Prime Minister, of telling a lie. I think the hon. member may wish to alter or use other language. I suggest to the hon. member his words are not parliamentary.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I would say those facts he set out are lies, and that is as far as I am going to go.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I seek the co-operation of the hon. member. He knows what the rules of the house are. I am sure he wants to co-operate with the Chair and with all hon. members in using words which are parliamentary. I ask him very humbly to co-operate with the Chair in this regard.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Well, I would like to hear the Prime Minister, with the greatest respect to Your Honour, quote from *Hansard* to show that the right hon. member for Prince Albert said what the Prime Minister said he did. If the right hon. member for Prince Albert did not say it, then it is certainly an untruth.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to insist there must be order in the house. There must be some respect for the rules of the House of Commons.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Well, let's have the facts.

**Mr. Speaker:** One of the most elementary matters in debate in the House of Commons is that hon. members should use discretion in their use of words. I do not think the hon. member meant to use the word he did. I again ask the hon. member, in the light of his experience in parliament and in the light of his long experience in court, for his co-operation. The hon. member knows he would not be able to say this in a court of law. As this is the highest court of the land, the hon. member owes it to his professional training and to his status as a senior member of this house to co-operate with the Chair and indicate his words have gone beyond his thought.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I have had a lot of counsel work around me, but I say this, that there are many examples in this House of Commons and you, with the greatest respect, know it—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I wonder if the rump would just restrain itself.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would ask hon. members to give some assistance to the Chair. This is a serious matter. The hon. member is entitled to express his views. I certainly am very anxious to hear him and he knows I have always attempted to co-operate with him, and I would ask him to do the same with the Chair.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, you always give all hon. members that kind of encouragement they need. I have always respected the kind of wisdom that comes from the Chair, but I would say to you, with the greatest respect, that it is correct that I have sat in this house for a number of years. I have heard the same expressions used on many occasions. I have not called the Prime Minister the word, and I will not use it, that implies a person who tells lies. I have merely said that those facts were untrue.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I wonder if you would restrain yourselves.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the hon. gentleman is now coming rather close to my understanding of what this situation ought to be. We all know that hon. members often say that the statements made by another hon. member are incorrect or untrue. What we cannot say is that the words that have been uttered were wilfully and deliberately untrue. I am sure that this is perhaps in the sense that the hon. member said these words and I would ask him to confirm this so that I may sleep more easily tonight.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I accept your ruling in that regard, sir.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Well, Mr. Speaker, for my part I might say it is sometimes difficult to understand the inference in the questions or in the remarks. I understand the hon. member said I told a lie but that I was not a liar.

**An hon. Member:** He did not say that.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Yes he did; but, Mr. Speaker, the same thing arises with the matter under discussion. I am told that the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) did not say what I said he did. I would like to refer hon. members to *Hansard* at page 8627, just a day ago, May 13, when this question was addressed by the right hon. member to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin):

> Having regard to Canada's strong objection to sales of wheat being made below the I.G.A. price, would the minister say whether Canada itself at the present time is doing just that namely, selling below the price agreed internationally?

The minister agreed that Canada was doing that, and so the right hon. member said:

> I should like the minister to differentiate between an offence being committed because the difference involved is larger or smaller than the amount agreed to.

If this means anything at all it means that the right hon. member was telling the minister that by Canada selling below the I.G.A. price he was playing on subtleties and committing an offence against the agreement by the fact that he was selling a little below it; and now the Opposition are telling the house that we should sell below the agreed price. I believe they will have to make up their minds on this.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Prime Minister would want to be fair. Surely all he has done today is deal with a question of interpretation.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Woolliams:** That is his interpretation. I put another interpretation on the words. What I would say is that the right hon. member for Prince Albert did not say what the Prime Minister charged him with today, and in that regard I am proud to defend my leader—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Woolliams:** — my former leader.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Before we embark on another question of privilege—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. May I say just one word. I should like to have an opportunity perhaps to bring to an end the discussion we have had during the last few minutes. I think, for the record, it should be assumed that the word used by the hon. member has been withdrawn. I should like the rule established—if there is no other rule in the house—that at least this one word should be banned from those expressions normally used in the House of Commons.

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

### LEGISLATION RESPECTING INDUSTRIAL INCENTIVES

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Stanfield:** —I rise as a humble member of the house to ask a supplementary question directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. It arises out of the question asked by the leader of the New Democratic party but follows up a question I directed to the government house leader yesterday. I should like to ask the minister whether he can inform the house when legislation will be introduced with regard to industrial incentives. I ask this urgent question in view of the reported gap involved in the phasing out of the existing incentive program and the introduction of a new program. Can the

minister inform the house when this legislation will be introduced and whether it will be dealt with before the summer adjournment.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, I believe I indicated several months ago that I was hopeful the bill would be introduced in May. I am still hoping this can be done before the end of this session.

[*English*]

APPOINTMENT OF ATLANTIC ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS

**Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister can inform the house when the remaining members of the Atlantic Advisory Council will be appointed, with the hope that it may be shortly in order that they can consider this and other legislative measures to effectively assist the region.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** As we promised, Mr. Speaker, we are proceeding through consultation with all those concerned, with all the provinces. That is why it takes a little time to appoint the Council, but I hope this will be done within a relatively short time.

[*English*]

## AIR CANADA

POSSIBLE REDUCTION OF DOMESTIC SERVICE

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. My question is based on or prompted by statements made by Mr. Yves Pratt, chairman of the board of Air Canada, but in accordance with the rules I shall put my question to the minister directly. Is it government policy that Air Canada should seek additional routes around the world but cut back on its feeder and other domestic services within Canada.

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** No, Mr. Speaker; it is not government policy.

[*Translation*]

STRIKE OF MECHANICS—INQUIRY AS TO PROGRESS IN NEGOCIATIONS

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Transport is in the house, will he tell us today if the negotiations are progressing in the dispute between Air Canada and its employees and if he expects a settlement before long?

[*English*]

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I would think this might more properly be directed to the Minister of Labour.

[*Translation*]

[*Later:*]

**Mr. Rondeau:** Mr. Speaker, I apologize for having directed my question to the Minister of Transport. I would like now to put it to the Minister of Labour who could perhaps answer it.

[*English*]

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can tell the house is that negotiations between Air Canada and the particular union involved began at eleven o'clock this morning and to the best of my knowledge are proceeding in very orderly fashion.

## AIR TRANSPORT

CANADIAN PACIFIC AIRLINES AUCKLAND-VANCOUVER CONTRACT

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, in light of the suggestions allegedly made by the chairman of Air Canada to the effect that one air line, presumably Air Canada, should represent Canada on international routes, will the Minister of Transport ask his colleague the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether he will continue to press New Zealand to review its decision to cancel Canadian Pacific Airlines rights to land in that country.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Later:*]

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I had a supplementary question and I believe the minister was rising to make a reply.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question I heard the hon. member ask was that he was asking the minister to tell something to another minister, and I did not think, on that basis, the question was acceptable.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** On a point of order and with great respect I suggest there was a bit of a

conversation going on in the house at the time and therefore I can understand why Your Honour might not have heard the question. If not now, perhaps Your Honour might see me shortly so that I could restate the question.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the hon. member might restate the question. I hope it will not be in the same words.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** I thank Your Honour very much. In the light of the suggestions attributed to the chairman of Air Canada to the effect that one air line, presumably Air Canada, should represent Canada on international routes will the Minister of Transport discuss with his colleague the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether or not he will continue to press New Zealand to review its decision to cancel Canadian Pacific Airlines rights to land in that country and will it be government policy to press this matter on behalf of Canadian Pacific Airlines in view of this announcement.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would think my original ruling was correct. I believe I heard the question correctly in the first instance. I would suggest to the hon. member that I will return to him later on. He may have a third opportunity to ask the question in restated terms.

LANDING RIGHTS AT TORONTO FOR INTERNATIONAL CARRIERS

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary or perhaps related question which I should like to direct to the Minister of Transport. Will the minister say whether he has received representations from groups in Toronto asking that foreign air lines be given landing rights in Toronto on a temporary basis, and if so what reply he intends to make on behalf of the government.

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, such representations have been received. The reply is that the matter is being referred to the Canadian Transport Commission.

## DEFENCE PRODUCTION

H.M.C.S. "BONAVENTURE"—CANCELLATION OF REFIT CONTRACT

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Supply and Services or the Minister of National Defence. Is the minister in a position to confirm that the contract for the annual refit of the *Bonaventure* won by the Saint John yard has now been cancelled.

**Hon. Leo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we can refer to that as a contract. We have decided not to follow on the bid that was proposed. We have decided instead that we would do the minimum necessary overhaul and repair at the naval dockyard at Halifax, as a measure of economy.

**Mr. Bell:** Since the Saint John yard had the lowest tender and since it had the realistic tender on the previous *Bonaventure* refit—and I am looking at the President of the Treasury Board when I say that—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Bell:** —and since there is tremendous dislocation—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Would the hon. member look at the Chair, so that I may have an opportunity to ask him to put a question.

**Mr. Bell:** Excuse me for getting excited about this, Mr. Speaker, but will the minister give every assurance there will not be any contracting out of this nature to anyone else, unless it is a tender job, in view of what has gone on in respect of the *Bonaventure* matter.

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of National Defence understand that the main dock at the Saint John shipyard has been reserved for the *Bonaventure* since the opening of bids early in April, and that other ships have been turned away including a laker, a ferry and two tankers in contemplation of receiving this contract? What is the government going to do about this?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** Mr. Speaker, I think my responsibility in this regard is to look after the *Bonaventure,* not more than that. We are trying today to do everything necessary to keep that ship afloat and operational under the present austerity program.

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Defence for the purpose of clarifying this matter. Inasmuch as it is now over two years since the *Bonaventure* has been out of the water, and I say this with apologies to the gallery, to have her bottom scraped, will the minister indicate how much longer it will take before this is done? Let me remind the

house that last spring this was promised in the fall.

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** It will be done immediately, Mr. Speaker.

## EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—DESTRUCTION OF RELIEF AIRCRAFT

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he has received word from Canairelief concerning the destruction of a C-97 relief plane on Thursday, May 8 and, if so, what action has the minister taken?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, there was a plane of the Canadian International Red Cross destroyed as well as the plane mentioned by him. I think this is very unfortunate. These pilots fly at very great risk to themselves in an area of warfare. In so far as the two parties in the war are concerned, they are trying to give protection, but sometimes they are not successful. I really do not know that there is very much more the Canadian government can be expected to do than to urge the best possible arrangements for the delivery of relief supplies, which would include daylight flights with greatly reduced chance of loss.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Mr. Speaker, is it now the intention of the minister to make further representations to the Nigerian government asking it to eliminate the strafing and bombing of relief planes in order that these relief deliveries may be unmolested?

**Mr. Sharp:** It is very difficult to differentiate between arms planes and relief planes which fly in at night. I hope my hon. friend will urge everyone concerned to authorize daylight flights. This would substantially reduce the chances of loss.

## FINANCE

ACTION THROUGH INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND TO PREVENT CRISES

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is a repetition of the question I asked the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance yesterday. I seek information as to any restriction the minister may have in mind in proposals to the International Monetary Fund in respect of the flow of hot money, and steps that might be taken to avert these recurring international crises based on speculation.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, as I previously indicated, the central banks have indicated in each situation they would look at the particular facts in an attempt to discourage flows of so-called hot money by re-routing the flow of funds back to the countries of origin.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, has the minister proposed anything in the nature of a special tax on the entry or speculative incidence of these transactions, so as to discourage this type of speculation?

**Mr. Benson:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the flow to which my hon. friend has referred is the flow into Germany. I have seen indications of what the German government intends to do in this regard. I have no additional information beyond that which has been given in the press.

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

BAN ON PIPE TOBACCO AND CIGAR ADVERTISING

**Mr. J. E. Brown (Brant):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State to advise the house whether it is true that advertising in respect of pipe tobacco and cigars has been forbidden on programs of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as well as advertising in respect of cigarettes?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I was going to suggest to the hon. member that he cannot ask whether a statement is true or untrue, but I gather he has obtained the information he was seeking.

## CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP

PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING REVIEW

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement by the Secretary of State in Montreal recently, that his department is conducting a review of the Citizenship Act which will "go back to first principles", and because of the basic importance of this matter to all Canadians, will he take an early opportunity to table or state his view of "first principles" of Canadian citizenship on which this review is apparently proceeding?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest that the question is acceptable only in the sense

that the hon. member is asking whether a statement will be made on motions. With this restriction in mind the question will be allowed.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** It is a suggestion which I am ready to consider, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

## THE MINISTRY

### DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question of the Prime Minister, and I refer to the same occasion in Montreal. Was the Secretary of State expressing government policy when he said in Montreal that he often considers the Department of the Secretary of State as a federal ministry of cultural affairs and, if so, is it the intention to change the name of the department formally in order that this intention may be explicit?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes to the first part and no to the second part.

## HARBOURS

### VANCOUVER, B.C.—THIRD CROSSING OVER INNER HARBOUR

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, anticipating your usual understanding and benevolence, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Public Works. In view of the fact the government is committed to constructing a third crossing over the inner harbour at Vancouver, and of the special engineering report, which is now several weeks overdue, according to the contract let with this company last August, can the minister now state when the report is now expected, so that local planning can take place and the calling for tenders can proceed without further undue delay?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. member the fact that this work is being undertaken by the National Harbours Board. The minister who answers for that board is the Minister of Transport.

**Mr. Winch:** In view of that answer, and I understood this was within the responsibility of the Department of Public Works, may I direct this question to the Minister of Transport, anticipating the same confusion created in the past in respect of other matters?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot answer with that degree of co-operation indicated by the hon. member. I can only say that I intend to go personally to Vancouver to get a firsthand view and a clear picture of the situation, in order that matters may proceed without undue delay.

[*Translation*]

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

### MONTREAL—INVESTIGATION INTO DEATH OF MALE

**Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice.

It seems that homosexuality is taking alarming proportions in Montreal. Could the minister tell the house whether he has received representations from the parents of the young man who died from sexual overexertion at Montreal's Queen Elizabeth on April 3 and whether he will intervene in this case to bring to light the motives of that crime?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I am under the impression that the hon. member is bringing to the question period the subject of the debate that has been on for a few days and that will be carried on this afternoon.

If there is some urgency with respect to the particular point he is raising, the matter could be brought up at the time of adjournment.

[*English*]

## CONSUMER AFFAIRS

### COMMITTEE STUDY FOLLOWING APPOINTMENT OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether, in view of the pending appointment of a prices and incomes commission and amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, it is his intention to recommend the setting up of a special parliamentary committee?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to clear up the implication in the question that both these are pending at the same rate. I hope to announce very shortly the appointment of the prices and incomes

commission. The revision of the Combines Investigation Act will commence after I receive the report of the Economic Council of Canada which, as I told the house the other day, I hope to receive in June. So I do not see that it would be appropriate at this time to appoint a special committee for the purpose suggested by the hon. member.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since it is sometimes a custom to commemorate long awaited events of national importance, is it the intention of the minister to recommend the issuance of a stamp or in some other way commemorate the final appointment of the commission, when it is announced?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## FLOODS

### TRAIL, B.C.—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON FINANCIAL AID

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. In view of the fact that it is almost three weeks since the disastrous flood hit the Trail area, and in view of the fact that there is increasing urgency for the committee dealing with flood disasters to know what financial resources will be available to them for rehabilitation purposes, may I again ask the minister whether the house can expect a statement this week on the federal government's contribution to the disaster fund?

**Mr. Speaker:** It seems to me that the hon. member asked the same question yesterday, but in all honesty I forget what the answer was.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** There was no answer.

**Mr. Speaker:** It might be better to allow the question today.

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, I expect that a reply from the government will be available shortly.

## HEALTH AND WELFARE

### SHORTAGE OF MEDICAL DOCTORS

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. On March 19 of this year I asked a question which in the absence of the minister that day his parliamentary secretary took as notice. The question as it appears at page 6815 of *Hansard* was as follows:

> In view of some divergence of views on the medical manpower situation, the apparent jungle of indecision and the extreme urgency of this problem if medical schools are to operate during the summer months, would the minister state whether he has discussed this urgent problem with the ministers concerned in the provincial governments?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is no doubt aware, we have constituted several task forces which are manned by highly competent personnel from both the provinces and the federal government, to study this very question. I expect their recommendations within the next couple of months.

**Mr. Rynard:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wish to ask the minister whether this task force will bring in a report soon enough for the schools to go into operation.

**Mr. Munro:** I think that the question of medical schools operating in the summer is not dependent on what the task force recommends. The schools are there and are manned by personnel now. If they decide as a matter of policy to operate this summer, I do not see anything to stop them.

**Mr. Rynard:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I just want to suggest to the minister that they cannot operate without funds.

## COMBINES

### HOCKEY—ACTION TO ABOLISH RESERVE CLAUSE

**Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour):** I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that the task force on sport has made certain proposals with respect to the National Hockey League and its reserve clause, can the minister tell the house whether he is considering action under the Combines Investigation Act which would serve to abolish the reserve clause?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, of course the task force report on sport was given to my colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, who is in charge of

bringing forward recommendations on this subject to the government. In so far as the report falls within my jurisdiction, may I say that I have referred it to the Director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigation Act and, should any changes in the act be indicated, we will consider them when we revise the act after receipt of the report on competition being prepared by the Economic Council of Canada.

I think however that the parliamentary committee, which will in due course be looking at the revised Combines Investigation Act, will be interested in knowing at that time to what extent the National Hockey League has paid attention to the recommendations in the task force report.

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

DELAYS IN RECEIPT OF CHEQUES

**Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that undue delay in the receipt of cheques for unemployment insurance benefits is causing difficulties for social and family services at many points across the country, will the minister look into the possibility of having unemployment insurance cheques forwarded more promptly.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Blame the Post Office.

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** Information from the Unemployment Insurance Commission indicates that cheques are being received three or four days faster than was the case a year ago. However if the hon. gentleman has a specific case in mind and would care to present it to the Minister of Labour, I will be glad to intervene personally.

## TELEVISION

C.R.T.C. DIRECTIVE ON PURCHASE OF STATIONS

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. It concerns circumstances under which television stations may be sold. Has the Canadian Radio-Television Commission received new directions from the government which would now enable one member of the C.T.V. network to buy another station of that network?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It seems to me that the question as asked is argumentative. If there is urgency the hon. member may want to have the subject matter debated at the time of adjournment.

**Mr. McCleave:** May I speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker? My question is not argumentative but rather asks whether there has been a change in government direction to the Canadian Radio-Television Commission. It was not meant to be argumentative but simply to elicit information.

## INCOME TAX

EXEMPTION INCREASES IN BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** I have a question for the Minister of Finance. The Economic Council has set new poverty levels at $1,800 a year for single persons and $3,000 for married couples. Will the minister in preparing his new budget consider raising income tax exemption levels from $1,000 for single persons and $2,000 for married couples who have survived 21 years of inflation?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member has made a suggestion which she must assume will be considered.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** We certainly hope so.

[*Translation*]

## SPORTS

QUEBEC—INQUIRY AS TO SUBSIDIZATION OF AMATEUR PROGRAM

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Since he met with the Quebec Minister of Tourism last week to discuss amateur sports, could he say whether an agreement has been reached and, if so, what is the amount of the grant?

[*English*]

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions. I hope that within the next week or so I will be in a position to announce the decision at which the government has arrived as a result of these discussions.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## THE BUDGET

INQUIRY AS TO PROBABLE DATE OF PRESENTATION

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Can the minister indicate now on what date his budget presentation will be made, and what form that presentation will take?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** It will be some time early in June.

**Mr. Burton:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure the house that there will be full opportunity for a debate of his presentation?

**Mr. Benson:** Mr. Speaker, this is determined by the rules of the house.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

AIRBORNE WARNING CONTROL SYSTEM—USE OF CANADIAN BASES BY U.S.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence a question arising out of statements attributed to officials of the department that AWACS will need the use of Canadian air bases to be effective. In the light of the remarks attributed to the minister himself, that he favours Canadian participation in AWACS, will he say whether the government has made a decision with regard to the use of the Canadian bases by the United States in this connection?

**Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** No, Mr. Speaker. No decision on this is required at this time because, as the hon. member knows, this is a project for the future and is not yet ready to operate. Therefore we have no decision to make at the present time.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of National Defence say whether the matter is under consideration, so that a decision will be available at the time it is required.

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** At the present time it is under consideration at the research and development level. That is all.

# BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

FURTHER TIME FOR DISCUSSION OF ADJOURNMENT DEBATE SUBJECTS

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly on a point of order having to do with an item of house business. I might have raised it during the question period except for the fact that the government house leader is away and so is the acting government house leader. My point of order relates to the fact that there are now over 20 questions, and perhaps more have been added today, that have piled up for the adjournment debate, and I wonder whether there could be a discussion rather than a decision at this point on the possibility of using the private members hour on Friday or finding some other appropriate time so that we might dip into this backlog of questions, and so that the questions members wish to deal with on the late show can be put on a more up to date basis.

**Mr. Speaker:** The suggestion made by the hon. member is a very valuable one inasmuch as it is embarrassing for the Chair to suggest that questions may be discussed at the time of adjournment because of the backlog that has accumulated. Perhaps the Chair might take the initiative in communicating with hon. members in an effort to find a way to solve that problem.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## CRIMINAL CODE

The house resumed, from Tuesday, May 13, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner that Bill C-150, to amend the Criminal Code, the Parole Act, the Penitentiary Act, the Prisons and Reformatories Act and to make certain consequential amendments to the Combines Investigation Act, the Customs Tariff and the National Defence Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be read the third time and do pass, and the amendment of Mr. Matte.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we undertook a debate on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte) to postpone the application of Bill C-150 for a six-month period.

We thought fit to bring forward this amendment for several reasons and we had the opportunity to explain them in this house. Several members of our group have spoken on this amendment, indicating the reasons why we wanted to delay the implementation of this legislation.

Since this debate began, we have been able to express our dissatisfaction regarding this

legislation. We have been able to explain the reasons why we were opposed with all our might to the implementation of this legislation, namely because we believe that the population does not want it and that everyone of us here has a heavy responsibility as far as legislation is concerned. And if there is a piece of legislation whose consequences will be serious, it is indeed this one.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have known since last night that the committee on regional development, composed of 20 members, will leave the capital Monday night on a study tour. We anticipated that the vote would be taken on the amendment and on the main motion on Tuesday, since Monday is a holiday.

In view of the fact that Thursday is an opposition day and that Friday is a rather short day, it would have been easy for us of the Ralliement créditiste to line up several speakers in order that they express their views on the matter.

As far as I know, the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Beaudoin), the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe), the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin), the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Tétrault), the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Rodrigue), the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne) and the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), could speak again on that matter. The debate could last until Tuesday; however, that would be anti-democratic, for the simple reason that two main things matter in this house, that is first, to discuss legislation and second, to vote.

Now, as we would like the question to be put this afternoon, we are ready to give up our time for that purpose and to allow all hon. members to vote according to their conscience this afternoon not only on the very good amendment moved by the hon. member for Champlain but also on the main motion, for we are anxious to know the opinion of each member, in particular the opinion of those on the government side, on the matter.

It would be regrettable to allow these hon. members to abstain from participating in a vote which could be taken Tuesday, and thus deprive the population from knowing how each hon. member would have voted.

I therefore conclude my remarks even if I have still a few minutes to speak and even if there are still about ten of our members who were most willing to take the floor in order to allow everyone to vote according to his conscience, not only on the amendment brought in by the hon. member for Champlain but on the main motion.

It is important that hon. members should vote and we do not want them to dodge their responsibilities. That is why we are taking that position.

**Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the previous speaker for having accepted to cut short a little his remarks on the amendment of his colleague and on the main motion, that is on third reading of that bill.

I have decided to shorten my last comments quite a bit in order to enable hon. members to be called and vote, so that the Canadian public and parliament will know the views of all hon. members on that basic question, resting on the most important principles which we have had to discuss in the history of this parliament and previous ones.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief. I would like, however, since it is my last opportunity to do so, to thank those of my colleagues who were kind enough to bring in my amendments, during my absence. I thank them all the more because I could not be in the house to give the reasons and arguments I had to support those amendments. I take this opportunity to extend to them my warmest thanks.

Mr. Speaker, we have really reached the end of a lengthy debate. The members of the Progressive Conservative party took part in it in a very modest way. We agreed in a general way to leave the debate to our colleagues of the Ralliement créditiste, not that sometimes we did not have extremely important arguments to set forth, but we believed that the time to really work efficiently, as the government had promised, was in the committee of justice and legal affairs, where we could put forward our amendments and viewpoints.

The committee report has been tabled in the house. We shall be called upon this afternoon to vote on the motion for third reading. However—and I must say that, Mr. Speaker, since my remarks deal with the amendment that has been moved—we tried several times in the committee to convince the government that some of the amendments were necessary to protect both public morality and the medical profession, and especially the medical practitioners who stood against the bill before the committee because they were themselves, in conscience, against the practice of abortion.

We tried to convince the minister and his colleagues, both within the committee and in the house. We tried to make them relaize that the doctors were worried about this bill.

A committee of doctors had suggested that the legislation be amended in order to enable doctors who would object as a matter of conscience or for personal reasons to procure an abortion, not to have to procure one. It would have been easy to accept a minor amendment drafted in general terms to the effect that nothing in this legislation would oblige a doctor to procure an abortion if, for personal reasons or reasons of conscience or other professional imperatives, he would feel necessary not to procure it. The government refused that amendment which in fact was sound.

The government refuses also a motion by the Creditiste member concerning a six month's hoist so that the Canadian people could really get aware of the problem now under consideration in the Canadian parliament.

This amendment is so necessary that some members of the Ralliement créditiste, myself and some others of my colleagues, have received representations from Liberal associations from all over Canada. In fact, some presidents of associations have expressed their concern and made statements contrary to the assertions of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and some other Liberal members, that during the last election, the Canadian people had been invited to vote at the same time for this government and for the omnibus bill.

This is totally incorrect since we have in hand documents and letters coming to us from all parts of Canada telling us clearly that during the last election, the Canadian people had not authorized the Trudeau government to pass this famous and infamous bill on abortion.

I have here an article from the May 5 edition of the Ottawa *Journal*, where it is said that Dr. Dalton McGuinty, who was president of the Ottawa-Carleton Liberal Association, dissociates himself from the Liberal party because he does not accept this legislation. That is why I am in favour of the amendment moved by the Ralliement créditiste so that those people may stand in opposition.

Another letter was sent to me which explains why the amendment was moved. I received a letter from Mrs. Claire Campbell, dated May 1, 1969, where it is said, and I quote:



• (3:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

The Campbell family voted for your party—

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Campbell was writing then to the Minister of Justice.

[*English*]

The Campbell family voted for your party but did not vote for the liberalization of abortion. I know many families, traditionally Liberal, who voted against your party because of that very question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we get such evidence from all parts of the country. I have some from Vancouver, from Ottawa, in short from everywhere. Canadians oppose this erroneous, unfounded and fallacious assertion which has been made for too long by the party in office, to the effect that the people, when they voted for the present Liberal government, approved at the same time the omnibus bill. This is an inaccurate and dishonest statement and, for the Liberal members, too convenient a pretext to shrug off their obligations and their responsibilities before the house and before the Canadian electorate.

Mr. Speaker, since I do not want to delay the vote, I do not intend to extend my remarks. I must go fast, unfortunately, but I still feel duty bound to remind the house of this magnificent document called "the Canadian charter of human rights" which bears the signature of the right hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau when he was Minister of Justice. It is not necessary to examine this wonderful document for very long to demonstrate the present contrast between what exists in the Liberal representation and in the grey matter of the present Prime Minister. I just have to open the document at page 9, chapter 1, under the title "The rights of the individual". This chapter was written by Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau. I will just quote the first paragraph:

Interest in human rights is as old as civilization. Once his primary requirements of security, shelter and nourishment have been satisfied, man has distinguished himself from other animals by directing his attention to those matters which affect his individual dignity.

I wonder what the Prime Minister had in mind when he referred to the dignity of the human being.

The dignity of the human being, as I understand it, is to respect oneself as such. It is to be aware, not only of one's responsibili-

ties, of one's rights but also, of one's duties and obligations. Any human being, any normal and well-balanced individual, aware of his moral, civic and political responsibilities has a duty, which is to respect that basic, natural right of the individual, that undeniable right to live of any individual.

It was proven beyond doubt before the committee, that after the implantation period, there is a foetus which is, by its characteristics and its chromosomes, a developing human being.

When considering the words of the Minister of Justice of the time, the present Prime Minister, I wonder how a human being can preserve his dignity as such and, at the same time, tolerate, allow and sanction the murder of a being called a foetus but which has its own rights as an individual, as a human being, and will be unable to defend himself if abortion is permitted or tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, I could have quoted more from this wonderful document of the former Minister of Justice. Still, I noticed, in paragraph 3, that in his foreword the Minister of Justice took his inspirations from the work of Jacques Maritain called: *Les droits de l'homme et la loi naturelle.*

In that extremely interesting book, the author delves into the source of the human being, natural law, political law, and civic law.

I note that the Minister of Justice of the day turned to it for inspiration. Just as he did, the book takes us back to the origins of natural law. I shall spare the house this, because for some government members the topic might be too deep. Still, some members might not be surprised and benefit from becoming acquainted with the philosophy of men who were determined to set up human values, criteria, standards, for the conduct of individuals, on the moral, political and civil planes.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote from the book entitled *Les droits de l'homme et la loi naturelle* by Jacques Maritain, because it ties in with the subject matter of the preamble the right hon. Prime Minister used for the Canadian Charter of Human Rights. I therefore quote from page 62 of the book:

The concept of natural law was inherited from the Christian and the classical thought. It does not date back to the philosophy of the 18th century, which deformed it more or less, but to Grotius, and before him, to François Suarez, and François de Vitoria; and earlier to St. Thomas Aquinas; and earlier still to St. Augustin and the Fathers of the Church and St. Paul; and further back still to Cicero, the Stoics, the great moralists of antiquity, and its great poets, Sophocles in particular. Antigone is the eternal heroine of natural law, which the ancients called the unwritten law, name that suits it best.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Natural law, is meant to enlighten the conscience of men who have become able to tell good from evil, political good from political evil, personal morality from public morality.

I saw some hon. members smile when I was quoting Jacques Maritain, because his writings were the basis of what the Prime Minister was trying to impart to us in his work. In fact, on page 9, third paragraph, first chapter of the "Canadian Charter of Human Rights", the Prime Minister says this:

Cicero said of natural law—

—the Prime Minister said that when he was Minister of Justice, and it confirms Jacques Maritain's opinions:

Cicero said of natural law that it was "unchanging and everlasting", that it was "one eternal and unchangeable law . . . valid for all nations and for all times".

In the Middle Ages, St. Thomas Aquinas—

Government members who made fun of our quotations taken from the Thomist philosophy should realize that the Prime Minister himself made it the substance of his "Canadian Charter of Human Rights".

In the Middle Ages, St. Thomas Aquinas emphasized that natural law was a law superior to man-made laws and that as a result, all rulers were themselves subject to it.

And he continues to talk of the Reformation and finally of all the writings of Jacques Maritain which prove that there is a natural right which is indisputably unalienable. And this natural right is the right of every individual to live, the right to decide for oneself what one must and can make of one's life.

The argument is set forth by the government members who are quite embarrassed, and it is understandable, to vote in favour of such a disgraceful legislation. They seek all sorts of excuses, when we are faced with the problem as to whether we, in Canada, are meeting the wishes, the thoughts of our Canadian and Christian community, by advocating, on the pretence of a pluralistic society, that we are respecting the individual's right to self-determination; we forget, in that fallacious argument, the indefeasible right of an unborn child to life.

That is why, despite all considerations, arguments, excuses and quotations of theologians which government members used to justify

their unfortunate and trying stand—I understand it—none of them asserted in his speech the right of the foetus to live. To avoid incurring the Prime Minister's disfavour, government members submitted to his dictatorship.

**Mr. Mongrain:** It is not true.

**Mr. Valade:** Mr. Speaker, if that is not true, let just one Liberal member stand up and vote against the bill on third reading, and we will say to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières that perhaps that is not true. However, we would like to know why up to now no Liberal member has had the heart and the courage to stand up and express publicly his personal views on this bill, in the light of his Christian philosophy, his aspirations and his conscience. No, Mr. Speaker, all of them—

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Mongrain:** I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. member makes inaccurate statements. Some Liberal members have voted against the proposed legislation. Some Liberal members have moved amendments, others view things differently, and it is for that reason that they vote for the bill, not because they got orders from the Prime Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. There is no question of privilege. The hon. member for Sainte-Marie.

**Mr. Valade:** Mr. Speaker, time does not allow me to answer, but I say to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières that I shall go on public platforms in due course and we shall consider together the studies made in committees. Committee members first started by abstaining and fell into step in order to block all the amendments we had moved to bring to heel a host of members—

**Mr. André Ouellet (Papineau):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Papineau on a point of order.

**Mr. Ouellet:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to challenge the statement just made by the hon. member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade). The facts are the very opposite of what he said, and, by referring to the minutes of proceedings of the committees and especially that of justice and legal affairs, it will be realized to what extent members of every party represented in the house took part in the debate in a completely impartial manner—



**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Ouellet:** I think the remarks of the hon. member—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Ouellet:** —for Sainte-Marie are quite untrue.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I do not think there is a point of order and I know the hon. member will admit it. However, if he wishes, he will have the opportunity to participate in the debate after the hon. member for Sainte-Marie has finished his speech.

**Mr. Ouellet:** I think the remarks of the member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade) are the opposite of what I said myself when the bill was studied in committee. I categorically object to the assertion that we received instructions from the party. On the contrary, I did speak myself—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Ouellet:** —at a certain time—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Ouellet:** —against the clauses of the bill—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. There is no question of privilege and I do not think there is any point of order.

I invite the hon. member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade) to continue his speech.

**Mr. Valade:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

I am closing because the time is very short and we really want to make a decision with regard to this bill.

I did not intend to refer to any one member in particular. I spoke of the whole situation. On the other side of the house, a number of Liberal members do not agree with this bill and, because we have been given the assurance there would be a free vote, I invite them to show themselves as free men. I invite them to take their responsibilities and to do as we do, on this side. Some Progressive Conservative members are in favour of the bill, with some reservations, others are against it. As far as I am concerned, I object to certain parts of the bill, namely those dealing with abortion and homosexuality. I am in favour

of other proposed amendments, but since the bill has been introduced as a whole, I have to vote against it on account of some reservations I have with regard to those amendments.

[*English*]

**Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, although I intended to speak on the third reading stage of the bill, I shall keep my remarks brief since there is general agreement for the vote to be taken. I deplore the introduction of the various amendments to the Code in the form of an omnibus bill. I find it difficult to see how one can relate amendments such as those to do with the liberalization of abortion with penal reform. How can one relate laws covering the use of firearms with laws to do with homosexuality? The government has seen fit to present these measures in an omnibus bill. I am in this position: Although there are many aspects of the bill I should like to support, I cannot support the bill as a whole because it has three major aspects that I cannot support. As a result, I must vote against all provisions of the bill.

Much of the time consumed during the debate could have been saved if the various issues the bill deals with had been grouped into separate measures. In this way each of the matters raised in the bill could have been voted on separately in a free vote. We have a responsibility as legislators, to uphold morality and those attributes which make our communities and our Canadian way of life strong. In this day and age this responsibility indeed is awesome. We, as legislators, have the responsibility to promote justice, liberty, good will, prosperity, and the highest standards of personal and public behaviour. In this country we send men to parliament with the hope they will produce first class legislation and not be mere followers of some questionable consensus of a vocal minority or majority.

If this is true, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it is, then the spirit of good legislation will be sensed not only in the marketplaces and production lines of Canada, but in the privacy of our families and homes as well. Any government worthy of the name will want to help to forward a national crusade for purity and integrity. In the amendments that seek to legalize homosexuality, lotteries, and liberalization of abortion, it cannot be said that this Parliament will be introducing laws that will encourage morality. Nevertheless, I believe that any government offering less than that type of legislation which strengthens the moral fibre of this nation will be weighed in the balance and found wanting. While I believe that it is impossible to legislate personal morals, yet I am convinced that the nation's bedrooms should cradle righteousness, with the backing of the state. It is, therefore, with regret that I must vote against the entire bill, while agreeing with many of its desirable aspects. Nevertheless, because I disagree overwhelmingly with those aspects of it that will work against the attainment of desirable moral standards and desirable objectives in family and human life, I am placed in the position of having to vote against it. That is the quandary in which many of us find ourselves. I will say no more, Mr. Speaker, because I believe there is general agreement for the vote to be held at this time.

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. J. A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières):** Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the vote by making a speech. A while ago, the member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade) challenged me, when he invited me to go and discuss the bill among the general public and I think it is my duty to accept the challenge. I accept it and I shall go and defend the bill anywhere in Canada.

I explained the bill to my constituents and they understood it, Mr. Speaker. There were no problems.

Therefore I accept the challenge of the hon. member for Sainte-Marie.

[*English*]

• (3:30 p.m.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is the house ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

*Division*

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Matte) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack
Beaudoin
Bigg
Caouette
Coates
Code
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne
Flemming
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Howe
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
Latulippe
MacEwan
MacInnis
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Mazankowski
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Noble
Paproski
Peddle
Ricard
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rynard
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Southam
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Valade
Yewchuk—53.

NAYS

Messrs:

Alexander
Badanai
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Bell
Benjamin
Benson
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Brewin
Broadbent
Brown
Burton
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Émard
Éthier
Fairweather
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gilbert
Gillespie
Givens
Gleave
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harding
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Jerome
Kierans
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Laflamme
Laing (Vancouver South)
Langlois
Laniel
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Lind
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
Macquarrie
McCleave
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mather
Mongrain
Monteith
Moores
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Nowlan
Nystrom
O'Connell
Orange
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Perrault
Peters
Pilon
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
Richardson
Ritchie
Roberts
Rochon
Rose
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Serré
Sharp
Skoberg
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Winch
Woolliams
Yanakis—151.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

• (3:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost.

The question is now on the main motion. Is it the wish of hon. members that we proceed with the division without the ringing of the bells?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Turner—Ottawa-Carleton) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Alexander
Badanai
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Bell
Benjamin
Benson
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Brewin
Broadbent
Brown
Burton
Caccia

Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Émard
Éthier
Fairweather
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gilbert
Gillespie
Givens
Gleave
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guay
(St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harding
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Jerome
Kierans
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Laflamme
Laing (Vancouver South)
Langlois
Laniel
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Lind
MacEachen
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
Macquarrie
McCleave
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mather
Mongrain
Moores
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Nesbitt
Nowlan
Nystrom
O'Connell
Orange
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Perrault
Peters
Pilon
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
Richardson
Ritchie
Roberts
Rochon
Rose
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Serré
Sharp
Skoberg
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stanfield
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Winch
Woolliams
Yanakis—149.

29180—551½

*Division*

NAYS

Messrs:

Alkenbrack
Beaudoin
Bigg
Caouette
Coates
Code
Crouse
Danforth
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Dionne
Downey
Flemming
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Howe
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
Latulippe
MacEwan
MacInnis
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Mazankowski
Monteith
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Noble
Paproski
Peddle
Ricard
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rynard
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Southam
Stewart (Marquette)
Sullivan
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Valade
Yewchuk—55.

• (4:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

## PEST CONTROL

### REGULATION OF PRODUCTS USED IN CONTROL PROCEDURE—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of Agriculture)** moved the second reading of and concurrence in the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. C-157, to regulate products used for the control of pests and the organic functions of plants and animals.

• (4:10 p.m.)

**Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex):** Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the amendment to Bill C-157 we find once again that the question of the right of an industry or an individual to appeal an action taken by a government department or a government official is brought to the fore. When this bill was originally introduced, we in this party made a very sincere and earnest plea against the mandatory power given to a government official in this regard. We felt then, and we feel now, that when a government official inspects or detains or takes any other action against a company or an individual in connection with the use of pesticides, there should be some recourse to an appeal in this regard.

Our contention was not accepted by the government, even though we pointed out that these inspectors were given greater powers than the R.C.M.P. in some respects. They could enter premises at their discretion, and demand to see papers, books, products or anything connected with the chemical involved. We maintained that when inspectors detain or cause to be withdrawn from sale certain products, there is no recourse to the courts against this action.

We were supported by the industry on this stand and they took it upon themselves to make strong representations to the Standing Committee on Agriculture in this regard. The industry felt this lack of appeal procedure was an undue hardship, and this was the reason for their plea. We in the opposition supported their plea because we felt it was justified, but at that time the government was not disposed to accept our recommendation. Subsequently, the bill, having gone through parliament, was referred to the other place. There is no doubt that the other place had the same attitude toward the rights of the companies as did the opposition at that time. So, the other place amended the bill and sent it back to the house. We had a further debate on this bill, at which time we once again attempted to convince the government that it was not the wish of Canadians to deny individuals or corporations the right to appeal.

Once again, the government was not disposed to accept the basic fact that when a government takes an action there should be some recourse or appeal from it. So, the government was not disposed to accept the amendment proposed by the other place. Now, the bill comes before us once more with an amendment which still does not provide for a direct appeal to the Courts. Instead, the amendment contains the weak proposition that appeal procedures may be set up under the regulations as prescribed by the Governor in Council.

We cannot accept this amendment, having due consideration for the rights of the industry and of the individual. Even at this late date, those hon. members who are directly concerned with this legislation appeal to the government to reconsider their whole stand on this bill. More and more of this type of legislation is being brought before the house. I think this is only one of a series of bills of this type brought before us in this session. We face the situation in which an action may be taken by a departmental representative in the course of his work and the only appeal procedure available to a company or an individual involved will be before an arbitrator appointed by the government. Although the contention of the government is perfectly correct that a judge may be appointed to consider this particular appeal, the fact is that he cannot be considered to be acting in the capacity of a judge in a court. The person whom the government appoints will be acting as an arbitrator to settle a dispute between the two parties. What we find very hard to accept is the fact that these bills, which will become the statutory law of the country, provide that once a decision is rendered by an appointee of the government there cannot be any recourse to review or appeal against the decision before a court. In our opinion this is an infringement of the basic rights of the citizens of this country.

I cannot accept the amendment to this bill proposed by the other place because I do not believe it fulfills the prime requisite of providing for a direct appeal against a government action.

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a procedure whereby we can say we are having another kick at the cat, particularly those of us who as members of the committee supported the right of appeal to an impartial body from decisions taken by civil servants which affect individuals and companies. As the previous speaker said, we raised this matter in the committee in relation to a number of bills. It has always seemed to be the divine right of governments to pass legislation, both in the field of agriculture and of fisheries, allowing government officials to be judge and jury as well as policemen. This is a dangerous procedure and an unnecessary one. It seems to make a mockery of the principle underlying the Bill of Rights. Everyone should have right to redress from a civil service decision. This is particularly important in relation to acts in which the rights of individuals may be involved.

These rights are certainly considered in the review by the Hazardous Products Board, where compensation can be made in the case of a decision which affects an individual. Under the bill before us the right involved is more often the right of a company to redress from a decision that has been made by an inspector appointed under this act. While we may not be quite as sympathetic in these cases, I think the same rules should apply and the right of appeal from an individual decision should be granted. However, another problem is raised. This bill has been passed

by this house, although not by unanimous decision. We are now faced with an amendment proposed by the Senate. The house made a decision to reject that amendment.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I do not blame the minister who introduced this amendment but I do think the government should have been prepared to explain why this proposal should not have been accepted. I am sure most members will agree that the government would not have been remiss had it accepted this amendment. If that course had been taken most of us, I am sure, would have supported its decision. Regardless of the merit of the amendment proposed in the other place, however, most members would, I feel, be of the opinion that the position taken by the government with regard to the amendment should be supported. But if we say this, we should also demand that the government explain why rejection of the amendment is again being anticipated. In my view, the minister is remiss in handling amendments from the Senate if he fails to explain why he is rejecting a particular amendment and why he is asking the house to do so.

I am still of the opinion that the amendment should have been considered by the government. Most people in Canada are not interested in having an inspector from a government department, operating under the terms of some act or other, entering a private establishment and having the right to seize books, samples and so on, and send them to an agency of his choice in anticipation of a decision which may be used as evidence. Yet this is the situation we are asked to accept. Moreover, the very official who entered the premises to make the initial investigation has power to set the penalty, and the individual or company concerned do not even have the right of appeal against his decision. Anyone who believes officials should have the power to make decisions of this kind is ignoring the feelings of the average person in Canada who believes he should possess certain rights and be able to exercise them.

The decision which will no doubt be made is not a reflection on the Senate or on the amendment. It is really a reflection on the government, on the cabinet and, in particular, on the cabinet minister directly responsible, who has failed to tell the house why in this instance provision for an appeal cannot be allowed through normal channels or why the government should feel it is so important in this case to take away civil liberties which should be the right of each and every Canadian person and corporation.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to recapitulate all the discussions we had in the Agricultural committee where qualified persons gave us details concerning this bill.

At that time, various amendments had been submitted. We rejected a certain number of them, but the one before us at present has not been submitted exactly as sent us by the Senate. The bill was adopted on second and third readings and later referred to the Senate.

The Senate thought it should come up with an amendment. On May 1st, this house had been informed by the Senate that it did not consider as a necessity to accept this amendment, but nevertheless made the following suggestion:

—as if the words, "Control Products Board of Review" were substituted for the words "Hazardous Products Board of Review"—

This same amendment reminds the house that paragraph (d) will read as follows:

"(d) respecting for registration of control products and of establishments in which any prescribed control products are manufactured and prescribing the fees therefor, and respecting the procedures to be followed for the review of cases involving the refusal, suspension or cancellation of the registration of any such product or establishment;"

So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), after meeting the Senate committee, decided that the amendment, as drafted by the Senate, was quite acceptable. That is why I am immediately giving these details to keep hon. members from believing that the government or the Minister of Agriculture reject this amendment. On the contrary, we recognize that it is worthwhile, and we accept it.

[*English*]

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** This is one of a series of bills with respect to which folly has been compounded with folly in connection with legal rights. There has been a wholesale trampling upon such rights. As the minister said, in an aside: We are trying to accomplish something but you lawyers get involved and start pointing out the holes in our procedures.

I have spoken on a number of occasions on this aspect, beginning with Bill C-154. As far as I am concerned, this bill is a complete

travesty of justice. It is true there is a purpose attached to the control of products used to keep down pests, and so on. I admit that. But the accomplishment of this purpose is no justification for trampling on the rights of individuals. I have pointed out that this bill goes much further than any narcotics control legislation in empowering an inspector to enter premises when he chooses, at whatever time he thinks is reasonable, without fear of obstruction by anyone. I remind hon. members that the inspector does not require a warrant. All he has, according to the minister, is means of identification. So what? Does this constitute carte blanche to enter any man's premises at any time the inspector considers proper?

Then, we come to this—talk about setting up one individual to act as judge, jury and prosecutor roled into one! The Governor in Council, in other words, the minister, is empowered by clause five of this bill to make all sorts of regulations. But the measure does not provide for the publication of these regulations. The minister said that as long as he is minister they will be published. But he doesn't know whether he will be minister a month from now. The parliamentary secretary may not know this—the minister did not know it—but there is power under the Regulations Act to suspend the publication of any regulation. This is the difficulty we are getting into following the assumption of absolute powers.

• (4:30 p.m.)

There was to be an appeal procedure. I must say that, having reread *Votes and Proceedings* for May 1, which contains the amendment proposed by the other place, I do not know what got into the members of the other place that they should take the so-called appeal procedures or review procedures of the Hazardous Products Act as an example to make changes, *mutatis mutandis*, to this bill.

I suggest this proposed board of review constitutes a complete travesty of justice. There is nothing in the Hazardous Products Act that obligates the minister in any way, with the exception of publishing the report of the board of review. Even though the minister and his officials had trampled on peoples' rights, the minister could, without accounting to anybody, simply carry on as he saw fit, ignoring the board of review. That was not acceptable to the minister, and I say thank goodness it was not. I think the review provisions in the Hazardous Products Act are an even greater travesty of the rights of individuals. That particular provision is completely and utterly unjust.



I see the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) shaking his head. If he will read this bill with the attention that a lawyer, which he is, should give it, he will see the powers that are given to the Governor in Council. Let us just observe what the bill provides. In clause 5 (d) the Governor in Council may make regulations respecting the registration of control products and of establishments in which any prescribed control products are manufactured, and may prescribe the fees therefor. There is nothing new there. I agree with that provision; I think the Governor in Council should have the power to determine such matters, and should be given the procedures to do so.

The Governor in Council is responsible for the actions of the minister and his officials. The bill provides that the minister or his officials are responsible for regulations respecting the procedures to be followed for the review of cases that involve the refusal, suspension or cancellation of the registration of any product or establishment.

There is no reference to the actions of inspectors, you will note, Mr. Speaker. An individual is put completely at their mercy. He cannot even complain about the conduct of inspectors; the bill merely refers to the refusal, suspension or cancellation of the registration of a product or establishment. There is absolutely no relief given in regard, for instance, to the destruction of any product which might subsequently be determined by the board of review not to be a product the registration of which should have been cancelled or suspended. Under this bill an inspector could simply order destruction.

Let me refer the house to clause 9 (2), which provides:

> Any control product seized and detained pursuant to subsection (1) shall not be detained after
>
> (a) in the opinion of an inspector the provisions of this act and the regulations have been complied with,—

Although an inspector may release certain products, he can order their destruction.

> —(b) the owner agrees to dispose of such control product in a manner satisfactory to the minister—

In other words, he agrees to destroy them.

No guarantee is given that the minister or his officials shall be bound by any review decision. What exactly does the review entail? I suggest the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) is asking this house to buy a pig in a poke, because absolutely no indication is

given of what kind of review is involved. This will appear in the regulations. After this house and the other place have passed the bill, the minister will make regulations. There is nothing in the bill to compel the publication of such regulations; it is all done on trust. For this reason, I say that the bill as drafted and presented to the house constitutes a complete travesty of justice as far as the individual is concerned.

I do not quarrel with the principle of controlling pesticides, but I certainly do quarrel with the methods that are used by the minister, who appears to me to be lacing on his jackboots and trampling on the rights of individuals. No right of society overrides justice and the right to appeal of impartial review. But there is not one iota of a provision in this bill, or any of its contemporary pieces of legislation that the minister presented, to so provide.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill. I must oppose it, not because of the objective to control pesticides, but because of the methods adopted. We will never accept the principle that the end justifies the means. I am sure hon. members opposite who are fellow legal practitioners agree with me that the ends never justify the means. So far as this particular bill is concerned I should like to ask them whether, if they were sitting on any commission on civil and human rights making an impartial determination, they could accept the principles that are implicit, and not only implicit but explicit, in this bill.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** On division.

Motion agreed to, amendment read the second time and concurred in.

## FOOD AND DRUGS ACT— NARCOTIC CONTROL ACT— CRIMINAL CODE

### AMENDMENTS RESPECTING CONTRACEPTIVE DEVICES, RESTRICTED DRUGS, ETC.— REPORT STAGE

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare)** moved:

That Bill S-15, to amend the Food and Drugs Act and the Narcotic Control Act and to make a consequential amendment to the Criminal Code, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, be concurred in.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Simcoe North.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this is the report stage and no amendments have been put down. Therefore, will not my hon. friend have to wait for third reading?

• (4:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is well taken. I will proceed to put the motion for third reading and at that time the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) may wish to participate. When shall the bill be read the third time?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, should you not first put the question with respect to the motion for concurrence in the report?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion for concurrence of the report from the committee?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** When shall the bill be read a third time?

**An hon. Member:** By leave, now.

**Mr. Munro** moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** Mr. Speaker, Bill S-15 really consolidates two bills, one dealing with contraceptive devices and the other with new drugs. As the minister said, we accept the principle that families should plan their children. The last prosecution for contraventions of the law in respect of birth control was in the late 1930's, if my memory serves me correctly.

Birth control information has not always been available to those who need it most. Now, we have formally accepted the principle that married couples have the right to space their family so that they can look after their children properly and bring them up in the best way. This legislation is all the more welcome in these times of high living costs. Our cost of living has not been higher during the last 15 years and this last month had the highest rise in 15 years. Also, since we have the highest taxes in history, a short supply of housing and galloping inflation this legislation is all the more welcome.

Nothing in this legislation says that a married couple must limit their family. Those who do not practise family planning because of religious principles have nothing to fear. No one is forcing them to employ birth control methods. This bill is particularly apropos at this time, since we have disposed of the bill dealing with abortions. As I said on a previous occasion, we ought to revise our law first in the area of birth control. Fundamentally that is where family planning begins, and not after the woman has become pregnant. Those who are permitted by their consciences to use birth control methods will thus be able to plan families. I have no quarrel with that part of the bill. I have some reservations about the forms of birth control that may be used. We talk of the pill, of loop devices, diaphragms, condoms, or jellies. Loop devices particularly need to be inserted by qualified personnel, and I have some reservations about such devices. Will a doctor insert them, or will they be inserted by qualified nurses? I ask this because there have been cases where the loop has been inserted and has caused uterine infection.

I do not know whether the Minister of National Health and Welfare planned to introduce this legislation immediately after the abortion legislation was passed. His timing was fortunate because now the horse is before the cart. As I said before, this legislation will permit those who in all conscience can practise birth control to do so and thereby space their families and eliminate any excuse for abortions.

I also wanted to say something about new drugs. The present legislation attempts to take the doctor completely off the hook, so to speak, and I do not think that is right. No doctor may prescribe for any patient a barbiturate dose that is strong enough for suicide. The point of the matter is that if a patient is able to obtain only, say, 20 pills by way of doctor's prescription, trafficking would be far too expensive a matter. So, doctors' prescriptions do not enter the picture. In any event, if a doctor prescribes a suicidal dose or a dose which may be used for suicide, he gets into trouble with the college of physicians and surgeons. That, I feel, ought to be made clear. Also, since the doctor will prescribe drugs, he ought to be made to accept some responsibility for writing the prescriptions.

Lysergic acid is one of the new experimental drugs, and hardly anyone knows exactly what it does. It is well known to researchers that those who have taken the drug have had varying experiences. Some researchers think that in some way the drug actually jumps across the insulating material between brain cells and thereby causes those wild hallucinations about which most of us have heard. We have heard of people jumping out of buildings. They actually believed they could fly. Not long ago a man jumped off a bridge in the belief he could fly. It was pointed out in committee that the drug could be manufactured from various, easily obtained substances. Yet not long ago researchers had difficulty in obtaining this drug while at the same time the drug was being peddled and manufactured on the street. This drug ought to be very rigidly controlled because it has most harmful effects.

While disagreeing with some parts of the bill, I support it in principle and therefore will vote for it. This is badly needed legislation and, since it follows almost immediately the passing of legislation dealing with abortion, it is most opportune and puts the horse before the cart. It would indeed be tragic if abortions became more frequent in family planning. As a matter of fact, they should have no place in family planning—and there should be little excuse for them.

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, we need not waste time by saying how very general is the acceptance for this bill. I think the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) adequately expressed the feelings of hon. members of this house and the people of this country in that regard. There is just one angle that none of us has referred to or emphasized. Having passed this legislation making birth control and family planning legal in this country, we as Canadians will now be able to go out and really do the job we ought to be doing as a member of the world community. Through the United Nations we ought to be able to reach a whole number of those countries which really need help with the controlling of their populations. Of course, prior to this time, although we were in a position to help the people of other countries in this way they could always say to us, "Aha! You want us as dark-skinned peoples to control our populations but you yourself cannot practise birth control legally." We can now help the peoples of these countries freely and openly.

• (4:50 p.m.)

We are also now in a position where the abortion legislation comes into its proper perspective. As the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard) has stated, it is the prop-

er over-riding measure for population control. The more knowledge there is on birth control, the less need there will be for abortions.

There is one feature in this bill which I referred to in committee and to which I will refer now. I am very hopeful the minister will take this factor into account when drafting the regulations under the bill. I refer to the advertising of contraceptives. I feel sure the minister will take this factor into consideration, but I remind him once again it is very necessary.

It was the feeling of the minister and the department that the advertising of contraceptives should not be permissible in commercial journals or media, but only in medical and family planning association journals. The minister took this attitude because he was most anxious to comply with the recommendations of the committee which some months ago studied the whole question of birth control. At that time our committee did not want the countryside to be further polluted by having advertisements showing contraceptive devices in all their horror. In the fear of having screaming billboards and headlines, the committee was very cautious about making recommendations.

There has been a lot of water pass under the bridge since that time. I believe this house and the country are now ready to have the regulations governing advertising of contraceptives the same as those governing the advertising of other products. If advertising of contraceptives is put in a special little pen by itself, it simply draws attention to it and makes it quite different from anything else. The public has become accustomed to advertisements for many items which years ago would not have been considered possible. We have become accustomed to advertising for patent medicines of all kinds, beauty aids, toilet paper, deodorants, feminine douches. It is now legal to advertise all these items and I see no reason why contraceptives should not be advertised in the same way.

I went into some detail in the committee as to the difficulties that would be encountered if these two categories were divided. Some of the present legal advertising is far more embarrassing to public taste than would be advertising of contraceptives. At the present time there is an advertisement which states:

> New answer for the intimate, embarrassing problems married women face.
>
> As every married woman knows, embarrassing feminine odor that begins in the vaginal tract is a hygiene problem.

If anyone were disposed to be squeamish, this advertisement would make a person that way. Yet it is a legal advertisement. On the other hand, an advertisement in a United States magazine, which is also for sale in Canada states:

> Until you're ready to have your next baby—
> If it's not quite time, consider—

And there follows an advertisement for a certain brand of contraceptive foam. An advertisement for the same brand of contraceptive foam shows the picture of a baby and states:

> Right now, he needs his mother more than a brother.
>
> You can give him the time and mothering he needs if you use . . . contraceptive foam.

This advertising will be illegal if the minister and his department do not permit advertising of contraceptives in commercial magazines. I hope the minister now realizes that would be a mistake. It is the only fault I have to find with this half of Bill S-15.

The women of this country are used to all these contraceptive devices. They are used to the look of them and are not horrified or upset by them. The women of this country should not be forced to seek information on this matter from family planning and medical journals. They should be able to obtain this information in the ordinary way through commercial advertising.

The minister himself pointed out that family planning information is most necessary among the lower income groups. The ones with the low incomes have, proportionately, the largest number of children. It is these fathers and mothers who should know how to control the size of their families. They are not the ones who buy and read family planning medical journals. Even if they did read these journals, family planning associations do not have the necessary money to do the advertising that is necessary.

If sufficient birth control and family planning information were available, there would be fewer abortions in this country. This is a very important point and one of which we should not lose sight. The hon. member for Simcoe North states that in his opinion, having the abortion legislation passed before the birth control legislation, the government was putting the cart before the horse. I don't know whether the government had much choice, but we are having a dead heat as to which will get there first.

But in the second half of the bill, I believe the government really managed to get the cart before the horse. I share the feelings of

those who felt so strongly that some items in the omnibus bill should not have been tied together. I feel very strongly about these two measures, drugs and family planning. If it were not for the fact that I want the birth control section of this bill to be passed without further delay, I and other members of my party would be very tempted to make amendments. We feel very strongly that the second half of this bill is not what is required to deal with the drug situation in this country at this time.

• (5:00 p.m.)

In particular, we feel strongly about leaving marijuana under the Narcotics Act provisions, and about the penalties applied to people found guilty of its possession. We know the government has brought in an amendment which, to a certain extent, softens the penalties, providing for summary conviction instead of proceeding by way of indictable offence. To that extent this is an improvement, but we think it is wrong to provide for long jail sentences and heavy fines for first offenders.

I have been re-reading the material prepared by the John Howard Society, and by other concerned bodies. They have grave doubts whether clamping down by fines and jail sentences is the way to handle the matter. This provision is discriminatory in that young offenders from well-to-do families will be able to pay fines, and offenders from low income families will have to take jail sentences because they will not be able to raise the money to pay fines.

However, the biggest question mark about this whole matter was provided by the announcement the minister made just prior to third reading of the bill, that he is setting up a committee to study the whole question of drugs, a committee that is to report within two years.

**Mr. Munro:** And a preliminary report in six months.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** I am very glad to hear that. Some of the pessimists in this group said it would be two years. I hope the final report isn't two years from now.

**Mr. Munro:** A final report within two years; a preliminary report within six months.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** Even the preliminary report will help. Again the minister has admitted that he is not sure this is the best way to handle the matter. No blame attaches to him because of this. Nobody is certain of the best way, and consequently my colleagues and I are not one bit happy with the drug half of this bill, particularly the provisions with regard to marijuana. We want this problem handled properly, and we are not at all sure that fines and jail terms are the right way.

Although I am disposed to move an amendment to place a six months hoist on the bill, or rather on those clauses dealing with drugs, I wish to let the birth control clauses carry. If I moved such an amendment I would jeopardize the birth control half of the bill. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues, although I cannot speak for all of them, will line up solidly behind Bill S-15. However, we do want a chance as soon as possible to deal with good drug legislation based on the report of the committee set up by the minister and on other up to date information.

**Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview):** Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my remarks to a narrow part of the bill dealing with the drugs L.S.D. and marijuana. It is commonly accepted that L.S.D. has proven itself to be a very dangerous drug. The medical evidence indicates that not only does it cause mental and physical damage but that it also affects the chromosomes of people, with dangerous effects on generations yet to come.

At a meeting of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs last week it was indicated that there has been a tremendous upswing in convictions with regard to marijuana. There were 600 convictions in 1966, 1,600 in 1967 and 2,700 in 1968. Some 1,200 of the 1,600 convictions in 1967 related to young people between the ages of 20 and 29 years. This raises the question of the distinction between soft drugs and hard drugs.

Many people accept heroin as a hard drug, and L.S.D. and marijuana as soft drugs. Much confusion and contradiction have arisen with regard to the different studies that have been made, especially on the drug marijuana. Many indicate that marijuana is not physically addictive, but medical reports have indicated that it is psychologically addictive. This is why it is so important that we have a study made by the committee set up by the minister, with a report submitted to parliament within six months.

If marijuana is psychologically addictive it may be responsible for some of the changes taking place in high school students. Here I speak of some of the students in the Toronto area, of which I have some knowledge. It has

been stated that the use of marijuana is bringing about a change in their personality and mental process. If so, it is highly important that we study it, and study it quickly, in order to bring forth some measure to correct the situation.

It has also been indicated that the incidence of the use of marijuana among students getting poor grades is much higher than among students with high grades. If that is so, it may indicate there is a symptom among young people that must be immediately corrected, an attitude towards life, an attitude towards work and school, an attitude towards parents.

The allegation has been made that the use of marijuana is a stepping stone to the use of heroin. The R.C.M.P. officials who appeared before the standing committee seemed to indicate that this was so. In this connection, when one thinks that there were 2,700 convictions with respect to marijuana last year, and that the greater number of them concerned people within the ages of 20 to 29 years, then one realizes the necessity for a study on ways and means to curb the use of marijuana because of its potentially dangerous effects. One realizes also the necessity for the government to look at the proposal regarding the expungement of criminal records.

• (5:10 p.m.)

If the study should indicate that the drug marijuana is neither addictive nor damaging to the physical and mental well-being of a person, then unfortunately we have convicted 2,700 people in the year 1968 on a most serious charge. As we know, with a conviction against a person, especially one of tender years, there is a difficulty which arises in respect of travel, employment and bonding. So this places on us the onus not only to act but to act quickly with regard to this serious matter. I hope that once the preliminary report is made some action may be taken by the government with regard more especially to the drug marijuana. Many people feel that it should not be listed under the Narcotic Control Act but should be listed under the Food and Drugs Act. As the father of a family and with children attending school I am greatly appalled by and concerned about this problem, because the obtaining of marijuana in high schools is so easy. The encouragement by other students to try this imposes upon me the responsibility to urge upon the government quick and wise action with regard to the drug marijuana.

29180—552½

Without a doubt, I believe the minister and others would agree that L.S.D. has been proven to have a damaging effect on the physical and mental well-being of young people. Young people are now veering away from L.S.D. but appear to be turning to marijuana. I hope the minister will keep these thoughts in mind, especially the thought that the drug is psychologically addictive. I hope he will bear in mind the consequences in respect of the physical and mental well-being of young students, as well as the consequences of conviction with regard to present and future employment and travel. I hope that he will act wisely in this area. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

## HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING BOARD MEMBERSHIP, REMUNERATION, ETC.—REPORT STAGE

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development)** moved that Bill C-153, to amend the Historic Sites and Monuments Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development on Wednesday, March 12, 1969 be concurred in.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion (for concurrence) agreed to.

**Mr. MacEachen** moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) has asked me to represent him at this stage of the study of the bill, because he unfortunately had to be away from the capital today on official business.

However, on second reading, that is on January 20 last, he gave some explanations with regard to the bill and, at that time, members of the different parties had the opportunity to express their support. The bill was then submitted to the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development that reported the bill without amendment.

This bill is of a strictly administrative nature and is not very complicated. As a matter of fact, Bill C-153 purports to provide for membership on the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of an officer of the National Museum of Canada simply by increasing the number of Board members from 14 to 15 and by bringing the quorum from 7 to 8.

As I said, the Board is established according to section 4 (1) of the present act, as follows:

a) the Dominion Archivist;

b) an officer of the National Museum of Canada—

c) one representative for each of the provinces, and an officer of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Before the adoption in 1964 of the government re-organization act, the National Museum of Canada was represented on the Board. The proposed amendment will rectify the situation and that official will be appointed by the Secretary of State.

The purpose of the second amendment is to provide that the remuneration paid to members of the Board is more appropriate to the times.

According to the existing law, those persons may be paid $20 for each day they are necessarily away from their ordinary places of residence for the purpose of attending meetings of the Board. However, considering the amount was fixed a few years ago and the depreciation of the dollar since, it is clearly insufficient and besides, less than what was paid previously to members of similar commissions.

Now, in view of the devotion and the ability of the members of that Board and the importance of the work they perform, it would be advisable and fair to grant them an increase.

The amendment provides that the remuneration will be fixed by the Governor in Council. This provision obviously allows periodic adjustments without it being necessary each time to amend the legislation.

This is the purpose of Bill C-153, which was moreover approved by the hon. members who had the opportunity to state their views on second reading. Some explanations were also given in committee which reported it without amendment. I am pleased to recommend it to the house so that it can be passed on third reading.

[*English*]

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, members of the official opposition have no quarrel with Bill C-153. We indicated this when the bill first came before the house and when it was before the committee. We repeat that stand at the third and final stage of consideration of the bill. There are some pieces of legislation which come before the house which are highly controversial. An example of this is Bill C-150, the extended discussion on which has just been concluded this afternoon. There are other items of government business which are non-controversial. The reason the present bill is non-controversial so far as we are concerned is that actually it does nothing. One cannot disagree with a bill which, as the minister stated when he introduced it last January, merely is a housekeeping measure.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Indeed, it is unfortunate, as I indicated at that time, that all the machinery of parliament was moved into action to deal with a matter which has no significance. The parliamentary secretary verified this fact in the brief statement he made this afternoon.

This measure adds a member to the Historic Sites and Monuments Board. It increases the quorum and makes it possible for the Governor in Council to change the basis of compensation to members of this Board. I suppose this is necessary to keep up with the fires of inflation which have been generated by the present administration.

There are two different types of government action which might be referred to as sins of omission and sins of commission. Bill C-150 might be placed in the latter category, that is sins of commission. Bill C-153 is definitely in the area of sins of omission. It does nothing to deal with fundamental problems relating to the development of Canadian historic sites and monuments as a part of a growing demand for expanded parks and recreational facilities.

Let me use this opportunity to deal with some of the matters of omission which arise from a consideration of this bill. The Historic Sites and Monuments Board dealt with in Bill C-153 bears the great burden and responsibility for designating areas of historic interest suitable for preservation by the government of Canada. Since 1953 this Board has compiled a list of areas which should be preserved and developed as part of Canada's historic heritage.

It is entirely fitting, as the bill has suggested, that there should be some cross-fertilization of the National Museum of Canada because of recent adjustments in departmen-

tal organization. The museums branch was withdrawn from the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, so we lack co-ordination between historic sites and the museums board. There is no co-ordination in Canada in respect of the establishment of historic sites and these two groups dealing with the preservation of historic areas in Canada.

We are now going to readjust this situation by making it possible for a representative of the National Museums Board to sit in on the deliberations of the Historic Sites and Museums Board. This is necessary and was in fact the situation which existed before the government began to play musical chairs with departmental organization by reorganization, as it has been called.

I notice that in the make-up of the Board there will be representation by the new Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, with at least one representative from each of the provinces—two from the central provinces, Quebec and Ontario. In any event there will be no representation from the Yukon or Northwest Territories. This is one of the sins of omission in this bill to which I referred. No amendment was introduced to this effect because I am sure the government would not have approved.

In that area of Canada north of the 60th parallel there exists some of the most significant and important parts of Canada, particularly from a historic and heritage point of view. It was in this area, for example, that early explorations took place during the search for a Northwest Passage. Because of this aspect of historic heritage in this 3,500,000 square mile area of northern Canada, the legislation might well have allowed for representation by the Yukon and Northwest Territories. Representatives of these two areas of Canada are vociferous in their demands for independence and consideration on the part of the government of Canada. I suppose we will require another housekeeping bill to deal with this situation.

There was another important omission so far as this legislation is concerned. I refer to closer co-ordination between the National Battlefields Commission and the Historic Sites and Monuments Board. The National Battlefields Commission, which has operated for most of the present century, has responsibility for the battlefield of the Plains of Abraham. This is related to an early confrontation which brought about the settlement of the final status of Canadian sovereignty. It has responsibility for other battlefields in Canada, some of which can be related to the war of 1812, including Queenstown Heights where Canadians turned back invading United States forces. I do not know whether we could do so now, but we did back in 1812.

These battlefields are preserved by the National Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada. It seems to me that it would be in the best interests of peace, order and good government if, in trying to bring about a rationalization or reorganization of the functions of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board, national battlefields were brought under the aegis of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board and the functions of the National Battlefields Commission. This would not only add to efficiency, it would be conducive to national unity and result in a saving in respect of administrative expenditures. But I think that the bringing together of the two groups will have to take place in due course and we shall again go through the motions referred to as housekeeping under the present legislation.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I do not think we have emphasized too much the increasing importance of the preservation of our historic sites and monuments as symbols of Candian progress on the road to confederation and national unity. There are many artifacts of Canadian history that are still available for preservation. Canada is fortunate in this respect because we are a comparatively young country and we still have the remains of many of these landmarks in Canada's progress toward nationhood that should be preserved. The whole movement toward the preservation of our historic sites received an impetus in the initial planning for our centennial.

It was contemplated that there would be major projects in every province that could be visited by the people of Canada and the thousands and, I suppose it is not extravagant to say, the millions who visited Canada two years ago during our centennial year and constituted the greatest boom in tourism that Canada or any other country has seen. Unfortunately, not too many of those historic sites were completed in time to be available for display purposes at that time. Just the other afternoon it was my privilege to attend a ceremony at lower Fort Garry in the province of Manitoba, celebrating the restoration to an almost perfect state of one of the old Hudson Bay forts that were identified with the early settlement of Red River which ultimately gave rise to the province of Manitoba. Then followed the opening of the west and the

completion of confederation in the early 1870's, by the addition of Saskatchewan and Alberta in the year 1905.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) was there and in his remarks emphasized the great importance of these historic sites as symbols of the progress of Canada toward nationhood and as examples to the young population of Canada today of some of the trials, tribulations and privations which were endured by the early settlers in this country. The restoration of the lower Fort Garry site was begun in 1960. It has taken almost nine years to complete and it is not finished as yet, but the big house which was the Hudson Bay factor's residence, the residence of Sir George Simpson back in the early part of the century, has been completely restored and furnished with period furniture. Last year, even before it was officially opened I understand, there were 137,000 tourists who visited the site. I say that it is not quite completed because in the total representation of that period of history it was felt that the Indian community which grew up around the site should be represented in historic reproduction and in animation. There is partial animation today. Troops of the period and various trades that were carried on at that time are represented, but we still have to go one step further and display the activities of our first Canadians. There should be representation of this sadly neglected group until recent times, our Canadian Indians, and the role that they played in making old lower Fort Garry a viable trading post by reason of the fact that the Indians were willing to come in with the furs. This was the first economic activity in many parts of this country.

The restoration of Louisbourg in the maritimes is well on the way. It will be a tremendous development which will not only represent an important stage of Canadian history but also will be one of the major tourist attractions.

I have already mentioned the fact that the omission of representatives from the northern territories is unfortunate, and perhaps I should end on this note because I am dealing with sins of omission rather than commission. This bill is conspicuous for what it does not do rather than for what it does do. I think the greatest historic site in Canada is the old city of Dawson in the Yukon territory which was declared a national historic site in 1961. I say it is the greatest historic site because it was the focal point of that great mass movement of men and women from all over the world along the trail of 1898, the gold rush of that year. Dawson city has been put into story by Jack London. It has been dealt with by that immortal comic, Charlie Chaplin. It has been immortalized in the poems of the Sourdough written by Robert Service, and unfortunately there has been no further development in the preservation of this classic example of Canadian history since the early 1960's. I am sure that had there been a spokesman from the Yukon territory on the Historic Sites and Monuments Board he would have kept this important subject before the members of the board in season and out of season. At least we have a cross-fertilization between the museum and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I hope that now we will be able to compensate sufficiently the members of the board who are all outstanding people in their knowledge and understanding of Canadian history. Then, they will become even more diligent in carrying out their responsibilities and putting pressure on the government to act in an area that has been neglected far too long.

It is important to preserve our history and to commemorate and erect our monuments. That is the historic aspect of the problem. But it is equally important to provide facilities for our growing and booming tourist industry as well as to meet the leisure time needs of the Canadian population. I am sorry that the government did not take advantage of this bill to press on with their responsibilities in this matter. As I said, we have no criticism to make because there is nothing in the bill of importance and therefore it cannot be criticized.

• (5:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** Mr. Speaker, this bill is really a housekeeping proposal which will make possible the addition to the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada of a representative of the National Museum. However, discussion of this matter affords an opportunity to express a view of the function of the board itself and of the work it is doing. I have a few comments and three suggestions to make.

It may be of some interest to note that it was in 1919, just 50 years ago, that the first Commissioner of Dominion Parks sent a memorandum to his minister—at that time designated the minister of the interior—which led to the setting up of this particular board. The board is a small body and a hard working one; its work increases as the interest of Canadians in their past increases and as the

number of visitors to Canada grows larger. It meets three times a year and deals with a good many of the subjects one would expect to find discussed in terms of historic sites and monuments. The board carries out recommendations and policies accepted by the minister who is responsible for operating parks and sites from the Atlantic to the Pacific. These include projects such as lower Fort Garry, Dawson City, Sir John Macdonald's house in Kingston and the fortress of Louisbourg which is probably the largest example of single historical restoration in modern history.

In supporting the passage of this bill and expressing the hope that it will be speedily approved, I wish to make three suggestions. The first is that there should be an immediate review of the hundreds of historical Canadian marking placques, particularly those which have to do with Indian affairs. Many of the inscriptions on these placques were drawn up 40 years ago, since when research has done much to clarify and sharpen our knowledge of Canadian history. To put it bluntly, the information on a number of these placques is out of date. My suggestion is that the section of the board which concerns itself with Indian tribes should consult with our native Indian people, our Eskimo and our Metis, to get their views in this connection.

My second point is this. With the growth of the tourist industry, our historic sites, particularly the larger and more interesting of them, are becoming increasingly important as centres of tourist interest both to Canadians and to visitors from abroad. I should like the board to give renewed consideration to co-ordinating visits to some of our major historic sites, such as that at Louisbourg, with either a cross-country tour or a tour of the provinces in which these magnificent sites are situated. In other words, I urge a better "tie-in" between the board and the Canadian Travel Bureau. If I may put it tersely, "thar's gold in them thar hills."

My third suggestion, Mr. Speaker—and I speak as a member from British Columbia where in the Lower Mainland we have the fine historic site of Old Fort Langley around which the industry of the province, including agriculture, fur trading, fishing, lumbering and manufacturing was born—is this: I recommend that if the historic Sites and Monuments Board is approached by the British Columbia Centennial Committee with a request for some special activation of the fort in 1971, the year which marks the province's hundredth year in confederation, it will co-operate in doing so, thus adding to the knowledge and historical perspective of our citizens as well as to the drawing power of this particular site as a tourist attraction.

In conclusion let me say I am sure many members of this house and a great many people in the country admire the work being done by this board, and wish it well in the future.

**Mr. John Roberts (York-Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, we all know that with the implementation of the new committee system hon. members are often called upon to attend various committees at the same time. I regret that I was unable to be present when the committee considered this particular bill concerning the National Historic Sites and Monuments Board. But I do not feel I can let this occasion pass without registering my dismay and concern at the timorous approach the government is taking to the challenge which confronts us in this area.

To make haste slowly is sometimes an adequate adage in both life and politics—but to proceed tortoise-like when events are moving so quickly in this area is a recipe for losing a great part of the cultural heritage of our country. The government has brought to this question a cosmetic approach, when surgery is required. For too long we have moved too slowly. As one member of the house has just told us, the board has been in operation for 50 years—most of this century. In 50 years it has managed to support 30 buildings, almost an average of one every two years.

Does the government announce, now, an approach commensurate with the urgency of the situation, bearing in mind what the increasing urbanization of our society is doing to the physical reminders of our past? No. After long consideration the government brings down a project which, in essence, would add one more person to the board of directors. One would have thought they could come up with something a little better than that.

I recognize we are not dealing, now, with something which is fundamental to our existence. I dare say western civilization will continue if we do nothing to preserve our historic sites and monuments. I dare say Canada will continue. But it will continue with a diminished heritage.

This is not a fundamental issue, but it is an urgent one. In the past ten years we have lost a great many attractive and important buildings and we continue to lose them very quickly. In my own constituency at Aurora

we have lost one of our historic buildings in York Township, Doane Hall. In the Town of Peterborough which is of some concern to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are in danger of losing another important historic building. I hope you and I will be able to combine forces and do something about that one. This is urgent. Cities are expanding. People are moving into the cities. Old buildings are often expensive to maintain and are falling into neglect. A great deal has already been lost. However, there is still much to preserve if we take action—and action does not consist of appointing one more person, no matter how able, to a board.

In Ottawa, which should be important to all of us, we have lost some fine buildings, the old Supreme Court building for one. Hon. members may have seen a television program last night on this subject. The Bytown Inn is in danger of being pulled down. No one can claim this is a building of national historic importance, but it is an attractive building and one which does add some character to this city—a building which represents the spirit of the past of this city. The owners are reluctant to see it torn down but there is little they can do to preserve it, because no kind of financial assistance for this purpose is available to them. In this city, Earnscliffe, the home of Sir John A. Macdonald is the home of the British High Commissioner. Here is an historic building attached to Canada's first Prime Minister which should be supported, preserved and used by Canadians. One of the suggestions I would have for its use—and I am sure that the British would be prepared to let us have it—is as a home for the Speaker. Can the members of the house possibly imagine the citizens of the United States accepting a situation in which the British ambassador lived in Mount Vernon? Yet that is exactly the situation we are facing in this country. What kind of pride do we have in our national heritage when we are content to let plenipotentiaries of a foreign power live in the original home of Canada's first Prime Minister in Canada's capital? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that situation constitutes a disgrace.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Let us look at the old port area of Montreal. Why has the government done nothing to help preserve the buildings that are to be found there? Why is this left to the activities of private enterprise, sometimes beneficial, sometimes not?

[Mr. Roberts.]

In Niagara-on-the-Lake we have an area of immense historical interest as well as aesthetic and cultural interest. The National Historic Sites and Monuments Board has recently announced that it is going to help support the preservation of the Apothecaries Shop, but the whole area should be designated as one that deserves government assistance and help.

There are many other places of this kind in Canada. Close to here is Williamstown, Ontario, which is full of fine buildings. Down around Cardinal and Cobourg there are marvellous buildings which may not be of unique historical interest but are splendid examples of early 19th century architecture.

Faced with the opportunities of preservation, in 50 years in this country we have managed to do something to help preserve 30 historic buildings. For members who are interested, I would suggest that during the parliamentary recess they might take a trip down to Vermont and New Hampshire to see some of the things that can be done. I ask them to go and visit Woodstock, Vermont or Deerfield, Vermont, where with government help there has been the preservation of distinct, unique communities as a whole,—not isolated buildings, but communities that bring to the present a description, a concrete depiction of how people lived in an earlier time.

When we look at what other countries are doing in this regard, the efforts of Canada seem almost laughable. I have described in this house in the past some of the activities that the French government has pursued: the enormous facilities that are directed toward the preservation of old buildings and monuments, including churches; the giving of tax benefits to various categories of owners which enable them to preserve owner occupied buildings of architectural or aesthetic merit.

In Great Britain, the National Trust was established, I believe, back in the 19th century and arranges a program of tax benefits to such an extent that the National Trust is now the second largest land owner in the country. I realize some hon. members will say that in Europe there are things that are worth preserving, that in Europe there is a greater heritage. But let us look at what the United States is doing in this regard. The United States is usually presented to us as an example of individualism rampant, where the state does not involve itself overly much in the preservation of amenities of society. The United States is spending over $10 million a year and has elaborated all sorts of programs of this sort, particularly urban renewal

schemes, for the preservation not of uniquely historical monuments but of buildings of general aesthetic and cultural interest.

The United States even has one program under which the government purchases a house, restores it and then resells it to a private owner who undertakes to keep the house in a restored and repaired order. There are many, many things in this area that we could be doing but are not doing.

What has gone wrong? I think the first thing that has gone wrong has been the orientation of the National Historic Sites and Monuments Board. Its members are not so much interested in architecture or general amenities; they are almost exclusively archivists. They are historians and, I suggest, attach too much significance to the principle that the buildings with which they concern themselves should be of national and historic importance.

Another thing that I think has gone wrong has been the attachment of this board to its present minister. The logic appears to be that national historic sites are a little like parks—recreational amenities. I suggest that what we are dealing with here is not simply recreation in that sense but the preservation of a cultural heritage. That function should really come under the umbrella of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), particularly now that the museum service is there. Because to a considerable extent the functions of the historical monuments board and the museum service are inter-related.

The basic problem of the National Historic Sites and Monuments Board is orientation—the orientation imposed by the law and that imposed by the ministry with which it happens to find itself. I suggest that the government seriously consider bringing the National Historic Sites and Monuments Board out into its proper place, the office of the Secretary of State.

The other aspect that undoubtedly hampers the Historic Sites and Monuments Board is the simple one of money. It is not simply a question of providing subsidies, but of arranging tax incentives so that the owners of buildings will themselves be encouraged to maintain them in a viable and attractive state.

I know the objections that are often presented to a tax incentive system. Yet in this particular area it is often impossible to place the initial responsibility in the hands of government. When government faces a difficult fiscal situation, the first kind of program that is squeezed under a diminishing budget is one that is oriented toward cultural activities. We would have a much more satisfactory record of preservation of historical buildings in this country were we able to rely upon certain tax incentives. There are many examples of these in the United States and abroad, incentives that give to the owners themselves the primary responsibility for maintaining their buildings in an effective order.

I suggest that we should not simply abandon this type of activity to the provinces. The provinces are doing much. For example, Ontario is doing much through the Heritage Foundation to preserve buildings. It is not simply a question of preserving provincial cultures or provincial heritages; it is a question of preserving a national heritage, one that belongs to us all as Canadians, not simply as citizens of one province or another.

This is an area in which the federal government has a responsibility, but I suggest the federal government has not yet met this responsibility. Nor do I believe that the National Historic Sites and Monuments Board has faced the problem of the orientation of the board and the problem of money. I think the kind of change with which the government has presented to the house today would be a grave deception to many people across Canada. I hope the government will continue to consider this problem and that we will soon be presented with some kind of effective legislation to deal with the kind of problems I have described.

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am prepared to put the question, but I had the impression that the hon. member for Vancouver East wanted to speak.

**Mr. Winch:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this matter so may I call it six o'clock.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the house leader whether he can say if the present bill and the other two small bills will be called on

Friday, knowing that Thursday is an opposition day?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, my present understanding is that the official languages bill will be called on Friday. If there is any change I will advise the house tomorrow.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being six o'clock the house stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Thursday, May 15, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

## PRIVILEGE

MR. BROADBENT—TABLING IN FINANCE COMMITTEE OF COST-BENEFIT STUDY—MOTION TO REFER TO PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege arising out of the tabling last Thursday, May 8, at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of a document labelled a "cost-benefit analysis". This document was requested by me at a prior meeting of this committee, as reported on page 2045 of the committee proceedings. The chairman at that time indicated that it would be printed as an appendix to that day's proceedings. Although this was not done at that time it did appear as an appendix to the committee proceedings last Thursday, following a commitment made in this house on Wednesday, April 23 by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Forest).

The document was requested originally, Mr. Speaker, because in the context of a discussion on military research and development at the committee's hearing on April 1, the assistant deputy minister asserted that a cost-benefit analysis that had been done by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce showed that probably benefits would exceed costs at the ratio of 24:1.

• (2:10 p.m.)

However, Mr. Speaker, the document which was finally presented to the committee was not, in fact, a cost-benefit study as prescribed by the Treasury Board Manual Planning Programming Budgeting Guide. In fact it is a one-page collection of items which bears no resemblance to a cost-benefit analysis. The committee, in short, was not presented with what was promised.

I raised this matter at the earliest opportunity as a question of privilege at the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. This morning, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of that Committee ruled against my question of privilege and asserted that since the parliamentary secretary to the President of the Privy Council had stated in this house that a cost-benefit study would be produced for the committee, a question of privilege should appropriately be raised in this place.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move—

—that the subject matter of this question of privilege be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to determine the course to be taken to obtain the promised cost-benefit analysis.

**Mr. Speaker:** In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 17(2) the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) gave notice to the Chair of his intention to raise a question of privilege. I think I should mention to him that although the provisions of the Standing Order indicate that a written statement showing the substance of the matter to be raised shall be filed with the Chair, there is not much advantage in informing the Chair about one hour in advance of the sitting of the house that a question of privilege is to be raised. The point raised by the hon. member is contentious, and at first blush I doubt whether it is possible to refer from one committee to another committee a question considered in the first of these committees.

A similar point I believe was raised by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) some weeks ago, when he suggested that the motion which had been considered in the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications ought to be referred for further consideration to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. As I said, the problem raised by the hon. member has some complexity. Perhaps I might have an opportunity to look at the matter more closely and, later in the afternoon, after I have had a chance to look at the record, to give a ruling.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** May I remind Your Honour that the subject matter of my question of privilege to do with the motion for a certain matter to be considered by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections is still before the house for debate.

[*Translation*]

## CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

POSITION RESPECTING ARCTIC ARCHIPELAGO, CONTINENTAL SHELF AND INTER-ISLAND WATERS

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, honourable members will recall my indicating recently that the government would make a policy statement regarding the question of Canadian sovereignty in the Arctic. I should like to make that statement at this time.

[*English*]

I have already informed the house that Canada's sovereignty over its Arctic regions, including the islands of the Arctic archipelago, is well established and that there is no dispute concerning this matter. No country has asserted a competing claim; no country now challenges Canada's sovereignty on any other basis; and many countries have indicated in various ways their recognition of Canada's sovereignty over these areas. The government is not aware of any maps allegedly disputing Canadian sovereignty over certain Arctic lands. I can assure the house that if any such maps do exist they have no official standing and do not affect Canada's position in any way. The Arctic mainland and islands form an integral part of Canada and we have extended to them the administrative, legislative and judicial framework which applies to all parts of Canada.

With reference to offshore resources in the Canadian Arctic, as elsewhere, the Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf provides that the coastal state exercises over the continental shelf sovereign rights for the purposes of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources. These sovereign rights do not depend on occupation or on any express proclamation. No one may explore or exploit the continental shelf off any of our shores without our express consent. Canada's sovereign rights over the continental shelf in the Arctic follow from Canada's sovereignty over the adjacent lands, and again there is no dispute on this matter. No country has asserted a competing claim to the resources in question; no country has challenged Canada's claim on any other basis, and none can do so under international law. Foreign companies carrying out exploration activities on the continental shelf in Canada's Arctic areas operate under Canadian permit and licence and in so doing expressly recognize Canada's sovereign rights. The same is true, of course, of foreign oil companies operating on any of our lands in the Arctic or elsewhere.



With respect to the waters between the islands of Canada's Arctic archipelago, it is well known that in 1958 the then minister of northern affairs stated the Canadian position as follows:

> The area to the north of Canada, including the islands and the waters between the islands and areas beyond, are looked upon as our own, and there is no doubt in the minds of this government, nor do I think was there in the minds of former governments of Canada, that this is national terrain.

[*Translation*]

It is also known that not all countries would accept the view that the waters between the islands of the archipelago are internal waters over which Canada has full sovereignty. The contrary view is indeed that Canada's sovereignty extends only to the territorial sea around each island. The law of the sea is a complex subject which, as can be understood, may give rise to differences of opinion. Such differences, of course, would have to be settled not on an arbitrary basis but with due regard for established principles of international law.

I should point out that the legal status of the waters of Canada's Arctic archipelago is not at issue in the proposed transit of the Northwest Passage by the ships involved in the *Manhattan* project. As the house is aware, this project is sponsored by a number of oil companies and consists of a trial run through the Northwest Passage and into the Beaufort Sea off Alaska by the ice-strengthened tanker *Manhattan*, accompanied by ice-breakers of the Canadian and US Coast Guards. The exercise is intended to test the feasibility of transporting oil by this method from Alaska's Prudhoe Bay to the northeastern United States and perhaps to Europe.

Needless to say the trials of the *Manhattan* may be of considerable significance for the development of Arctic navigation. Such development is consistent with both Canadian and international interests, and I do not see that any conflict need arise between Canada's national policy and international responsibility in this connection. Arctic navigation will

be an important factor in the general development of northern Canada and as such it will, of course, be encouraged rather than restricted by Canada.

[*English*]

For these reasons the Canadian government has welcomed the *Manhattan* exercise, has concurred in it and will participate in it. The oil companies concerned and the United States Coastguard have consulted with appropriate Canadian authorities in the planning of the operation. The government will support the trials with the Canadian Coastguard icebreaker *John A. Macdonald,* as already indicated, and will also provide aerial ice reconnaissance and assume responsibility for the co-ordination of such reconnaissance. The government has also selected and appointed an official Canadian government representative on board the S.S. *Manhattan* who will act as technical adviser and as co-ordinator of Canadian support for the operation.

• (2:20 p.m.)

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I am a little puzzled by the length of the statement and the content of the statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), with one exception, in that it does not seem to take matters any farther than the ground he had previously covered, and I find somewhat disturbing the comment he has made with regard to the waters between the northern islands.

The Prime Minister refers to positions taken by previous governments and quotes the then minister of northern affairs in a statement made in 1958, laying claim to the islands and the waters between the islands and the areas beyond. I cannot help but wonder whether the effect of the statement made by the Prime Minister this afternoon is to abandon that claim which was asserted previously, leaving the matter strictly on the basis of following scrupulously what the Prime Minister refers to as the principles of international law, which principles are not always as clear as they might be.

I wonder whether this is the attitude that the government of Canada followed when it decided to extend Canadian jurisdiction over our seas. At that time the government of Canada did not set out to follow scrupulously the principles of international law, and of course other governments, for example the government of Iceland, have not done so.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to argue about the principles of international law but simply to raise the question of whether the Prime Minister in effect has abandoned a position asserted by previous Canadian governments, and to ask what is the reason for this abandonment if my interpretation is correct. Further, Mr. Speaker, if my interpretation is correct I think this will be regarded by the Canadian people as a matter of rather keen disappointment.

Sir, I would hope that the government would reconsider and bear in mind the fact that the principles of international law are not necessarily all that clear. At least the government should assert our position vigorously and aggressively. As I say, I am disturbed by the manner in which the Prime Minister seems to have abandoned the position taken by previous governments with regard to the assertion of our sovereignty.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members welcome the Prime Minister's statement asserting Canada's sovereignty over the Arctic regions and his intention to maintain that sovereignty. I would feel happier if the statement of the Prime Minister with reference to the waters between the islands of the Arctic archipelago had been more forthright. It seems to me that if there is uncertainty with respect to international law concerning these areas, the Canadian government would be well advised to state its sovereignty and allow any other countries that wish to dispute it to refer the matter to whatever international court or international jurisdiction exists, for a judgment on it. It seems to me that if the Canadian government leaves this matter in an indefinite state we are almost inviting someone else to suggest that we do not have jurisdiction, and that this is a question upon which we are prepared to compromise. I think the Canadian government ought to make its position clear beyond any shadow of doubt.

It is not only important that we categorically state our sovereignty over the Arctic regions, but we also remember that this parliament has a responsibility with reference to the resource development of those regions. A great part of the settled areas of Canada is already under the control of foreign oil companies and foreign investors. In many cases this is because provincial governments do not have the necessary funds or expertise to

develop these resources themselves or to set up a Canadian consortium for that purpose. But in these regions which come directly under the jurisdiction of the federal government, the Canadian parliament has an opportunity to set up a Canadian consortium with a majority of public ownership and control so that the development of these vast areas will redound to the benefit of Canadians today and Canadians of future generations. The Panarctic consortium which has been established is controlled in the main by United States oil companies. It seems to me that if this assertion of our sovereignty is to have any meaning it must go beyond merely asserting our control over territory; it must also assert Canada's intent to develop the resources of that area for the benefit of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, the members of the Ralliement créditiste are pleased to hear the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) say that Canada actually has sovereign rights on the Arctic islands, but there is some confusion as regards the surrounding waters.

At all events, we hope we never have to cross American, Russian or Chinese waters in order to reach any region in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, at any rate, the statement made by the Prime Minister makes it clear that Canada is sovereign, as far as those Arctic areas are concerned.

I approve also what the leader of the N.D.P. (Mr. Douglas) said, that if Canada rules the Arctic, we should endeavour to proceed with the development of the tremendous natural resources of that area, instead of letting foreigners take them over, to the prejudice of Canadians. To encourage foreign investments is perfectly in order, but it is not proper that foreigners should exploit all those resources to their advantage. A share should at least be given to Canadians who deserve, I believe, to benefit from the development of the natural resources of their country, specially in the Arctic.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND STANDING ORDERS

### CONCURRENCE IN SECOND REPORT

**Mr. Gérard Duquet (Quebec East)** moved that the second report of the standing committee on miscellaneous private bills and standing orders tabled in the house on Thursday, March 27, 1969, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

## INDIAN ACT

### AMENDMENT PERMITTING INDIAN WOMEN TO MARRY NON-INDIANS WITHOUT LOSS OF RIGHTS

**Mr. Raymond Rock (Lachine)** moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-193, to amend the Indian Act (rights of Indian women upon marriage).

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

**Mr. Rock:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to enable an Indian woman to marry a non-Indian without being deprived of her rights as an Indian and thereby place her on the same basis as an Indian man who marries a non-Indian woman. Presently such persons lose all property rights willed to them by their parents.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

• (2:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** When shall the said bill be read a second time?

**Some hon. Members:** Now.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to give the bill second reading now?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**An hon. Member:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Next sitting of the house.

## CANADA DISASTER FUND

On the order:

May 13, 1969—Mr. Harding—Bill intituled: "An act to provide for the establishment of The Canada Disaster Fund."

**Mr. Speaker:** I am advised that the table has not yet received a copy of the bill in question. In view of the fact that the bill has not been presented it is difficult to propose first reading at this time.

**Mr. Harding:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Reservé.

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

### LABOUR CONDITIONS

ALLEGED URGENT SITUATION DISCLOSED BY RELEASE OF CURRENT UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES—MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for York South, to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the urgent situation revealed in the unemployment statistics released today, showing 10.5 per cent unemployment for the Atlantic area, 8 per cent for Quebec, 5 per cent for British Columbia and 5.4 per cent as the over-all figure for the entire country, and the failure of the government to provide policies to cope with this situation.

More significantly, Mr. Speaker, since these April statistics do not yet reflect the 600,000 students who are presently entering the labour force seeking job opportunities for the summer months, it is doubly urgent that parliament adjourn to discuss this important matter.

In conclusion, may I refer Your Honour to your ruling of March 13, 1969, as reported in *Hansard*. Your Honour ruled that, in considering whether such a general subject can be put before the house, the general rule be discarded if the circumstances of a continuing situation reached critical proportions. I propose that such a time has arrived.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. There are two points I should like to make in connection with the motion proposed by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, of which he has given appropriate notice under the terms of Standing Order 26. The first point has reference to the form of the notice. Standing Order 26 requires that a member wishing to move that the house do now adjourn shall give to Mr. Speaker a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed. Subsection (3) adds that at the appropriate moment the member shall rise in his place and present without argument the statement in question. The purpose of the new rule is obviously to eliminate argument in support of or in opposition to urgency of debate.

I fear that we will return to the previous unsatisfactory situation which the house has sought to correct in adopting the new standing order if the statement filed by an hon. member and read to the house is also an argument supporting urgency of debate. Hon. members may want to consider this suggestion when motions under Standing Order 26 are presented to the Chair.

When the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands proposed his motion and read the last paragraph I noticed that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) wanted to rise on a point of order. I assume that this is the point he wanted to raise. If we revert to a situation under which hon. members take advantage of the opportunity of making a statement to argue urgency, I am sure we will then have members from the government side also wanting to rise on a point of order to debate the question of non-urgency, and we will then be where we were before the rules were amended.

In respect of the substance of the matter, I have to refer hon. members to rulings made in similar circumstances on January 14, March 13 and May 8 during the current session. It was then suggested to the house that by long established practice a motion under Standing Order 26 could not be entertained in such circumstances. I would have to make the same ruling, even in the particular conditions outlined by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

There is of course the additional consideration that by agreement this day has been set aside as an allotted day under the terms of Standing Order 58. I submit that circumstances would have to be extremely exceptional to justify an adjournment motion on a day which already has been allotted to the opposition for the purpose of proposing a specific motion of non-confidence.

I regret, therefore, that I cannot put the hon. member's proposed motion to the house.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

VIET NAM—PARTICIPATION BY CANADA IN SUPERVISORY BODY TO EFFECT SETTLEMENT

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister a question arising out of the proposals announced last evening by President Nixon designed to obtain negotiated peace in Viet Nam. Will the right

hon. gentleman or the Secretary of State for External Affairs indicate whether Canada is prepared to take part in the international advisory body suggested by President Nixon? Has there been any indication that the International Control Commission would be acceptable in this supervisory role, or would it be replaced by some other body?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, our experience in Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia in the last 15 years has not been such as to lead us to seek out such an assignment. We would nevertheless examine very carefully any request that Canada serve in a new supervisory body. Whether we would be prepared to do so would depend in part on Canada's other commitments at the time, the terms of reference and the operation of the proposed new body, and on the anticipated duration of the assignment. It would also depend on whether, in our best judgment, the type of supervisory role envisaged would in the context of the statement be likely to make an effective contribution to peace and stability in the area.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, apparently I misunderstood the statement made some months ago by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in which he indicated that Canada was volunteering for such a role. May I ask now whether there has been any communication from the government of the United States asking whether Canada would be prepared to participate in such a role?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, if the question asks whether we have been requested by the government of the United States to agree with the proposal it has put forward, the answer is no. If the question is, are we aware of the possibility that we might be called upon to make such a contribution, the answer is yes. Indeed, we have made some preliminary studies of this question, and we have consulted with various governments about this role.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my question was put so obscurely that apparently it was not understood. I meant to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether there had been any communication from the United States government as to whether Canada would be prepared to participate in such an international supervisory body.

**Mr. Sharp:** We have had no such request from the United States government, Mr. Speaker. But, as I said, in reply to the question as the hon. gentleman put it originally, we have had studies made in Canada and we have talked to officials of the United States government and of other governments about how such a role might be fulfilled. Because we feel this is a government with some responsibility in this area, and since we are perhaps the most experienced in the world in peacekeeping operations, we wanted to have some preliminary investigations of the problems that would arise if we received such a request.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Is it correct in summary to conclude that the government of Canada is not volunteering to participate in this role and will only make a decision after it has carefully assessed all the circumstances surrounding any proposal that is made?

**Mr. Sharp:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that would be the view which would receive the strong support of Canadians.

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Did the American authorities, the President directly or someone in the State Department, inform the Canadian government ahead of time of the proposal that the President of the United States intended to make, and was there any discussion not only with the government of Canada but with other friendly governments about the way in which the unhappy situation in Viet Nam might soon be brought to an end?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question, as to whether we were consulted in advance about the statement made by President Nixon yesterday, is no. We have, of course, been consulting with the United States over a very long period of time trying to help in bringing about a solution to this very unhappy situation.

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, if Canada were invited to assist in the matter which has just been discussed, would the government prefer to do it under the present auspices of the Geneva agreements, under United Nations auspices or auspices of that nature?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, our purpose would be to be as helpful as possible. It would be for those who are directly concerned in the conflict to decide what kind of request they would like to make to us that would be most

helpful. As I have indicated, we have not been very happy about the way in which the International Control Commission has operated. We do not want to repeat that sort of experience.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As the minister has indicated, our experience with the International Control Commission has been nothing but unsatisfactory. Are we under the present conditions considering withdrawing from that particular body?

**Mr. Sharp:** No, Mr. Speaker.

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

### REQUEST FOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND OTHER MEASURES TO PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the figures which were released today, showing an unemployment figure for the month of April of almost 5½ per cent and involving some 435,000 unemployed persons, I ask the Prime Minister whether he intends to speed up the presentation to the house of legislation to set up a Canada Development Corporation and to establish industrial incentives and any other measures that will help to provide jobs in the near future?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** With regard to legislation, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion said a few days ago that he would soon introduce his bill. The government has been a bit inhibited during the past weeks in the advancing of legislation, and we hope that our progress will now be aided by the opposition.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Prime Minister has just said that for the last two or three weeks the government could not bring in legislation to eradicate unemployment. Why did it not do that instead of introducing Bill C-150?

[*English*]

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the legislation which has been holding up the house is now disposed of, and in view of the fact that the legislation of the minister dealing with regional development has not yet been introduced, would the Prime Minister undertake to have that legislation introduced within the next few days and give it top priority over anything else on the order paper?

**Mr. Trudeau:** We do not have the same conception of planning as the hon. member. His top priorities change every day with what he reads in the newspapers. We announce ours.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, at least I have some priorities.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**An hon. Member:** How do you like that?

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** I ask the Prime Minister when the government intends to come out of its lotus-eating, never-never land and do something about the economic problems facing this country.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that some 43 per cent of those unemployed have been unemployed for more than four months, is this a matter of concern to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, and would he consider making a statement to the house in the near future as to any plans he may have to put forward with regard to easing the difficulties from which these people have been suffering during a prolonged period of unemployment?

**An hon. Member:** Let them eat cake.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend will have noticed that, as the figures reveal, Canada's labour force is now past the eight million mark.

**Mr. Woolliams:** So what?

**Mr. MacEachen:** It is of some interest to observe that 7.6 million Canadians are employed at the present time.

So the notion of insisting upon the unemployment side does not give a proper perspective to the economic situation in Canada. There has been an improvement in total employment from month to month and year to year. There has been a decline in unemployment from month to month. But there has been an unusually large increase in the labour force. My hon. friends will be interested in knowing that year to year the

unemployment situation has improved. It may be of further interest, as the figures show, to note that the unemployment situation is to a significant extent a regional one.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Woolliams:** It is all over the country.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I think it is a tribute to the discernment of the government that such a high priority has been placed on the regional economic expansion plan of the minister.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I asked the minister if he would in the near future make a statement on a specific point. I did not ask for a partisan speech in reply to a question which I did not ask.

I would repeat the question, Mr. Speaker. I ask whether the minister will consider making a statement in the near future on the point about which I asked him.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to consider making a non-political statement to the political question that has been asked.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Would the minister who has just said that the number of unemployed has decreased, explain why the number of people on welfare has increased in proportion to that of the unemployed?

**Mr. Speaker:** It seems to me that the hon. member's question might give rise to a debate. I feel we have started the discussion proposed by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), and we could now go back to questions.

## CANADIAN CONFEDERATION

### SUGGESTED STEPS TO PROMOTE NATIONAL UNITY

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct to the Secretary of State a question which I could as well ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Last night, I was present at a meeting in Montreal of the Pro-Canada Association, and I heard a choir made up of 80 teenagers from Trois-Rivières. Would the Secretary of State be prepared, for the sake of national unity, to foster a tour of that group all across Canada?

**Mr. Speaker:** This question should be put on the order paper.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

[*English*]

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

### HAL BANKS—POSSIBILITY OF RENEWING EXTRADITION PROCEEDINGS

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. On Tuesday last I asked the Prime Minister, in view of the statement by the Secretary of State of the United States clearly indicating that the new government is waiting for an application for the extradition of Mr. Hal Banks, and as the Ontario government has clearly indicated that it wishes to have Mr. Hal Banks back here so that he can be prosecuted for perjury, to indicate what action is being taken by the government to put forward this application for extradition. The Prime Minister answered that the Minister of Justice would answer the question. As the minister has had two full days to consider this matter, may we have a full answer to this very important question?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** I will be glad to reply to that speech, Mr. Speaker. As I informed hon. members in this house on November 20 last during the debate on the estimates on the Department of Justice, the legal officers of the Department of Justice are of the opinion that, as a matter of law, the Banks case is closed since the extradition proceedings in the United States have been exhausted. That conclusion was arrived at in consultation with American counsel, namely Mr. Richard Kuh in New York City. Mr. Kuh was the counsel who acted for the government of Ontario in the extradition proceedings.

United States Senator Fannin met with Secretary of State William Rogers on Monday of last week and the Senator is quoted in the press to the effect that the position taken by Mr. Rogers is that nothing much could be done to reopen the case in the absence of a request from Canada. If what was said at this meeting has been fully and accurately reported, the position would appear to be that a further request for extradition by the government of Canada might result in further steps being taken by the government of the United States. This was what prompted the hon. member's question.

**An hon. Member:** You are right so far.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I wonder whether the minister would not agree that the statement

he is making now is of the type which would normally be made on motions. He might wish to revert to motions for the purpose of making this statement—

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was replying preamble for preamble.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Hees:** The minister has out-preambled me so far.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder whether the minister considers he has now answered the question.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** In view of these developments, and at my request, inquiries are being made by the Department of External Affairs to clarify the position of the United States State Department in this matter.

**Mr. Hees:** A supplementary question—

**Mr. Speaker:** Before the hon. member is allowed to put a supplementary question I think I should remind all hon. members that questions should be as short and to the point as possible, and that replies should be the same. If we are to have questions and answers as long as those we have just heard we might be placed in a position where the length of the question period would have to be extended, and I am not sure all hon. members would desire this.

**Mr. Hees:** My supplementary question will be very short, Mr. Speaker. Provided his inquiries show that an application will be accepted by the Secretary of State, will the minister undertake to make such application immediately?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Hees:** Have I got the minister's word on that? Come on.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member's question is hypothetical.

**Mr. Hees:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The minister's reluctance to answer shows that somebody is being protected against the due process of law, and that is Mr. Banks.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to rule that this is not a proper point of order.

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** A supplementary question to the Minister of Justice. While further inquiries are being made, would the minister arrange for a showing of the Hal Banks home movies?

[*Translation*]

## NATIONAL PARKS

### GASPÉ—AGREEMENT BETWEEN PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

**Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

The negotiations with regard to the development of the first national park in the province of Quebec are going at a snail's pace. Does the Prime Minister intend to meet the Regional Development Council for the Lower St. Lawrence, the Gaspé peninsula and the Magdalen Islands as requested by telegram by its chairman, Claude Jourdain, a lawyer, with a view to finding out the reason for holding up this project which is most important to the future of tourism in Gaspé and the whole province of Quebec?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have indeed received an invitation to meet the chairman. I am willing to do it, if I must, but I feel that it might be more useful for me to say that this very day the government took a decision in this regard which, I think, will benefit the citizens of Gaspé and Canada as a whole. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development will advise the authorities of the province of Quebec of the terms of that proposal to find out whether it might be possible to reach an agreement.

Should we fail to do so, I might consider the request but, for the time being I have every reason to believe that our proposal will benefit all Canadian citizens.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Moncton.

**Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question was for the Minister of Transport. Since he is not here today, and since his assistant is not here, I will defer it.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

SUCCESSOR TO GENERAL ALLARD

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** My question is for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In the light of widespread reports in connection with the imminent retirement of the Chief of the General Staff, can the right hon. gentleman advise the house whether the government is now considering the question of a successor to this most eminent Canadian soldier?

**Mr. Speaker:** I have some doubts whether this question has attached to it the type of urgency which would justify its being asked at this time.

**Mr. Forrestall:** With all due respect, Mr. Speaker. I submit that the degree of trust and confidence which has to be placed and maintained in whoever is appointed to the office of Chief of the General Staff is such as to warrant at least an indication from the Prime Minister whether or not General Allard's retirement is imminent, or whether rumours to this effect are false.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Surrey.

**Mr. Forrestall:** There are still 90,000 people in the forces. Why doesn't the government tell them what is going on?

**An hon. Member:** Shut up.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL

HULL—COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER INCLUSION IN CAPITAL AREA

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** May I address a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in his capacity as the Minister reporting on national capital questions? I wish to ask him this: Having in mind the reported major developments in the Hull region of the national capital area—developments with which I personally very much agree—will the minister tell us if and when the legislation approved by the last parliament for the setting up of a parliamentary committee to deal with national capital matters will be implemented?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, as soon as our general policy with regard to the National Capital is known, I shall be happy to convene the parliamentary committee so that it may be discussed.

[Mr. Thomas (Moncton).]

[*English*]

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

AID TO VICTIMS OF CRIME

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** My question is directed to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise whether his departmental officials have been conducting discussions with their opposite numbers at the provincial level with regard to the provision of a uniform system of aid to victims of crime, as well as to those who are called upon to aid police power and who are injured as a result of their actions in response to such calls?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** We have not been in active discussion with the provinces on this subject, but in the light of the hon. member's question I think it would be useful if at the next meeting of the uniformity commissioners we were to take this up with the provincial attorneys general.

## COMBINES

HOCKEY—ACTION TO ABOLISH RESERVE CLAUSE

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** May I direct a question to the minister of health, Mr. Speaker? It has to do with the recommendation of the commission on sports to the effect that reserve terms in National Hockey League professional agreements should be outlawed, and the hon. gentleman's statement that he was considering bringing in legislation to this effect. Would the minister say, having regard to the statement by the president of the National Hockey League that parliament has no jurisdiction to do this, whether any opinion has been secured from the law officers of the Crown and, if so, what is the nature and the purport of the advice he has received?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** I would answer the right hon. gentleman by referring him to the reply my colleague the minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs gave in the house yesterday to the effect that, despite Mr. Campbell's opinion, my colleague is looking into this matter.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I was not here yesterday, but I saw that answer. My question is: Has the matter been submitted to the law officers of the Crown?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I answered yesterday to the effect that this matter had been referred to the combines investigation branch.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That is not what I asked.

**Mr. Basford:** If I may finish: They will undoubtedly be considering the legal position in relation to Mr. Campbell's statement. As far as I know, the matter has not been referred to the Department of Justice, if that is what the right hon. gentleman is inquiring—to the law officers of the crown.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The Department of Justice is the only place to refer the matter.

**Mr. Basford:** I can assure the hon. member that a legal opinion will be sought if we feel that one is needed.

**Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister also say, when his department is looking into the reserve clause in National Hockey League contracts, whether he will also consider looking into the same reserve clause on Canadian Amateur Hockey Association players' registration cards?

[*Translation*]

## FAMILY ALLOWANCES

INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE CUTS TO BENEFITS

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

As the bill dealing with abortion was passed in the house yesterday and as the number of births will probably decrease as a result, does the Prime Minister intend to increase or decrease family allowances in respect of such children as will still be born?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I volunteer to give the assurance that there will be no decrease in the number of births.

[*English*]

## CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

BASE LINE CO-ORDINATES IN ARCTIC ARCHIPELAGO

**Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Coast Chilcotin):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister which arises out of his statement that waters within the Canadian archipelago are considered to be Canadian. When will base line co-ordinates be drawn around the rim of the Arctic archipelago to enclose it, and when will maps be issued so that it will be clear to other nations where Canadian boundaries are?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry said a few days ago that the co-ordinates would be published forthwith, and that from the co-ordinates the base lines could easily be drawn.

**Mr. St. Pierre:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The fisheries minister's announcement dealt only with the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. Our longest coastline is the Arctic.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Joliette.

**Mr. St. Pierre:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe that the Prime Minister is anxious to answer my question, which is: When will the government draw the base lines around the Arctic archipelago, since they are now drawing them on the eastern and western coasts of Canada?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The Prime Minister does not appear to be as anxious as the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

## AIRPORTS

STE. SCHOLASTIQUE—CO-OPERATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS IN CONSTRUCTION

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Being aware of the importance of co-operation between the government of Quebec and that of Ottawa regarding the Montreal international airport, could the minister tell us today if he has officially received from the Quebec government the assurance of such co-operation which, in my opinion, is necessary?

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

## INDUSTRY

ACQUISITION OF SALADA FOODS BY KELLOGG

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the takeover of Salada Foods Limited by the Kellogg Company, which is yet another takeover by a United States concern, will the minister

undertake to make an early statement on motions indicating whether the government has a policy to counteract this trend?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated the other day, that statement would be more appropriate coming from the Minister of Finance, who has ministerial responsibility over these matters.

## THE MINISTRY

### DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. Now that the right hon. gentleman has accepted, as he indicated yesterday in his reply to a question, the new role of the Secretary of State as minister of culture, when will he be making this status legitimate by establishing a department of cultural affairs?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I did not comment on the name yesterday, I indicated the function; and after all, what's in a name?

**Mr. Dinsdale:** A supplementary question. In view of the Prime Minister's emphasis on the limited authority of the federal government under the constitution, when will he be discussing this matter with the provincial governments?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Secretary of State, at an earlier date when asked a similar question, said it was the view of the federal government—and I would re-emphasize it—that it did not consider the whole area of the spirit and of man's mind was under the jurisdiction of any one government in Canada.

## IMMIGRATION

### DESERTERS—REQUEST FOR POLICY ANNOUNCEMENT

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of increasing concern among many Canadians about the treatment of United States deserters and draft resisters by immigration officials, is the minister in a position to assure the house that he will make an announcement about the policy review of this matter before the end of this session?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. This question was asked on a number of occasions during recent days and I suggest that the question was answered when asked.

[Mr. Burton.]

## GRAIN

### REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION TO ASSIST PRAIRIE FARMERS

**Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, but in his absence I am pleased to direct it to the acting minister. In view of the fact that the committee mechanics seem to preclude the bringing in of an early report and related policy recommendations following the recent tour of western Canada by the Standing Committee on Agriculture, will the minister consider making an interim statement of government policy designed to alleviate immediately the critical economic situation facing western farmers today?

**Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, as agriculture is so very sensitive an area I think I had best refer this question to the minister for answer on his day in the house.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

### TORONTO—BOOKLET DETAILING ZONE NUMBERS

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for our ever efficient Minister of Communications. The minister's department has been running full page advertisements in all the Toronto newspapers which read "Bet you forgot to use your new postal zone number!" Why did the minister's department forget to provide Toronto post offices with even a single booklet telling the people of Toronto what the new postal zone numbers are?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The minister will have the floor later today when he can perhaps answer that question.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

### SUCCESSOR TO GENERAL ALLARD

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of the Prime Minister. Would he look into the matter of the retirement of General Allard and clarify the position for the sake of the 98,000 men still in the armed services?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is customary to comment on the retirement of civil servants or military personnel. This is something that will happen in the future; it is not a matter that is before the government now.

## HOUSING

POSSIBILITY OF MEETING WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio who is in charge of housing. On May 6, I believe, he indicated to the house that there was the possibility of a meeting with provincial representatives to discuss housing. Can the minister say which officials he will be meeting, and when these meetings are going to take place?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of having one meeting with the Minister of Trade and Development of the province of Ontario which was both exploratory and instructive. I think the next priority will probably be piloting the bill through second reading, which I hope will take place some time next week. As soon as possible I want to come face to face with the ministers, but in the meantime I have written them all and had return communication from some.

REQUEST FOR GUIDELINES ON URBAN RENEWAL

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for that answer, which shows that we are on the move, but I should like to ask the minister whether he can assure the house that the government will give some indication with regard to its intention to establish guidelines in respect of public housing and urban renewal commitments before the house adjourns for the summer recess?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** I think that would be a reasonable assumption, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the minister to bring forward amendments to Bill C-192, which he hopes to pilot through the house next week?

[*Translation*]

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

RETRAINING OF UNEMPLOYED PERSONS

**Mr. Gaétan-J. Serré (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that unemployment is a matter of great concern these days, would the minister tell us whether he has taken the necessary steps to allow a greater number of unemployed to follow retraining courses this year?

[*English*]

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the funds allocated for the current year have been greatly in excess of the funds for the preceding year. At present we are considering our retraining program with the provinces. Our retraining program will be as great as the resources available within the total programs of the government permit.

**Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the government reconsider its decision with respect to trainees having to be in the labour force for three years prior to being eligible for benefits while training?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, this has been a matter of continuing discussion between the department and provincial ministers. We have not yet been convinced that this would be a desirable move. We want to give the members of the adult labour force the maximum opportunity for training and retraining. Many in our labour force went through the economic periods of the 1930's and 1940's without having had an opportunity for training. We have an obligation to the adult labour force, but we are also attempting to serve the needs of the young people. We are therefore asking for people to be in the labour force for a certain period before training allowances are granted.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS

**Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the numerous strikes throughout the country which may further aggravate the serious summer unemployment situation in regard to students, has the government any immediate, alternative plans which would assure students of summer employment? If so, will the minister be prepared to make an announcement of such plans at an early date?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. We have already spent quite a few minutes on this problem during this question period. When

the minister makes a statement on other matters, perhaps he may wish to make an additional statement on motions covering the matter the hon. member has raised.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member's question referred to the existence of strikes, may I say I am confident that the work of the Minister of Labour will remove any roadblock that exists in that direction.

[*Translation*]

## EXCHEQUER COURT OF CANADA

### PUBLICATION IN FRENCH OF RULES OF PROCEDURE

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

As, for an unknown reason, the publication of the rules of procedure of the Exchequer Court is being delayed, could the minister assure us that this publication will be available shortly?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** To the question I asked a moment ago, the Minister of Justice answered in the affirmative. Then, can he now tell us when those rules of procedure will be published in French?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, the last time I answered that question, I spoke of two to three months, but I will inquire as to the date of publication.

[*English*]

## GRAIN

### WHEAT—GRADES IN POSITION FOR SHIPMENT

**Mr. George Muir (Lisgar):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Can the minister assure the house and country that sufficient quantities of No. 2 Manitoba Northern wheat are in export position to fill our immediate export requirements and that there will be a minimum time lapse between the arrival and departure of ships seeking wheat cargoes at Vancouver and Fort William?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to wonder whether this was my day to be in the house. To answer the question, there is no problem so far as Vancouver is concerned. Three ships are now loading No. 2, and two are waiting. One of those will begin loading today and the second on Saturday. The situation is back to normal in Vancouver, if it ever was abnormal.

**Mr. Muir (Lisgar):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister drew the attention of the house to his presence, I wonder whether he would now indicate whether any wheat is being shipped from the Lakehead? What is the sales position with respect to grain being shipped from the Lakehead?

**Mr. Pepin:** Mr. Speaker, I will try to bring a report to the house. I know the elevators are filled at this time. Shipments upstream have already started or are about to start. I shall try to make a fuller report tomorrow.

**Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. While preparing the report with respect to wheat shipments from the Lakehead, would the minister also prepare a report with respect to planned shipments of wheat out of the port of Churchill for the coming shipping season?

**Mr. Pepin:** Mr. Speaker, I will consider that.

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** May I address a supplementary question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of a certain remark by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, will the Prime Minister inform that minister whether he is supposed to be in the house today?

## AIR CANADA

### STRIKE OF MECHANICS—INQUIRY AS TO PROGRESS IN NEGOTIATIONS

**Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron):** A question to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Because there is great hardship to the travelling public, will the minister say whether he holds out any hope of an early settlement of the Air Canada strike?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that hope springs eternal in the human breast. I think that is answer enough.

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the day.

## WATER RESOURCES

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—ANNOUNCEMENT OF GOVERNMENT LOANS TO FISHERMEN FOR LOSS THROUGH POLLUTION

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I did not succeed in catching Your Honour's eye earlier. Since the matter I have in mind is of great urgency to the people concerned, would Your Honour permit me to ask a question of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have no objection if that is the wish of the house. I should bring to the hon. member's attention that he was not alone in not catching the attention of the Chair earlier during the question period. We try to see as many hon. members as possible, but when the questions are long and the answers are also long some hon. members are left by the wayside as we come to the end of the time allocated. However if there is no objection perhaps the hon. member might ask his question.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Carter:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry elaborate on the statement he released just before lunch to the effect that a form of assistance would be available to the fishermen of St. Marys and Placentia Bay, Newfoundland, whose livelihood has been cut off by the pollution problem in their area? Will the minister advise the house whether it is planned to give the fishermen affected by the serious pollution any form of compensation?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, we have a team of officials in the area determining the extent of the damage and the degree to which fishermen's incomes are being reduced. It is the government's intention to make loans in order to offset the reduction in incomes so that the fishermen will not suffer from the closure of the fishery there. We hope, of course, to be able to recover those funds at a later date from those who caused the pollution in the first place.

**Mr. Carter:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister in his statement made reference to the fact that his department has taken stringent measures to ensure that no fishing is carried out in the waters where the affected fish have appeared. Could the minister assure the house that the plant which is reported to be the cause of the pollution will be forced to remain closed until this problem has been resolved?

**Mr. Davis:** Mr. Speaker, we are constantly in touch with the management of the plant concerned. There may be some test running necessary. I can assure the hon. member that the situation is being kept under very strict review.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

AGREEMENT AS TO DEBATING TIME ON MOTION UNDER BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order which relates to a motion that will be before the house very shortly. It has been agreed by the house leaders that the time allocation for speeches shall be as follows: That the mover of the motion be allotted 30 minutes, that the minister who replies for the government be allotted 30 minutes, that the leading spokesmen for the New Democratic party and the Ralliement Créditiste be allotted 20 minutes each and that all remaining speakers be allotted 10 minutes. That will give a greater opportunity for hon. members to participate. If that is agreeable, perhaps it could be made an order of the house for this debate.

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, this proposal was agreed to. May I ask the minister at this time whether there is to be any change in the business of the house for tomorrow or for next week? Will the business for tomorrow be as announced last night?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, the understanding is that we will begin tomorrow with the official languages bill and that debate on that bill will continue until notice is given to the contrary.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the statement made about the time arrangement for speeches to be made today, may I say that the minister's announcement is a correct statement of the results of our collective bargaining on this issue. However I wish to make it clear that this discrimination with respect to the time allotted to the leaders of the two larger parties and the two parties in this part of the house should not be considered a precedent that will always be followed.

We accept it for today and we agree to it, but with that understanding.

**Mr. Aiken:** Can the house leader indicate what legislation will follow the official languages bill?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that following the official languages bill we will proceed with the housing legislation. Is it understood that my proposal with respect to the time of speeches is now accepted by the house?

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it so agreed and ordered by the house?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—GOVERNMENT MISMANAGEMENT CAUSING DETERIORATION IN POSTAL SERVICE

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough)** moved:

This house regrets that this government's mismanagement of the postal service imposes on the country a steadily deteriorating service at higher cost to the public and contributes to a declining morale among the postal workers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, regarding the time limit for speeches, while the minister may need more than 20 minutes to defend his department's record, no overtime is needed for those who criticize it. One has only to read the press, hear the protests of patrons or read one's mail to know that the postal service, more expensive than ever before, is also less efficient. If there is in this chamber any member who has not had a letter of complaint about poor mail service, I am confident the reason for his unique position is that the letter or letters have not yet been delivered. There is hardly a newspaper which has not deplored and denounced the service offered Canadians by one of the most important utilities in the land.

The gentlest comment I can find is in the Ottawa *Journal* of March 5, 1969, in Richard Jackson's column:

A great deal of mail is not being delivered on time.

Of course, Mr. Jackson was quoting the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) himself. On May 12 the Montreal *Gazette* declared:

There has been a limit to how long Canadians and Canadian businesses could put up with the sort of Post Office service they have been receiving. That limit has been reached. While many have complained, they have been hoping that the dislocation, the delays and the losses of mail were somehow temporary. But bad service has by now settled down into a bad pattern. It has become the expected thing. And this is not tolerable in a modern industrial nation.



It is not just good enough to charge more for mail service than ever before and then to provide the worst service the public has ever known.

The Winnipeg *Free Press*, the Liberal tribune of the prairies, in an editorial headed "Scandalous Service" declared:

Since Mr. Kierans' reforms it is almost impossible to send a letter within Canada's main centres and have it delivered the same day. Where periodicals are concerned it's nothing but disaster

Indeed, Charles Lynch, senior savant of the Southam News Service, calls the Postmaster General "The Minister of Disaster" and, rugged royalist though he be, Lynch brings himself to confess: "I have no faith whatever in what used to be called Her Majesty's mail".

The press offer some solutions. One suggests we write fewer letters and thus hedge our disappointments. Charles King thinks it might be worth paying 10 cents and hopes that with the extra surtax we might get back to the former service. But the most clearcut recipe for improvements is that of the Oshawa *Times:* "Kierans Time is Up. He Should Go." Who am I to quarrel with the Oshawa *Times*? With friends like these the minister scarcely needs an opposition!

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that postal service has sadly deteriorated. The past ten months have seen the sad chronicle of one major strike, partial strikes, near strikes, disruption, lowered morale. Indeed, everything is low but the costs. Instead of five cent mail for six day service, most Canadians get five day service for six cent stamps.

When the minister raised the local rates by 50 per cent to six cents instead of four cents per letter, I wondered about the logic of this action. It seemed strange that one should pay as much to get mail from one end of town to another as from one side of the continent to the other. But I discounted the minister's logic. There was a rational justification. It was simply that it often takes as long to get a letter across town as across Canada, and thus we have equalization of service justifying equalization of cost. I suppose in this process of justification he is doing his bit for the just society.

There is much I can record: the increase in the cost of stamps, mail boxes, keys, money orders and all the rest. A wholesale closing of smaller post offices and a drastic increase in newspaper subscription rates have also taken place. Even the Easter Seals' campaign for crippled children and the War Amputees service have been hurt, perhaps mortally. There are wickets at which you cannot buy stamps on Saturday even though a clerk stands behind the counter; vending machines that take only old quarters; cheques issued to the employees not written up correctly; zone books, as the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) pointed out, not in stock yet although the advertisements are in the newspapers. What a litany one can recite!

One of the most recent is the contribution of the minister's department to the great passport hold-up, or should I say hang-up? For weeks after the new forms and the new $10 charge were imposed, many Canadians were receiving the old forms at post office wickets. These were sent, more slowly and at greater cost, to Ottawa. Delays, new forms back from Ottawa, new $10 money orders to Ottawa again—no wonder there is a little congestion. What the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) planted, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) watered and the Postmaster General helped to flourish. If I wished to be biblical I would say, "What a Trinity".

I do not believe that this is administrative fallout from certain disagreements between the Postmaster General and the Secretary of State for External Affairs on certain external policies. I would not be so cynical as to believe that. Rather I am convinced it was a case of some faithful postal employee conscientiously following the ministerial edict. The Post Office must pay its way, it must go into the black. Would it not be uneconomical to get in new passport forms before all the old ones were used? A bit far-fetched? Perhaps. But possibly I am reading too many of the minister's speeches. By his futuristic word-painting of telephones in the sky, wired cities, waves of the future he seeks to throw stardust in the eyes of those who look at the mail service. I ask simply that his department do the elementary job of getting the mail of the Canadian people to its destination efficiently, speedily and surely.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I am sure that before the day is over we will see the minister's expertise in skywriting. We will hear of the many studies he has under way. But, Mr. Speaker, studied inefficiency is still inefficiency. Task forces, consulting firms and study groups may all have their place, but surely it requires no elaborate sophisticated apparatus of investigation to know that things are bad and are getting worse. To misquote Goldsmith, "The mail accumulates and morale decays."

I say in candour, Mr. Speaker, that personally I have the greatest respect for the minister. He has achieved great things in scholarship, in business, in provincial administration, and he still speaks well. I enjoy his addresses, but whether or not the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) do, I cannot say.

But the time has come for the minister, excellent talker though he is, to act and not to talk. I wish I could express confidence in his willingness to take meaningful action. But I must conclude from what he has said in this house in recent months, in the committee, and on the many and varied platforms from which he has spoken on so many subjects that today we will hear the same tired catalogue of excuses that he has accumulated to counter charges of inefficiency in the Post Office.

The first of these famous excuses is that the major part of the mail continues to go through, that complaints represent a small and insignificant proportion of the mail carried. This excuse is not acceptable. This excuse is becoming paler and paler as complaints pour in from every corner of the country. That 70 per cent or 80 per cent of the mail goes through is small comfort if it is your letter, your key document, your business form that has gone astray or arrived too late to serve a useful function.

Another of the minister's favourites, which I have no doubt he will trot out today, is that only since he became Postmaster General have people started to watch and look at whether their mail arrives in time. It would be strange indeed if people had not counted the time from date of postage to receipt even before he was minister. The regrettable fact is that Canadians everywhere know that the mail service is just not what it was and what it should be, and as a result they are making the Postmaster General the butt of their jokes and the object of their anger.

No doubt the minister will later speak glowingly of the numerous reports he is commissioning. Had I spent a quarter of a million dollars on reports, one of which was a report on which further reports I should buy, I too

would glow with pride. And when the first report came through saying in effect that I should mechanize the Post Office and modernize its physical plants I would glow even more, $250,000 more confident that what I had been told from all sources for ten months was in fact true. Reports are a poor excuse for action.

The minister will no doubt give the excuse that the buildings in Toronto and Montreal are inadequate, and God knows they are. That excuse, however, has become just that—an excuse. In committee over two months ago the minister spoke grandly of taking action to ameliorate the terrible working conditions in these major bottlenecks—improvements to take place some five to seven years from now money permitting. But only the other day the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said that expenditure by government and its creatures would have to be cut back. Where does this lead us, Mr. Speaker? I can only conclude from the minister's statements and that of the Prime Minister that Canadians are to be condemned to inadequate postal service for some years to come. We cannot let the minister use tears over the inadequate conditions in Toronto and Montreal as an excuse for action now to eliminate these bottleneck conditions.

We know too, and I think we can predict that the minister will tell us today, of his study to be brought down next month outlining Toronto's needs. But like all else in his department this report is future futuristic. It jumps over today's needs to talk about the 1890's.

**An hon. Member:** 1990's.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** Yes, 1990's. I must have been thinking of conditions today. What we want to know is which of the many ways of moving today's mail today the Postmaster General intends to use.

Another diversion that he is almost certain to offer us is talk of his crown corporation idea, one which is supposedly being studied but even before the studies are completed is rapidly being adopted by the Postmaster General so that he may claim paternity not only for the studies but for the idea. We all look forward to September when Kates, Peat and Marwick bring down their study on this subject. But we are somewhat sceptical of the minister offering this report as a panacea for today's bad mail service. Will a crown corporation structure heal the distrust between the workers and management of the Post Office? Must we wait for September to start the mechanization schemes suggested by the minister's consultants? It would be wrong for him to offer this report as evidence that the mail service will improve in the immediate future, as it must.

And as a final rationalization for the upset, for the disruption and, indeed, occasional chaos in his department, the minister will no doubt speak to us of diminishing deficits and freeing funds for welfare, for education, and for regional development. On this minister such suggestions are ill-fitting robes indeed. For this is the same minister who will divert many millions of dollars of Canada's resources, both public and private, from the very programs of which he speaks in order to foster the development of the favoured child of his department, Telesat Canada, and refuse the private sector the opportunity to put the satellite into service.

Coming from this minister this excuse is almost grotesque, for while on the one hand as a proponent of Telesat Canada he speaks of the need to extend, at great cost, television to that remaining 5 per cent of Canadians without it, on the other hand he withdraws in the name of economy from every Canadian the element of promptness and dependability in mail service which was so central to our national life. The minister, to say the least, has a strange sense of economy and a stranger sense of priorities. His evaluation of the written word as against the electronic message shows a wide disparity.

For communities of 400 or 500 he is prepared to engage in the expenditure of perhaps a quarter of a million dollars to bring them television, but in communities of the same size he will close down post offices that lose a few hundred dollars a year and he will offer a rural route service so that Canadians may buy their postage stamps and expensive money orders in subzero weather by flagging down the mail courier. I am not against the north and I love television too, in colour or in black and white, but let us have some sense of justice, some sense of propriety here. Let us not take a certain group of people and cut them off from standard communications in the name of economy and then with a lavish, generous hand splash out to others all sorts of conveniences at great cost. Let the Minister of Communications on the right know what the Postmaster General on the left is doing.

In some ways, Mr. Speaker, I need not have recited the litany of faulty service now being offered by the minister, nor need I have enumerated the problems, or should I say the running sores, in his department. The Postmaster General perhaps knows more about

his department than any of his predecessors ever did. Much of his knowledge, I can say in all honesty, is the result of efforts on the part of members of this party who have expended considerable effort in the last months to bring him to a state of education and increased awareness of the problems of his office. In addition to the education which we have generously and kindly given him, he has the advantage of the experience of his officials and the departmental information to which only he is privy.

• (3:40 p.m.)

We have confirmation that the minister is aware of the problems in the Post Office as one fruitful source of criticism of the department's procedures and performance has been the minister himself. I shall quote the *Financial Post* of the other day:

> But I admit the attitude in the Post Office isn't good. It isn't as good as it was two years ago. Management and labour just aren't working together and the service is suffering.

In that respect he was reciprocating by giving us a good quote, and that I appreciate. But the time for stating problems, as the minister occasionally does, is over. The time for action is here. Every member in this house can criticize the Post Office. We have listened to the pleas of our constituents, the patrons of the Post Office. The minister knows the problems. We all know the problems, but he alone among us is able to do something to remedy a situation which is deplorable and is growing worse.

This is the challenge that faces him. It is not so long ago that the minister in a kindly reference likened me to Cassandra. He said he liked to hear my Cassandra-like utterances. I will accept that as a description more accurate perhaps than many of his forecasts. Cassandra did go about prognosticating woe. She did; she preached that things were not as they should be, and like myself she was not believed either. But she was right. I and others told the minister that publications in this country in the non-profit sector which perform a most valuable service in communicating essential information to the Canadian people could not stand the rates which he imposed upon them. The publishers said that. But he said, of course, that they did not know and that they were selling him a bill of goods. Well, they are not selling him such a bill of goods now because many of them already are out of business. Cassandra is not always wrong.

We also advised him from time that the people in his department did not care for the regulations imposed as a result of the five-day delivery week. He said that despite what they said they were happy and the disproof did not come to him apparently until there were strikes, walk-outs and all the rest of it. Now we have adjudication and in fact at this very moment the matter is sub judice. We also said that the conglomeration of five-day delivery in one part of the country and six-day delivery in the rest would not work. Let us just look at our own mail to see how the service is working today.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** What mail?

**Mr. Macquarrie:** "What mail", the hon. member in front of me says. So I would say to the minister that I do not mind being called Cassandra and I do not mind making doleful prophecies when he gives me little material upon which to make joyous ones. I say to him further that while it is all right to call me Cassandra he is in a situation that poor King Priam never had. Priam did not know enough to listen when he was being warned and receiving information. King Priam in his self-confidence went on until his city crumbled in destruction. The voice of Cassandra was not heeded.

I say to the minister how many more times do we, representing the troubled patrons of the Post Office, have to tell him that things are in bad shape? How much more time does he want to get things straightened out? How much longer does he need to snow us with a forest of mimeographed reports? How much longer will he go on assuring us that all is well in the land when everybody agrees with him except everybody who uses the Post Office? While it is fun, of course, to dabble in the sky, to be Buck Rogers on Monday and, a Star Trek hero on Tuesday and ride the waves of the future, there is still such a thing as mail. There are still people who like to communicate one with another and there are still some humble Canadians who think that their government is doing something for them at considerable cost—we recognize that—in taking their communications from them to the person or persons to whom they are addressed.

In all humility I suggest to the minister that he might address himself to this elementary problem and that the way to the future might begin with a little communication in the present. I would hope that this new and costly postal service which he has imposed

upon a reluctant public might begin to perform at least at the level at which the department performed before he took over. While that would not stop me from my role as Cassandra, it might diminish the frequency of my protestations. This is something he might enjoy. If it helps the Canadian people and the long suffering patrons of the Post Office I would welcome it too, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to lead off in this debate for the New Democratic party I would first like to express my own and I am sure the compliments of my colleagues to the hon. gentleman who just spoke on behalf of the official opposition. He began a debate which I submit by the time the day is over will have provided an opportunity to a large number of hon. members to illustrate and point out complaints, ideas and arguments to the minister and the government concerning improvements which need to be made in the Post Office Department.

When I end my remarks I intend to move an amendment to the motion to insert words to the effect that postal rate policies seriously threaten the continued existence of church, farm, labour and other non-profit Canadian publications. Those of us speaking on behalf of our party in this debate will have a number of principles and certain criticisms as well as this amendment to offer concerning the operation of the Post Office Department. We direct these not only at the Minister of Communications, although he must bear most of the responsibility for the present situation, I submit, because of his attitude, his entrenchment and his insensitivity, but also at the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the cabinet and all government members because they are equally guilty and must answer to the Canadian public. The minister could not possibly have decided on the actions his department has taken without the blessing and full support of the Prime Minister, his cabinet colleagues and the Liberal backbenchers.

I submit that the actions of the Post Office Department in recent months are but another in a long series of actions and inaction over many decades which have been perpetrated by successive federal Liberal governments and have betrayed our nationhood, our dependence and our sovereignty. The actions of the Post Office Department with regard to service and rates have served to attack the wrong people and the wrong organizations. They have served to attack the increasing needs of Canadians to communicate with one another. They send to stifle and even prohibit the ability of non-profit organizations and associations to maintain publications that provide a vehicle for their own members to talk to one another or communicate with their fellow citizens generally.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

• (3:50 p.m.)

In the past my leader, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), in reference to other matters affecting Canada's independence and relations with the United States, likened the attitude and action of the Canadian government to supine acquiescence. He was right then and he is still right, but in my opinion he was too kind. I would call it a knowing betrayal and unconscionable lack of concern for the preservation of Canadian sovereignty, unity and viability as an independent nation. This Liberal government, like former Liberal governments, has long since either given up on the possibility of Canada surviving as an independent nation or it welcomes its absorption and takeover by a powerful and massive although friendly neighbour.

The operations of the Post Office Department in regard to the imbalance with the United States in mail handlings and the outrageous subsidy for two massive United States publications are another symptom of this betrayal of our people to foreign domination. It is too much that our resources and our businesses are steadily being taken over—two more in the past week—but surely it is unbearable that we have to go to the extreme of aiding foreign enterprise to take over our minds and communications.

Let me illustrate how the minister might do something more than he has in respect of his concern about Post Office deficits. He and the government are worried about deficits, yet they allow deficits to continue which are in no way contributing to our country and its people. In his own financial statement and details of rate adjustments which he issued a few months ago the minister illustrated that the imbalance in respect of Canadian and United States second class traffic was as follows: United States mailings to Canada amount to almost 70 million per year. This is based on 1967-68 statistics. Canadian mailings to the United States amount to 17 million. The deficit in the number of articles handled is about 52 million and represents a cost deficit of about $3,500,000 per year. If the handling deficit remains steady compared with 1967-68, that is the loss. The minister seems

to be strangely lacking in concern about this deficit. The deficit, in spite of the minister's rate increases, also means a gift of $1,522,000 each year to *Time* and *Reader's Digest* which are what I call ethnic American publications.

In the minister's own documents his rate adjustments propose to increase the coverage of cost on second class mail involving Canadian daily newspapers from 30 per cent to 80 per cent. I do not object to that because these people are in the business of publishing newspapers to make money, and the great majority of their revenue comes from advertising. As closely as possible they should pay the cost of handling their newspapers, although there is perhaps some argument in favour of a slight subsidy.

If the minister accomplishes his aim in this regard there will still be a slight subsidy of about 20 per cent. If this is valid for Canadian daily newspapers I should like the minister and the government to explain to us and the Canadian people why *Time* and *Reader's Digest* will have to pay only one-third of the cost after the minister's new rate adjustments. I submit that the minister can pick up over $5 million, certainly not less than that, each year if he does two things: first, discuss with the United States authorities and then implement rates that require the payment of all costs of handling the imbalance of mail service between our two countries and, second, immediate implementation, and this requires no discussion, of rates for *Time* and *Reader's Digest* which cover the entire cost of handling.

The minister, the government and their apologists must quit using as a basis for subsidy to these two publications the outrageous myth that somehow because they are printed in Canada and contain three or four pages of Canadian news, which is either irrelevant or slanted or both, this makes them Canadian publications. This kind of criteria is nonsense. It is outrageous and is enough to give a coyote the heartburn. These two publications have no right to a subsidy in Canada. All they have is the privilege to make use of our postal services provided they pay the full cost of those services. They are in fact foreign publications put out for profit, and profit alone.

If the minister will illustrate by action his concern for deficits in these two areas, amounting to not less than $5 million per year, he will do something to convince many of us and many Canadians that he is serious. Instead, he attacks the wrong people and the wrong organizations. Instead, he seeks to pick up deficits from those from whom it might be easier to pick them up. He reminds me of the bully in the schoolyard who picks on the Boy Scout, the Girl Guide and the war amputee. He reminds me not only of a bully but of someone who is trying to solve the problems in respect of Post Office deficits by attempting to be half pregnant. This means he will be a born loser.

The minister is attempting to use so-called private enterprise efficiency methods in respect of an instrument that is basically a social enterprise designed to render service. He is a born loser. This is the way the minister has directed his concern. He is attacking non-profit Canadian publications while giving those great candidates for social aid, *Time* and *Reader's Digest* benefits amounting to $1,500,000 per year. He is attacking Canadian non-profit publications and forcing them either to cease or substantially reduce the number of their issues.

Let me illustrate this fact. I can think of a publication that can really do something about Post Office deficits, if one were really to believe the department. I have in mind the Toronto Metropolitan Police Association's publication, *News and Views*. There is not a word of advertising in it, although if you want to buy a baby crib or a second-hand car from a fellow member of the force you can read about it. It contains news of the internal doings of the police association. It is all mimeographed, but the department suggests that here is an area where deficits can be reduced. Rather than $500 a year, the minister wants $2,500 a year.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The minister can attack the *Labour Statesman*, a now discontinued publication of the British Columbia Federation of Labour. This was a non-profit publication by a Canadian organization. He can attack *Le Travail*, put out by the C.N.T.U., which has ceased to be published. By the way, the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) had a great deal to do with this publication and was an important contributor to it. I hope the Secretary of State is expressing his concern to the minister.

The United Church *Observer* is another Canadian, non-profit publication. The costs of this publication have increased five times, from $30,000 a year to $145,000 a year. The minister tells us that he has doubled the charges in respect of *Time* and *Reader's Digest*. However, they are still receiving $1,500,000 a year by way of subsidy. The minis-

ter should have tripled the charges on *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, but no, he needs to attack a publication such as the United Church *Observer* to help bring about his reductions.

Canadian *Transport*, normally published twice a month, will now be issued only once in the three months of July, August and September. This is a Canadian, non-profit publication. To add insult to injury, *Postmark*, the publication of employees of his own Post Office Department, has ceased publication. The minister is trying to apply an attitude of efficiency and organization which one usually associates with profit-making organizations. No one objects to efficiency, but the efforts of the minister and the government to apply an attitude of efficiency and money-making in respect of the Post Office, or any other public service essential to the national interest, such as applies to the Montreal Stock Exchange or the "Lovey-Dovey Finance Company" is to deny a fundamental principle that a social enterprise must have as its first priority and its first purpose the provision of service rather than making a profit.

Since when must the Post Office make money? Surely the provision of effective, efficient receipt, handling, dispatch and delivery of communications between Canadians is of such paramount importance that the incurring of deficits for that service is no crime. In fact, the paying of such deficits from the national treasury is surely a proper way for some of the costs of the service to be borne by Canadian citizens and corporations in a manner that has some relationship to ability to pay. In other words, postal deficits can mean that low income people and non-profit organizations will not be carrying a disproportionate share of the costs of a service that is essential to our national well-being and the survival of our culture and independence.

The Post Office is a social as well as a public enterprise. It needs a socialist to run it. The application of free enterprise attitudes and methods to its operations have not allowed, are not now and will not allow in the future, for its efficient and effective operation. We have been experiencing attempts by the government at efficiency for the sake of the internal operations of the department, efficiency for the sake of dollars, in the typical private enterprise way. This has resulted in drastically reduced efficiency in service to the public. It has further resulted in unreasonable and unwarranted hardship being imposed upon publications of non-profit, Canadian organizations and groups.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall move the amendment which I mentioned earlier. In doing so I would invite members on the back benches on the Liberal side to take this opportunity to get the message through to the minister and the government. I know I cannot ask them to vote against the government and defeat it. However, I ask them to take this opportunity to have at least half a dozen of them vote for the motion and arrange for enough other Liberal members to be absent this evening so that the government will survive by only the skin of its teeth. It may well be that in this event the minister and the government will get the message. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom):

That the motion be amended by inserting therein, immediately after the words "mismanagement of the postal service", the following words:

"including a postal rates policy which seriously threatens the continued existence of church, farmer, labour, co-operative and other non-profit Canadian publications".

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), who has just moved an amendment to the main amendment, said in concluding his remarks that the Communications Department is run as a private enterprise, which explains why its operation is a complete failure.

I must say that if private enterprise was run in the same way as the Communications Department in Ottawa, our trades people and businessmen would have gone bankrupt long ago, because the policy followed in most cases is the same as in other countries where the minister is no longer responsible.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage, I must say that Canada has seldom seen a cabinet minister achieve national unity from sea to sea as totally and as fully as this one.

• (4:10 p.m.)

From East to West, in the central provinces, everywhere, everybody is equally annoyed with the Post Office Department. Mr. Speaker, it is that kind of Canadian unity which we find today, to the same extent, in every field.

The no-confidence motion presented by the official opposition to the effect that the cost and the quality of the postal service are not adequate, is justified.

I somewhat doubt that the motion will even be passed by all the members. I even fear

that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) mistrusts the motion and will tonight vote as usual with the Liberals, against the motion presented by a member of his party. It has happened before in the house, Mr. Speaker.

All that to say that, last fall, when the minister introduced Bill C-116 in the house, as reported in *Hansard* of October 21, we said to him then that he should increase the rates and decrease the services and this is exactly what is happening now. The minister at the time, as a justification for the increases, pointed out that a $100-million deficit had to be made up. If a $100-million deficit is cancelled, it will result eventually in a much higher deficit always at the expense of the small wage earner, the ordinary people and the workers.

The rates for the delivery of publications have been reduced from ten to three and apply to the following classes: dailies, weeklies and other periodicals. Dailies now have to pay 5c. a pound for reading matter and 15c. a pound for advertising matter. As to the weeklies, they will pay 5c. a pound if the circulation is below 10,000 copies. The other periodicals will pays 5c. a pound with a minimum of 2c. per copy.

The policy of the government or the minister, has led to a steep increase in the cost of subscriptions for those who must buy those publications.

For instance, *Le Devoir*, a Montreal daily, has increased its subscription rates by 275 per cent. Other newspapers did the same. Several publications were reclassified and new postal rates applied to them which are three, four or five times higher than they were before.

As my colleague from Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) said on October 21, 1968, as reported in *Hansard*, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker . . . the minister also received—

. . . the brief of the Corporation of Quebec Dailies Inc.

Sherbrooke's *Tribune* which has 6,978 subscribers and whose subscription rate is $4.60 at present, would be $13.70 at the new rates.

As far as *Montréal-Matin* is concerned, the cost would jump from $6 to $9.

In the case of *Le Soleil*, the subscription rate would be increased from $7.30 to $24.75.

As a result, I believe a subscription to *Le Soleil* now costs $40 a year.

Mr. Speaker, those are the results of the legislation introduced by the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) in October 1968.



We are facing, since then, an increase in subscription rates. Associations' newspapers whose subscription rate is included in the membership fee are now third class instead of second class mail.

We can give examples: the newspaper *Regards*, which is the organ of the Ralliement créditiste, has become third class mail.

*La Terre de Chez-nous*, the newspaper of the farmers of Quebec, passed from second to third class mail, as well as *Le Travail*, which is the newspaper of the CNTU, and some other magazines of movements or associations.

Mr. Speaker, we think that this hinders information, while newspapers and publications with Communist leanings circulate freely.

Recently we read the following in the *Owen Sound Sun-Time* of May 7th, and I quote:

[*English*]

Photographically reproduced below is the masthead from the Quebec Communist journal *Combat* of March 28, 1969. Note in the third line that it has been granted second class privileges by the P.O. Department, registration number 1491. This number is allocated after second class privileges are granted. *Combat* had its number (1491) displayed six full weeks ago in its March 28 issue. Yet the Post Office Department is now "providing information" that the decision respecting this red organ is pending. Perhaps another question or two would be in order.

This was addressed to Mr. McIntosh of the Post Office Department.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this is the exact picture published in *Combat*, a newspaper published semi-monthly at 5327 Park Avenue, Montreal. It is second class mail, registration No. 1491.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is discrimination against news publications.

The Postmaster General is therefore going directly for the population as a whole. It has become almost impossible to publish newspapers, such as the magazine *Montréal*, for instance, which has completely disappeared. In that connection, one could read in the May 9 issue of l'*Action*, four or five days ago:

The prestige magazine *Montréal* which, for the past five years, was published every month, and later on, every six or eight weeks by the City of Montreal, will not longer reach its 517,000 select readers scattered in 148 countries all over the world.

The mailing of that glossy magazine used to cost $6,000 per month. That—

—to all countries in the world, or almost.

Those charges would have gone up to $28,000 last November and to $55,000 since April 1st—

—1969, a month and ten days ago—

—but the magazine has not been published since the major rate increase.

The Postmaster General is aware of that. People are not informed, not only in Canada, but in other countries also, of what is going on in Canada's metropolis, due to the establishment of prohibitive postal rates, that prevent some magazines from being published while others still benefit from the old post office legislation.

For instance, one can read in the *Vancouver Sun* "Reds and Hippies Get Special Rates".

[*English*]

Also: the Canada Viet Nam newsletter, organ of the communist Viet Cong in Canada. A further investigation revealed that the following revolutionary publications have been accorded subsidized second class rates.

[*Translation*]

The newspapers which try to inform the people honestly cannot take advantage of the same privileges.

I quoted a while ago the newspaper *Combat* and I shall now list some others:

[*English*]

*The Progressive Worker.* Subsidized by Peking through Anna Louise Strong, this publication features an assortment of revolutionary material and is pushed by such Peking line outlets as Progressive Books and Periodicals, 1867 Amherst Street, Montreal.

*The American Exile in Canada.* Organ of the American deserters and draft dodgers. The March 30 issue carried the second class mail authorization. This poorly produced mimeographed publication promotes the distribution of the notorious Manual for Draft Age Immigrants to Canada.

*Logos.* A Montreal "underground" publication which supports F.L.Q. terrorists and various revolutionary activities. Its current issue, (April) carries the second class notation.

*La Lutte Ouvrière.* Organ of the Trotskyites in Montreal, known in Quebec as the "Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière".

*The Workers Vanguard.* Organ of the revolutionary communist Trotskyites outside Quebec.

All these are given second class mail privileges while publications meant to work for the benefit of our people are not allowed these second class facilities.

[Mr. Caouette.]

• (4:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, that is why we made representations to the minister on many occasions, regarding the privileges granted to publications bent on destroying Canada, when those same privileges are refused to magazines or newspapers trying to keep Canada together.

Turning now to another matter, I say that the bill introduced last October has imposed extremely difficult conditions upon mail carriers. The five-day week increases the load of these men, who must do the work of six days in five. This slows down mail delivery.

Recently, I gave a few examples to the minister, and I want to give him a few more:

A letter addressed to Miss Atholl Maining, 6960, Sherbrooke St. West, Montreal, mailed in Washington on May 1, was delivered in Montreal on May 10. It required ten days, to get from Washington to Montreal. It takes as long as in the horse and buggy days. We have reached that point.

Here is another instance: a copy of *The Reader's Digest,* sent to the same young lady, was mailed in April, and was delivered in Montreal on May 7, 1969.

Another letter, addressed to the same young lady, by the Vermont Educational Television Society, and endorsed Dated matter, please, do not delay, was mailed in Burlington, Vermont on April 25, and delivered in Montreal, on May 7. A very efficient postal service indeed. The letter was endorsed First Class Mail.

I was in western Canada recently, and letters were sent to various people in British Columbia, in Alberta and in Saskatchewan. Those letters had left Ottawa 10 or 12 days previously but had not been delivered yet in those provinces. This is the kind of postal service we have now.

I realize that the minister has difficulties with certain union leaders. I know that he is sometimes reluctant to take sides because he is afraid of losing votes by coming down hard upon them. However, the minister knows that the postal employees are not interested in starting strikes or creating difficulties, in spite of what some union leaders may say, for instance a certain Mr. Houle who stated on television in Montreal: I am going to close the central post office, I am going to close the post office in the north end, and the one in the south.

Mr. Speaker, there are laws to stop fellows like that from speaking like that and stirring up the workers in Canada. It is precisely because such people are tolerated, feared, that lamentable results such as those which are now seen in the Post Office Department come about.

Mr. Speaker, every hon. member insists that our postal employees are well treated. However, it is another thing to be threatened by people who never accomplished anything in Canada and are ready to stir up people on one against another. The Postmaster General should have been firmer on some occasions.

For example, the minister knows very well that the five-day week service does not serve the people well. He knows very well that the closing down of post offices is not right for the people. Nevertheless, small post offices are closed down, employees are laid off, and the five-day week is imposed, while the mail accumulates in post offices during two days, and delivery is delayed.

The present postal service in Canada is a disgrace, as I said earlier. The system is not satisfactory. We are in a mess because the minister was afraid.

When the minister will decide to stand up, to make the facts known to the people concerned, I am convinced that postal rates might be cut, because it is imperative.

Moreover, second class privileges should be granted to Canadian publications; since the population should be informed instead of being punished.

Also, a fuller, better and speedier service should be provided, because we keep getting complaints from everywhere.

I referred to one complaint, but I received a number of them when I visited western Canada. The same thing happens in the East.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the minister has achieved—as I said at the beginning of my remarks—perfect national unity. He has antagonized everybody across the country with his new legislation. Since everyone has the same complaint, I would ask him, for the sake of national unity, to reconsider his position and to improve the Post Office Act so that all Canadians will be better disposed towards the government and especially towards the Postmaster General.

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I must first make a rectification.

The following newspapers mentioned by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) were not granted special privileges: *Logos, Canada-Vietnam News Letter, The Workers Vanguard, The American in Exile in Canada, The Communist Viewpoint* and *The Progressive Worker.*

[*English*]

I have listened to the speeches of hon. members opposite and I should like to say right away that although some of their criticisms and complaints are justified—and specific complaints are what we are looking for in order to enable us to do a better job—in order to investigate them we should like to have the actual envelopes in our hands so that we can trace where the delays are. So many of these delayed letters come from other countries. There are parcels from the United Kingdom that had to come through New York where there was a three-month dock strike.

**Mr. Thompson:** No, we have examples right here.

**Mr. Kierans:** Then give them to us and we will investigate them. This is the best chance we can have to find out what are the weak points in the Post Office administration. I think we have had enough of these wild generalizations.

All that has been said so far in this debate and anything that remains to be said was said far better just under one year ago, and I want to quote a certain comment:

> —Post Office faces a crisis. Each year it slips further behind the rest of the economy in service, in efficiency and in meeting its responsibilities as an employer. Each year it operates at a huge financial loss. No one realizes the magnitude of this crisis more than the postal managers and employees who daily bear the staggering burden of moving the nation's mail. The remedy lies beyond their control.

I deliberately omitted three words from that quotation, Mr. Speaker. In the original quotation the first sentence commenced:

> The United States Post Office faces a crisis.

That quotation is taken from the report of the Presidential task force on the United States Post Office.

**Mr. Thompson:** Why do we have to learn from the United States?

**Mr. Kierans:** Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) with one word. Although our Post Office can stand comparison and come out on top by almost any measure, the quotation itself could apply almost unchanged to

the Canadian Post Office. The most important aspects of that quotation are, I suggest, first, the existence of a crisis in postal services everywhere in the western world; second, the fact that post office managers and employees are fully aware of it and, third, that the remedy lies beyond their control. The remedy lies instead with the government, and it lies with this parliament.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Post Office employees are intensely loyal to their institution and take great pride in it. I have listened to these whispered rumours about sabotage, but I put those rumours and insinuations against the fact that one of the unions is itself spending more than $65,000 a year of its own members' funds to educate the employees to do a better job. So they are loyal. This refrain time and again comes through all the comments of those consultants who are examining every aspect of the Post Office. A tremendous reservoir of talent and good will exists within the Post Office, and the government through parliament will have to provide those who work for the Post Office, whether as managers or employees, with the tools to do the job they want to do and have to do.

This crisis has been building up for years. It did not happen this year; it happened 10 to 15 years ago when decisions that should have been taken were not taken. Time and again the Post Office has been starved of resources and responsibilities. Today some hon. members seem to feel they have a licence to make any criticism they want of the Post Office. Specific criticisms I welcome, because they are extremely helpful to us. But the kind of criticism that is not helpful and not specific is damaging and, I suggest, downright unfair. That kind of criticism was raised by an hon. member in this house last Tuesday night when, taking advantage of the protection afforded to him by virtue of his being a member of parliament, he pilloried a postmaster who lives and works 3,000 miles away in Prince Rupert. That postmaster was not present to defend himself and, in any case, would be incapable of defending himself against the kind of attack the hon. member chose to make. I quote his exact words, as reported at page 8673 of *Hansard*. He said in part:

> Unprovable allegations of racial discrimination have been whispered about—

Just imagine that; he talked of unprovable allegations. Well, they were not being whispered about when he got through shouting them in this house. In his own words, the

[Mr. Kierans.]

allegations were unprovable. I therefore suggest he owes the postmaster concerned a public apology.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Kierans:** This was character assassination at its worst. Then he went on to talk about this unprovable allegation of racial discrimination. He applied it to the quality of management in the entire Post Office and later had the gall to ask me if I or my officers approved of tapping telephones throughout the Post Office. This kind of criticism hurts. It attempts to capitalize on a situation where the Post Office is at the moment vulnerable because we are experiencing some difficulties with delivery, particularly in the key Montreal-Ottawa-Toronto triangle. I think it is high time some hon. members of the opposition removed the beam from their own eyes.

The hon. member for Hillsborough was indignant, but there were some curious omissions from his speech and I will fill him in.

The rate increases we have brought down—yes, they are considerable. The reason, as I previously explained, is that they had been left unchanged for 17 years for first class mail and since the middle 1930's for other classes. During six of those years the government of which the hon. member for Hillsborough was a member preferred to hide from the public the fact that it was subsidizing the publishing industry. It never informed the public of the amount of that subsidy, made no attempt to bring that subsidy under control and made no attempt to distribute it on a more equitable basis.

Post Office employees are today experiencing some difficulties in reacting to change, and it does not require much wisdom to uncover the reason. We should have started bringing about improvements years ago if we wanted a complete management team today. We failed in our responsibility to provide Post Office employees at all levels with training to equip them with the skills to take advantage of the opportunities we are opening up. We failed to train them to manage and administer the Post Office effectively. Mr. Speaker, after five do-nothing Conservative years, guess how much was allocated for training within the Post Office budget? There are 41,000 employees in the Post Office, and what do you think was the total amount set aside for training? It was $15,000. That is where we failed. That is why we have problems today.

**An hon. Member:** But you had better service.

**Mr. Kierans:** That worked out at 35 cents per man. What did that buy the men? A hot dog or a cup of coffee? Is that how you trained them? You spent 35 cents per man for training in the Post Office.

**An hon. Member:** Peanuts.

**Mr. Kierans:** Our budget for training this year is $592,000, and there will be more money as we divert funds to make up for lost time. Next year we are budgeting for more than $1 million.

After training the next evident need of the Post Office was for mechanization. In 1962-63, when we were finally coming to the end of those years of Conservative irresponsibility, what was the amount of money spent by the Conservative government through the Department of Public Works for mechanization of the Post Office? Remember, Mr. Speaker, there were over 8,000 buildings right across Canada; there were problems, as Judge Montpetit pointed out, with lighting, heating, air conditioning and there was a need for mechanization. And what was the Conservative government's budget that year? It was $133,000 for mechanization. Imagine that! With over four billion pieces of mail going through, with more than 41,000 employees, with more than 8,000 post offices across the country, that government spent $15,000 on training and $133,000 on plant and equipment. There were problems, Mr. Speaker and they were easy to see and forecast with the ever growing avalanche of mail when the only policy that government had was to add more bodies, more people belonging to the political party supporting it, to already overcrowded buildings.

The root problem of the Post Office is that of personnel relations.

**An hon. Member:** Poor management.

**Mr. Kierans:** After six years of being governed by the government of which the hon. member for Hillsborough was a member, the state of the Post Office was such that Mr. Justice Montpetit was directed to undertake an inquiry, and he brought down 282 recommendations in order to assure employees of the Post Office of minimum, tolerable working conditions. As I said, that report was finally commissioned in 1965 after the years of neglect had built up. We could see such pitiful things as lack of toilet facilities, wash-up space, recreational facilities, restrooms, and air conditioning.

May I read what Mr. Justice Montpetit wrote after having visited some post offices last fall. He said:

> I would not be doing my duty if I did not first of all mention the numerous and excellent efforts made by the Post Office Department to correct or improve the "environmental or physical working conditions" of postal workers and letter carriers.
>
> Naturally, all is not perfect, and the department itself acknowledges that fact. But, in my opinion, the department has made remarkable progress since October 1966 and continues, as the days and months go by, pursuing a well-conceived and well-planned policy.

We cannot make up for 20 years of neglect since the second world war in several months. That is the record of the party opposite—neglect, irresponsibility, and a refusal to face up to even the most obvious and urgent problems. If we are facing difficulties today, the wonder is they are not worse.

For years the Post Office has been forced to carry a sackload of other people's problems. Everybody wants their mail delivered on time and at the right price. They have a right to it, but they also have a duty to recognize the difficulties under which the Post Office is operating. I have said before that in past years Post Office employees by their wages reduced the deficit to the general public. To cure that situation cost two national strikes and a legacy of union-management suspicion which is not yet cured.

• (4:40 p.m.)

If the people in Toronto complain about mail deliveries, they should also complain about the situation in which the Post Office itself first attempted in 1948 to build a new Post Office there. Today, 21 years later, we are still where we were at that time, the planning stage, but this time we really intend to do something about it. During that 21 years more bodies were put into that building, without air conditioning and heat, and the building was already overcrowded.

When people in Montreal complain about mail delays, as they have a right to, they should remember the steps we have taken: introduction of colour-coding, introduction of containers, new transportation schedules so that today 75,000 more Montreal mail items achieve next day delivery than a year ago. When the opposition complains about rate increases they should add, if they want to present an honest picture to the public, that the cost to the taxpaying public has gone

down. That cost is direct, in stamps, and indirect in the annual deficit, which this year was forecast at $130 million.

An hon. member of the New Democratic party recommended in committee hearings that all mail services should be free. I think we are more sensitive than the members of the New Democratic party. If all mail were delivered free of charge, the cost of transporting it would be $1 billion a year. The hon. member does not realize what the Post Office business is all about. The Post Office is no longer personal mail but business mail. Almost 80 per cent of first, second, third and fourth class mail is business mail. The New Democratic party recommends a $1 billion subsidy to the business community of this country. Where do they intend to get this money? Health and social welfare, regional disparity, medicare, old age pensions? They should balance their figures before talking. When the opposition opposes change in the Post Office, when members opposite criticize every attempt to change the Post Office to make it an institution that is less of a burden upon the Canadian public, an institution equipped to provide better service to the public, an institution that above all is able to provide its own employees with a more fruitful career, then members opposite had better reckon the consequences of refusing to change.

The originally forecast deficit for this year was $130 million. If we do not make any changes, in 1975 the Post Office will have a deficit of $500 million. In the United States this year the deficit went up to $500 million. Do members opposite want a deficit in 1975 of $500 million or do they want the people who use these services to pay for them? I can think of an infinite number of better ways to spend $500 million than to cover a Post Office deficit, as suggested by hon. members opposite, a postal deficit which really only subsidizes the business community.

There is a second and more crucial reason for change and a consequence if we refuse to change. The Post Office above all is a human institution. It has 48,000 employees which makes it the fifth largest business in the country. The Post Office runs on people power. Each letter is delivered individually to each home. Each letter dispatched from one city to another may go through as many as 60 separate manual handlings.

These people have been shortchanged by their governments and parliaments. You can find the evidence for that accusation either in the $15,000 spent on retraining 40,000 employees six years ago, or in the fact that at the head office of an organization which does close to $500 million worth of business a year there are fewer than 20 individuals earning more than $13,500 a year. That is what parliaments and governments have done to the Post Office since world war II. The effects upon them of this neglect, this year by year irresponsibility, were expressed by the United States Presidential task force in the following words:

> Regardless of any of the productivity improvement possibilities within the Port Office system, desirable as they may be, probably the most serious criticism is the failure of the Post Office to offer the individual employee the kind of opportunities for personal improvement and involvement that characterize almost every other phase of American life.

The Presidential task force continued with these sad words:

> The salaries it pays are, in most places, competitive with those paid by private companies, yet there is widespread disquiet among postal employees. Time and again senior employees told us they would not recommend postal employment to someone beginning his working career. Many newer employees said they were staying only until a better opportunity arose.

Change is difficult, Mr. Speaker, for an individual or an institution. Those difficulties, and I fully recognize they are real, are more than worth while if the end result is a Post Office in which senior employees gladly recommend to their sons that they join the service and in which new employees stay on because the career opportunities are too good to be missed. That is the past. No matter who was at fault or what the faults were, it is over. The Post Office is now looking to the future and its responsibilities to the public and its employees.

I have twice quoted from the Presidential task force report which was completed in June of last year. President Nixon has informed Congress he will be presenting a bill to take action on it. These conditions are world-wide and, serious as they are in Canada, they are not as serious as elsewhere, but that is no cause for complacency or congratulations. We are at this moment behind both Great Britain and the United States, not in the quality of our service or in the level of our standards but in refashioning the Post Office to face the future, and indeed to face today.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Hon. members know about the task forces that are examining every facet of our operations. They may recommend refashioning the Post Office as a crown corporation. This is the route that is being chosen both in the United States and in Great Britain, but of itself it is no panacea. However, by both of these countries it is being seen as an essential first step.

I will list the studies presently being undertaken. They are an organizational study, an environmental study which has already been published, management practices, management inventory, management information systems, blueprint for implementation, marketing, personnel administration—one of the most serious problems we have—a transportation study, mail forecasting, productivity, facility design and equipment utilization, mail sorting, distribution and pre-sorting. All of these are extensive studies and, as hon. members know, we even created a study group outside of them to study stamp design. Its report was critical, but we were glad to release it. We are not interested in being flattered. We are interested in knowing what our weaknesses are. We also have a special study taking place on the information branch, with emphasis being given to ways in which we can improve internal communication within an organization that is so vast and so diverse.

I hope to publish as many of these reports as possible. We are looking for criticism, but I cannot forecast in advance the content of these reports. However, it may turn out that, a substantial majority contain confidential information drawn from private sources or affecting internal management and financial affairs. In that event we will go to the idea of a white paper, but in no event will the decision be taken not to publish a report on the ground that it is critical—confidential, yes, critical, no.

That is the present picture. We are examining every phase of our activities. There is no single criticism made in this house this afternoon or earlier, or outside of it, that we have not ourselves identified long ago. In fact some have been identified that no one has spoken about.

Some criticisms of the Post Office, however, are unfair. If one believed some editorials it would seem that the Post Office alone stood between the Canadian publishing industry and bankruptcy. I suggest to hon. members that they compare the editorials now being written with those that were being written in these same newspapers last September. At that time when I said we were going to move to put the Post Office on a more efficient basis, to reduce costs and to attempt to balance the budget, there was not a newspaper across the country that did not hail the Postmaster General as being the ideal man for the job. But in the latter part of October when the details of the bill were published and they knew what my statement meant, nearly every newspaper across the country, with some very notable exceptions, turned the other way around. The attitude was, "Balance the budget, yes. Who, me? Never."

I suggest it is time that the publishing industry recognized that subsidies paid by the public are a privilege and not a right, that they imply certain duties, including a duty to suggest how large the subsidy should be and how it should be divided. We are not experts on the publishing industry and we do not claim to be. We do not claim to be able to construct an equitable formula that will give help to those publications that need it, whether they are non-profit or Canadian or American. I suggest that the publishing industry, which is still going to get a subsidy of $40 million from the taxpaying public in its second and third class elements, instead of taking the attitude that the subsidy should be larger or that it should not be cut, should come before parliament with specific proposals on how we should allocate the funds.

I have no objections to and can see a great value in support for Canadian periodicals—but define them, and say how much—just as I can see great value in helping Air Canada to fulfil its national mandate. But I object to subsidies to anyone, no matter how deserving, being hidden from the public and being mixed up in postal rates.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the Post Office is going through a difficult period of transition. Change is always difficult. At the present time we are suffering an abnormal amount of criticism, and that is always difficult for morale. There are other difficulties which may be related to the fact that both management and unions inside the Post Office are new to the concept of a union contract. We are working on our first such contract in over 100 years of existence, and there has been on both sides perhaps a tendency to interpret that contract too literally, to look at the words and not, at times, at the implied intent behind those words, in other words, to treat it as a human document.

Change itself has brought some uncertainty within the Post Office and criticism from without. We have had to cut back some services because they are no longer worth the cost, in much the same way as people now go to supermarkets because they no longer want to pay for the services of the general store. To expect, say, the Post Office to operate on a six-day week when virtually the rest of Canada operates on a five-day week, including members of parliament—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Kierans:** —is much like expecting newspapers in these days of radio and television, still to publish four and five editions a day, or for railways to operate—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the minister but his time has expired.

**Mr. Kierans:** May I have consent to finish?

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** May I suggest the Postmaster General might continue but let him talk facts.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous agreement that the Postmaster General may continue?

**Mr. Aiken:** I merely rise to ask the minister to indicate if he has nearly completed his remarks. I am sure we would not want to cut him off in mid-paragraph.

**Mr. Kierans:** I shall be only another minute.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous agreement?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Kierans:** What we are setting out to do is to provide service in the style of today, to fulfil the real needs of people today, and to do this in a way which does not burden the general taxpayer with expenditures that go only to benefit a few.

I take tremendous pride in being the Postmaster General, and I want every one of the 48,000 people working for the Post Office to have exactly that same feeling of pride. O.K., we are subject to criticism, but we will smile at the people of Canada and they will smile back at us. These are the goals of the Post Office. We are moving toward them and moving at an increasing pace as we identify our problems and take action to solve them. For that objective I ask for the support and the confidence of this house.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

• (5:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans), and right at the outset I should like to say that what is going to happen in the Post Office some day is wonderful. But I ask the minister, when is the mail going to go through? Heaven knows, there is enough to be said in criticism of the new broom in the person of the Postmaster General so that I will not have to do what has been suggested should be done, that is, criticize the Post Office Department. There is plenty of room for criticism right at the top. Nothing the minister has said in his remarks today, and I listened to them carefully, has changed my view that one of the main criticisms is his apparent advocacy of the barren and destructive concept of change solely for the sake of change.

To me the minister is the perfect symbol of our sick society, "a prophet of mindless action", to quote the distinguished Cambridge professor of English constitutional history, Geoffrey Elton. Since he assumed office and undertook to reform the Post Office Department and the postal service the minister has managed to alienate postal workers, disrupt service and impose burdensome and unjustified extra taxation on Canadians generally. This I believe is directly attributable to a blind dedication to the theory that change, no matter how unreasoned or how destructive it may be, is bound to be good. I should like to quote from the *Monetary Times* for the month of May, 1969. The minister is reported as having said:

> I intend to reshape the Post Office not as an organization in the business of moving the mail, but as an organization in the business of communications.

The minister has embraced the proposed new communications satellite as the justification for his theories and the badge of his new régime. What he has failed to do is explain to Canadian businessmen and others who depend upon a reliable mail service for their daily bread just how his satellite or communications organization will ensure fast, efficient mail delivery, reasonably contented employees or relief from exorbitant charges.

I should like to revert to my earlier remarks about our sick society and mindless

action. Perhaps we should not blame the minister too much for being one among many in our society who has fallen under the current intoxication of heedless and purposeless change. We see the symptoms and the results on every hand today. In the Montreal *Gazette* of Tuesday there is an editorial comment on the destruction of the small American town of Zap by a mob of young people bent solely and mindlessly on destruction pure and simple. This town in North Dakota has a population of some 300 people. A chance, tongue in cheek reference in a college paper to a "Zap-in" brought down a wave of 3,000 young people on that village who proceeded to leave it in a shambles.

This is simply an extreme example of what we see about us in this country all the time today. It makes no more sense and is no more reasonable or explainable than was the destruction of millions of dollars worth of computer devices at Sir George Williams University. I admit it would be unfair to equate the minister's chaotic reforms with either incident, but it is my conviction that the disruptive changes in our postal system and the other occurrences have their roots in common ground. Perhaps I might again quote Professor Elton as reported by Bruce West in Tuesday's *Globe and Mail:*

> Our world is one in which reason is in retreat. The mentors of the day are prophets of mindless action. The current methods of argument are belief, assertion and the slogan, not rational analysis and exchange of views.

It strikes me that the minister's arbitrary decisions and stubborn refusal to listen to argument may very well stem from his adoption of "belief, assertion and the slogan" rather than the old-fashioned method of "rational analysis and exchange of views". People in public life, clergymen, politicians, educators and commentators, all appear to feel a compulsion to get with it and underwrite if not actually recommend basic and revolutionary change. Nothing is held sacred or useful any more if it lends itself to attack as being part of the "Establishment", whatever that may be. An establishment seems to be anything that has been in existence for more than a few years.

Recently I read an article by a Protestant clergyman propounding the theory that Christ was a Communist. The truly frightening thing about all this is that so much reform, so much change and so much revolutionary upheaval is preached and embarked upon without any thought of what its ultimate aim is or what results it will produce once it is instituted. This is the fact about today's restless urge for change which makes much of it mindless, purposeless and meaningless.

It may seem far-fetched to suggest that the minister is a dangerous anarchist or that he is an undisciplined and irresponsible teenager, but the fact remains, in my opinion, that he has been guilty in launching his departmental reforms of the very same sins of heedlessness, thoughtlessness and irrationality of which I have been speaking. The minister can talk all he wants about his bright new Flash Gordon or Star Trek world of the future with satellites, computers and automatic machinery of every sort speeding communications in Canada and to the world outside our boundaries, but that will not change the fact that since his takeover of the department and the institution of his so-called reforms a letter can take 10 days to go from Parliament Hill to a town in Alberta. Even a registered letter can take six days to go from Ottawa to Winnipeg or four days to go eight miles from Gainsborough, Saskatchewan to Pierson, Manitoba.

This morning I spoke on the phone with a very prominent photographer in Chatham. He informed me that he sends film to a colour laboratory in Toronto. Formerly it took three days. Now it takes two weeks if he uses special delivery and his costs are up 100 per cent. He finds that he can get quicker service by sending it to a colour laboratory in Edmonton.

**Mr. Smerchanski:** What would you suggest?

**Mr. McCutcheon:** I suggest frankly that the post, after all, is a public service, one of the oldest and necessary services our central government is supposed to provide for taxpaying citizens. Like any other service, taxpayers expect to pay for it. So far as I know there has never been any suggestion that such a public service should make money for government. There has never been any public cry for this.

The new minister, however, upon assuming office adopted the arbitrary attitude that henceforth the mails must pay for themselves and, perhaps by good fortune, turn a tidy littly profit for a spendthrift government. I suggest that this is contrary to the whole concept of a public service, particularly the postal service. Let us by all means exercise economies and good management in the operation of the Post Office Department but let us not expect such a service cost free. I would rather be able to rely on my mail getting there on time and receiving it regularly than

get back a few paltry tax dollars which in all probability will only be squandered by some other department of government.

I would be quite willing to see some other minister have responsibility for the proposed communications satellite if I had any reason to believe that by relieving the present minister of this heavy burden he would be in a position to devote his full time to the very real need to restore our postal services to respectability and reliability. The present minister, however, cannot do it. He has lost the respect of his department and of the people of Canada. He has proven himself to be completely incompetent to cope with the details of effectively running the Post Office Department.

**Mr. Smerchanski:** That is your opinion.

**Mr. McCutcheon:** It is the opinion of the bulk of Canadians, I believe. It was a little thing to him, but it was big in the eyes of Post Office boxholders in January this year when he tried to collect rent a second time even though people and firms had valid receipts for paid-up box rents.

• (5:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. McCutcheon:** Mr. Speaker, I have just one paragraph left.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there agreement to allow the hon. member to carry on?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. McCutcheon:** Mr. Speaker, it was not until the justice department handed down an opinion stating that proper Post Office receipts constituted a contract that he backed down. His attitude was: If I can get away with it, never mind the ethics. This was a small item with not much money involved but it was enough to destroy the minister's credibility. One would not buy a used car from a man like that.

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak during this debate I should like to say that Canadians have never paid more for and received less from postal services than today. The residents of my own province of Manitoba might as well be living in the Rupert's Land of Hudson's Bay Company days when mail at best came half yearly by sailing ship and canoe.

[Mr. McCutcheon.]

In my opinion, the sad decline in convenient and reliable service by the Canadian Post Office and the steep increase in cost to ordinary Canadians is attributable to only one man, the new Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans).

He alone can take credit for the fact that in Canada today private mail pick-up and delivery services are preferred by many people to the service provided by his department. He alone must bear the responsibility for doubling the ordinary postage rates, for no other reason than to raise a quick buck for his free-spending cabinet colleagues and to create a reputation for himself as a great innovator and reorganizer. He may well have come perilously close to innovating and reorganizing the postal service right out of existence.

Without experience in postal matters, without experience in federal administration and with nothing but far-out theories and an all-consuming desire to enhance his reputation as an artist of radical change, he took over the Post Office Department and proceeded to turn it upside down. He has done such a thorough job of disruption that by now there is little hope that a new minister could sort out the mess. He has reduced postal service to that of the days of the horse and the windjammer. In many ways a band of native runners carrying letters would be a more efficient way of handling the mail than the one he has instituted. Arbitrarily and without any adequate supporting evidence he has increased postal rates to burdensome proportions. By his heavyhanded and inept handling of Post Office employees he has all but destroyed departmental morale.

In a few short months the minister has successfully ruined a great public service which has operated for the benefit and to the satisfaction of Canadians since Confederation. Why has he brought about this havoc? In the name of what economist and business administrator has he acted? Apparently the only excuse for his actions has been his own opinion that all public services should pay their own way, that the postal service was running in the red and that he, the lone ranger of the Montreal Stock Exchange, must saddle up and ride to the rescue.

I for one do not believe there is any basis for the minister's contention that a public service of the nature of postal delivery should necessarily pay its way. I think every Canadian taxpayer would expect the department to be operated with economy and business efficiency. But I do not believe that the public of any nation would expect essential public

services to be operated at a profit like a private business venture. The essence of government and its chief purpose for being is to provide services for citizens which must be provided centrally and universally. That is why people pay taxes to government. They need and seek certain services and are willing to pay for them through taxation.

If the minister's theories of departmental self-sufficiency were carried to a logical conclusion, we would turn our armed forces into a crown corporation and expect it to show an annual profit. What municipality in this country expects its fire and police services to show a profit? The whole concept is absurd. This might be an interesting point for discussion in a class of first year university students but it can hardly be taken seriously by anyone with maturity or experience in the operations of government.

It is my belief that the minister has constituted a national disaster, and the damage he has already done to our postal services may render them beyond restoration. He might well be replaced by a competent man charged with the task of restoring public confidence in our postal service, bringing postal rates more in line with the realities of the general usage of such a public service, and generally making the Post Office Department tick with its old effectiveness.

I would have no objection if the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) allowed the present minister to stay on in some communications role. He might be quite happy if he were left with his satellites and his computers. But I urge most strongly upon the government that something be done quickly to make our postal services once again reliable, efficient and satisfying to the vast majority of Canadians who are today disgruntled, dissatisfied and despairing of the present Post Office regime of the hon. member for Duvernay (Mr. Kierans).

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on this question I should like to say immediately that today's discussion on the regrettable state of our postal services is most timely. It is true that the rate of unemployment in the country is now over 5 per cent. It is true that our national air line is grounded. It is true that our passport office is inadequate in the light of modern demands. It is true that the cost of living has increased by a very substantial 1.1 per cent in the past month. With all these troubles it seems to me that the government inadequacy which has probably had the most annoying effect on the greatest number of Canadians has been caused by the policy of the Postmaster General.

Under the present minister we have seen an increase in the cost to consumers for postal services. He has even put out during his brief time in office an unsatisfactory stamp, one which resists perforation. He has admitted that it is poorly perforated. This probably adds to the cost of the consumer because one is apt to tear off one and a half stamps in trying to get one stamp. This may add somewhat to postal revenue, but at what cost in patience to the letter writer?

In my opinion there was no need to increase ordinary first class rates from five cents to six cents. For many years this service paid its way whereas other services have not.

The greatest public complaint has naturally centred on the substandard quality of delivery service. It has been said that we now have in Canada a five-day delivery service. It takes five days to deliver a letter almost anywhere. Let me quote briefly from one or two publications in reference to our present postal service. I quote first from the Winnipeg *Free Press* which carried an article referring to "the scandal of the century". This is stronger language than I would use because, like other hon. members, I am aware of the fact that there are legitimate difficulties involved in the changeover the minister has attempted to make. Nevertheless let me quote from this article which appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press*. After stating that present postal services represent the scandal of the century; the article continued:

• (5:20 p.m.)

> Since Mr. Kierans' reforms, it has become almost impossible to send a letter within Canada's main centres and have it delivered the following day. Where periodicals are concerned, it's nothing but disaster. Second-class mail is obviously left to accumulate.

I ask the house to take particular note of this passage:

> One is almost back in the days of Jalna, when a month's supply of the *Times* arrived by the mail boat to be read at breakfast each day, with exactly one month's delay.

I should like to quote briefly from an article which appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* of May 12:

> There has been a limit to how long Canadians and Canadian businesses could put up with the sort of Post Office service they have been receiving. That limit has been reached. While many have complained, they have been hoping that the dislocation, the delays and the losses of mail were

somehow temporary. But bad service has by now settled down into a bad pattern. It has become the expected thing. And this is not tolerable in a modern industrial nation.

Quite apart from the letters all hon. members are receiving almost every day of the week from people complaining about the difficulty of getting their mail through the postal service, the major complaint is from many church, farm union, co-operative and association papers, small publications which are put out in the interests of the membership or particular group and which under the new rates imposed by the Postmaster General are being asked to pay three, four and five times as much as they paid previously. As a result, these papers are going out of business or are having to cut back from weekly to monthly publication. Speaking in the House of Commons last fall, when the new postal policy was first unveiled, I said:

I agree with the Postmaster General in one respect. I have in mind his statement that the Canadian postal service is one of the best, if not the best, in the world. I would only qualify this by saying "it was" rather than "it is". I am not sure it will continue to be the best under the proposals the hon. gentleman is putting forward.

I do not often regret that I am right about anything, but I really regret that I was entirely correct and that under the present policy our once splendid mail service, by which five billion pieces of mail were distributed every year, the vast bulk delivered without error and within 24 hours, is a thing of the past.

I and my party have urged for many years that business mail and publications which are distributed for private profit should be made to pay their way. This has been our position, and we complimented the minister when he moved to bring it about. But we also asked that the question of non-profit publications should be referred to committee for a proper review, and that small publications which are not published for profit should be allocated a rate which would not curtail their circulation and communication.

It is very easy for those on this side of the house to rise on this subject and make a very critical attack on the postal service. I used to be in that service at one time. I admire the service. I think the minister is well motivated; I believe he attempted to do what he thought was the right thing. What he has done, in effect, is try to perform two or three surgical operations at the same time. This is a very dangerous situation with regard to both surgery and the postal service. We in this country have had eight postmasters general in the last ten years. I hope the present one will not take it as a personal criticism when I say that my party and I hope he will not be the last Postmaster General that we have.



[*Translation*]

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, I will try to be rather brief since I have only been allotted ten minutes.

I should like to draw the minister's attention to a number of facts, after all the criticisms he has just heard.

I realize that running his department is an overwhelming task. I wonder, however, whether he has been pursuing the right aim, either to make the Post Office a profitable concern or to provide efficient service. In my opinion, since he runs the department, he has tried rather to make a paying business out of the department which, like the Department of National Defence, is not a department meant to make money but a commercial department.

It is primarily a service department, as the Department of National Defence is meant is ensure protection and I think it should first aim at service. I think the best example of lack of service is the closing down of rural post offices. In my riding, it is certainly one of the areas in which the minister has not tried his best to provide an adequate service to the people.

In my own riding, three post offices have been closed down and a fourth will soon be. I wonder if the minister and his officials have looked fully into the problem.

I have not dwelt on the other problems, because the minister had some arguments. But here is what the minister wrote, in a letter addressed to me and dated November 4:

We are now taking the necessary steps to close down the post office at Saint-Stanislas, Que.—

—a rural parish.

—which serves only 28 patrons.

They will now be served daily on the present route of Mistassini, R.R. No. 3.

Moreover, this road will be extended so as to serve daily the 25 users who now receive their mail through Saint-Stanislas, R.R. No. 1.

I will remind the minister that on February 25 he received from the council of the parish of Saint-Stanislas a petition signed by 40 objectors, and I can assure him that even today there are in the village of Saint-Stanislas 40 users rather than 28. I am not sure, but if the minister can guarantee, even to these 40 users, that the mail will be delivered to them at their door, that will be a lesser evil.

These public boxes are a problem in our villages, especially in winter, when the snow-plow knocks them all down on its way, as it happened in some villages not far from Saint-Félicien.

• (5:30 p.m.)

One could knock down this collection of public boxes one fine day in those parts of the country where winter lasts six months a year. This is why I want to draw this problem to the attention of the minister, and especially of his officials.

The latter should once again make a study about this post office, and convince themselves that there are now 40 users. According to the regulations, according to the correspondence, the minister said that he was closing the post offices with 30 users or less. As in this village there are 40 users and others will arrive next summer, I wonder if the minister has good reason now to close this post office.

Besides, he tells us, I think, that this other service, that is the rural mail delivery service, costs about $3,332.

I simply wish to point to the minister that if he came to make a survey—I do not know whether it is route No. 1 or No. 3—he would find out that there is one with about only three or four users left, while the route is still carried out in the whole division.

In my opinion, those people would be ready, with the village inhabitants, to give up the money allocated for that route, serving three or four users, so that it could be spent in the village. This would balance expenditures without involving any surplus, although an inquiry should be made to find out if those three or four users would really be ready to yield their rights in favour of the village inhabitants. To say the truth, it seems they would rather get their mail at the village post office. In my opinion, we could deal with the financial problem that way, to the satisfaction of the people there, while providing them at the same time with good service.

Last Saturday, namely on May 10, I went to Saint-Stanislas to discuss with the association's president the postal problem, because a council was created to deal with this question. I met the association's president and he discussed the matter with me. I told him that at the earliest opportunity in the house, I would draw the minister's attention to that. In my opinion, this is a very interesting proposal, as at present that post office is not really up to the standards set by hon. minister, who says that where there are less than 30 families, the post office will be closed.

The minister has received the request, signed by 40 persons, and dated February 17, from the secretary-treasurer's office of the Saint-Stanislas municipality, which said, and I quote:

Mr. Minister,

We, the undersigned, residents of Saint-Stanislas, in the county of Roberval, who are not being served through rural mail delivery, firmly object to the closing of our post office.

Mr. Minister, we request, through our federal member, that the St-Stanislas post office, in the Roberval riding, be kept open and we ask you to take into consideration the fact that:

The rural mail service cannot replace the use of a post office which provides many services even to the people already served through rural mail delivery in a climate as harsh as ours.

The closing of our post office would greatly affect all our public bodies such as: the credit union, the city council, the school board, the manufacturing plant, the farmers wives' club, the convent and others—the services of the post office are indispensable and preferable to all the inconveniences of the rural mail delivery as far as all our organizations are concerned.

That request was signed by 40 users. The minister is well aware of that.

Without going into further detail on the subject, I should like the minister to reconsider the case before putting this post office under lock and key because, in my opinion, these people need their post office. They live far from other centers and it would simply be an injustice to take away their post office.

The officials should make a thorough study of the rural mail routes. It is also claimed that the post office is not a paying proposition.

It must also be noted that the St-Stanislas post office and Rural Route No. 3 of that parish are in the Mistassini postal district and that Mistassini Rural Route No. 3 is in the St-Stanislas postal district.

I believe this is a mistake. The revenue of profit-making routes in considered as part of the revenue of the Mistassini post office, when that is not the case at all. Those routes belong to St-Stanislas, and the amounts should appear in the revenue of St-Stanislas.

I do not imagine that the officials are prejudiced, and I would not like to criticize their inspector—who likely is also a postmaster—or anybody else, but I simply ask that justice be done. There should be a serious inquiry. I am sure that the minister will realize that that village needs its post office, and that it can

rightly expect from the minister a decision to the effect that it will remain open.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, in supporting the motion as presented by the party to which I belong I am pleased to have the opportunity of attempting to impress on the minister responsible for communications his obvious lack of regard for all the people of Canada in instituting changes in the Post Office Department for reasons which, it is quite evident, he alone feels will provide a better service and at the same time save money for the government.

To be more specific, I refer to those rural communities of Canada which in many cases are so isolated that one of their most important and vital forms of communication is the small post office. This action by the Postmaster General is another substantial reason for the feeling of disillusionment I find as a new member. I thought that after coming here I would see and experience the ultimate in organization and planning—the smartest minds in the country charged with responsibility for introducing or amending legislation for the common good of all Canadians.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, I find a group of ministers across the floor who may have a high standard of intellect in theory, who can spout and expound supposed words of wisdom regarding their dreams for the future of communications, who can write pages of fancy words of wisdom about ways in which to improve our country, but who certainly do not get their message to the intended receivers even when they put all those pages of words in an envelope and send it through the Post Office. I found instead, Mr. Speaker, a group of ministers vying with each other for popularity and power, in some cases by going around the country kissing teenagers. And in this case we have a minister who is kissing in another way, by playing post office.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we see evidence of intellectual studies and task forces. This time we have been told about an "inside task force". The department intended to make a study of the effect of closing post offices across the country under certain circumstances—an on-the-spot survey to determine whether or not to close uneconomical post offices in communities where fewer than 30 families live or where revenue amounted to less than $1,000.

In my district alone, this would mean the closing of 60 out of 90 post offices. It would completely cut off the people from any form of communication, further isolate them, and deprive them of the only form of contact with the outside world. Many of these post offices serve not only one small community but five or six surrounding communities spread over a wide area. Things are inconvenient enough as they are now, and to deprive local people of this due public service is not only undemocratic but downright discriminatory.

I was interested to look back at one of the recent issues of *Time* magazine and read the Postmaster General's prediction that within six months of the changes in the Post Office Department being put into effect the esprit de corps of the postal employees would be the highest ever. Mr. Speaker, I do not have the time in which to discuss the esprit de corps of the many thousands of postal employees across the country, but I can tell the minister that the moral of citizens in some 70 per cent of the communities in Newfoundland which are threatened with losing a decent postal service was never lower. I can tell him, too, that the esprit de corps of the many postmasters who have given devoted service to the department for many years was never lower.

I did not find this out by sending in a task force, either an inside one or an outside one. I found out through a process of simple dialogue and discussion with the people concerned—people who do not have a union or anyone else to speak for them but who continue to serve the department and, what is more important, to serve their neighbours in their communities without concern for time or remuneration.

Let us consider for a moment the results of my contact with the hon. gentleman's employees. One postmaster, classified as a revenue postmaster group 16, in my riding is getting a salary of $2,700 a year. I was astounded to find that out of this salary he operates a government-owned post office in a government-owned building and pays the government $305 a year for rent. He also gets the magnificent sum of $32.33 for operating the C.N.T. office in the same building—but he has to pay $30 a month for janitor service.

**An hon. Member:** Shame.

**Mr. Marshall:** Just a minute. He gets an increment of 4 per cent of his annual salary for holiday pay, which amounts to $108, but in order to go on leave for two weeks he has to hire another postmaster for relief work at pay which amounts to $116.50.

Another postmaster, assisted by his wife, looks after a post office which serves five other settlements and the surrounding area. For this he receives $150 a month. This is $150 a month for two people covering rent and salary. Should we not get the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) to work that one out in accordance with the minimum wage scale? When I discovered the low salaries paid to these government employees I wrote to each and every postmaster or postmistress in all rural communities in my district, and I established the following salaries out of 25 replies I received. The lowest salary is $11.50 a week for a female operating from Monday to Saturday in her home. Another postmistress is getting $16 a week after 30 years' service. One lady after 20 years' service is getting $22.20 per week. The lowest in the male category is $25.50 per week for operating both the post office and the C.N.T. office.

• (5:40 p.m.)

The Postmaster General may tell me that their salaries are based on a few hours a day only but people who have to walk miles for their mail cannot come at certain hours in the day; and the only ones who seem to be aware of this fact are these people themselves. So these postal employees continue to serve the community, and not five days a week but in lots of cases six and seven days a week. So I ask the minister not to talk to me about treatment of employees or about the pride of employees.

Are these examples which I have outlined examples of the pledge of the government that every individual or group of individuals must have equality of opportunity regardless of the part of the country in which they live? Is this an example of the human rights which the government has pledged to the people of Canada? How are these people going to communicate, Mr. Speaker? How are they going to conduct a dialogue with the government? How are they going to get their complaints to the government's regional desks?

Where is the Postmaster General going to place his information centres that he advocates be located in post offices around the country in order to give the people of Canada a channel of communication to know what is going on in government? Probably he is going to locate his information centres in the mail boxes. Or perhaps he intends to send out this information by the new method of sending couriers around the rural districts with mail. Probably he is going to resurrect the town crier.

There is a great deal of uncertainty right now among the people who man the 60 odd post offices in my riding and are potential candidates for the Postmaster General's axe. These 60 people represent some 60 Newfoundland families. They do not know where to turn. They do not know when or where the axe will fall. As one 85 year old pensioner wrote me, "I used to enjoy at the end of the month leaning against the post office, waiting for me check. But now I daren't do it, because that feller Keerings might haul her away!" This might sound funny to some hon. members, but to me it is very serious.

My whole point is this. This government seems to be embarked upon a program of "profit or else". To my way of thinking a government cannot operate in this manner. This is the way in which business and industry operates. But unlike business and industry, I think it is essential that government have a much higher concern, a concern for human rights. Recently the minister in charge of housing resigned, and within one week after that resignation many measures were introduced to improve the housing situation in this country. The post office department is in an even worse mess. For the good of Canada may I humbly suggest that we might get a little action if the Postmaster General were to resign.

I feel that running the post office department in a country the size of Canada is a full time job, a full time job for a man with considerable talent. My humble suggestion would be for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to appoint a full time postmaster general and allow the present incumbent to devote his full time to playing with his satellites.

**Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, on March 4 the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans), the former postmaster general, declared to this house: "I am going to adopt a pretty skeptical and cynical approach". He has been true to his word. We have listened to him today talking in that vein. To the mounting criticism from every corner of the country his attitude, as recorded many times in *Hansard* and in numerous speeches, is one of cynicism and arrogance.

We have listened to this same kind of speech today. This attitude is one which causes concern and hurt for the patrons of the postal department from west to east and from sea to sea. In the years that I have been in this house, I have had very little complaint from the public about the postal service of this country. In fact, I have received ten

times as much protest and complaint during the past three months as in the previous seven years.

It used to be that I could mail a letter to my home city of Red Deer, more than 2,300 miles away, in the afternoon and it would be delivered the following afternoon. It now takes at least four days, and sometimes a week. In fact, last Tuesday I received a letter through the mail which was postmarked Ottawa, May 5, 6 p.m. Should it require six days for the delivery of a letter that is posted here in Ottawa? If the postmaster general would like to have this letter I will pass it across to him. There are many more I could give him, as well as many copies of letters written to him about the matter, all verifying the same situation. Now, at the very best a letter that used to be delivered to Montreal from Toronto overnight takes three to four days.

What has gone wrong? It seems to me that the postmaster general is the only one who can answer that question. Yet he does not answer it, but rather pulls red herrings across the trail.

When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) took office, he declared that his cabinet ministers would be permitted one blunder only. As the Oshawa *Journal* stated in its issue on March 19, the Postmaster General has made three. I think it might be well to place some of this article on the record:

> His initial one was in trying to cut off rural mail delivery in Canada on Saturdays. He had to retract that edict through pressure from his own Liberal followers from the rural constituencies of the country.
>
> Then he slapped prohibitive postal rates on newspapers and other publications. He doubled the rates, tripled them and in the case of the advertising portion of newspapers, he sextupled them—
>
> The minister's third blunder, and perhaps the most glaring, was in his dealings with this own employees, the mail couriers who through good weather and bad carry the load for the postal department.

As a result, I believe that we have had a breakdown in morale, and certainly we have had a breakdown in service. This article continues:

> One thing is clear. It's now Kierans who should walk off the job, and quickly. He should go by command of the Prime Minister who promised his ministers would be permitted only one gross blunder.

This newspaper claims the minister has made three. This expression from the press reveals one of the most sensitive areas

[Mr. Thompson.]

touched by the policies of the postmaster general.

Also what bothers me in this regard is the simple fact that the publishers in this country were denied the opportunity of coming before parliament, presenting their case and explaining their proposals. These people are conscientious and are rendering a service. They are doing their job just as well as government ministers or as we try to do ours. But the government refused to send Bill C-116 to committee, as was suggested from this side of the house. We were overruled. Thus, no opportunity was given the publishing industry to put its case before the committee, as is the normal, democratic procedure.

I sympathize with the minister in his effort to minimize the deficits of the postal operations in this country. I am not accusing him of anything here; I think that his objective is a good one, though in this regard I wonder why the postal department should be singled out from, shall we say, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or other services rendered by government agencies, crown corporations or other government departments.

As far as my constituency is concerned, I have very little to complain about. During the last year five new post offices were built, and two major post offices reconstructed in order to meet expanding business. However, what is tragic is that in his sincerity and dedication to the job that he has been given to do, there is an inability to select sound policies from the deluge of advice that he has invited. The minister has failed to consult various communities across the country on how changes might best effect those reforms that are necessary. It is not good enough for the minister to stand in his place this afternoon and to tell us we are against change. The minister invites trouble when he does not consult the various people who are affected in the country. I ask, how can he justify rate increases for weekly newspapers of between 400 and 700 per cent? Does he wish to destroy them? Already, since April 1, a number of weekly newspapers have had to cease publication. I know of at least seven such papers which have had to fold since January because of the extra cost of postal delivery. I can name at least twenty publications—they are trade, professional and farm publications—which have likewise folded. Worse than that, the minister has driven many such publications across the border. Those magazines being published on the other side of the border do not, pay excessive rates as second

class mail. Thus the minister further damages the sovereignty of Canadian enterprises.

• (5:50 p.m.)

It seems to me that if the Postmaster General had really wanted to curb the many errors and weaknesses in the administration of the department he would have given the publishers of newspapers, journals and periodicals an opportunity to come before the department and state their case.

Perhaps the most vital part of the entire inquiry relating to the newspaper and publishing industry is that part relating to farm publications. More than a few of these publications have their backs to the wall because of increased postage costs. I am convinced that the Minister's explanation of Post Office departmental costs does not accurately reflect the real costs of handling second class newspapers. If all such publications were to cease publishing and if the Post Office Department were no longer to handle such publications, what saving would be effected? Not one major delivery system would be changed. Trucks would continue to deliver from farm to farm or from point to point and the same rail cars would be used. The only difference would be that revenues would fall while expenses would continue as they are. I believe that the picture presented by the minister with respect to rural and farm publications, which are so vital to the rural communities of Canada, is wrong. When the minister says the delivery of such publications is loaded with unjustified and unjustifiable costs, I submit he is wrong. Perhaps we could consider publications other than farm newspapers. The minister talks about subsidizing business. In that connection may I read from notes prepared by the Graphic Arts Industries Association for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), dated March 20, 1969. They say:

> The magnitude of postage rate increases instituted Nov. 1, 1968 and April 1, 1969, and the abruptness with which these have been made effective in their totality, will have the most adverse effects upon the Canadian printing and allied industries of any setback experienced since the depression of the 1930's. The paper and allied industries will share the consequences—
>
> Directly or indirectly, virtually all Canadian businesses and industries will be retarded. Communications within countless national and regional organizations, representing nearly every sector of Canadian society, will be sharply restricted. Federal and provincial revenues from corporate and personal income taxation, and especially from sales taxes, will be significantly reduced. These effects are self-evident.
>
> A number of publications have already been killed, and more will die, without hope of being resurrected. Unemployment has already been caused across the country, and more will follow. Opportunities for expanded employment in many companies from coast to coast have been destroyed.

There is more than one side to the case for condemning the increase in postal charges for publications. The Canadian Welfare Council, in a communiqué dated May 15, 1969, had the following to say:

> New postal rates have gone into effect, bearing down hard on all the newsletters and journals that have enjoyed second class mailing privileges: a destructive measure that weakens the flow of ideas in Canada and should be challenged.
>
> The action is justified by the government on the grounds that the Post Office should "pay its way"; it is a "business"; mail should not be "subsidized". The Post Office has not only clashed headlong with its employees through get-tough policies; it has also rescinded the idea of public service in a vital area.

Service is the only commodity the Post Office has to offer. Why does the Post Master General insist on lowering the traditional service of his department?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

## PRIVILEGE

### MR. BROADBENT—TABLING IN FINANCE COMMITTEE OF COST-BENEFIT STUDY—MOTION TO REFER TO PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

**Mr. Speaker:** In the two minutes or so left before six o'clock may I, with the consent of hon. members, give a ruling in connection with an important point raised by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) earlier today.

During routine proceedings today the hon. member raised a question of privilege concerning the tabling in the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of a certain document. The hon. member went on to give certain details of events which had occurred in the committee and referred to a statement made in the house on April 23 by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council. I suggested at the time that I wanted to look into the matter because it appeared to be very complex. It related to matters that had occurred in committee and I was of the opinion that it would be very difficult to give a judgment then and there with fairness without having had an opportunity to

look into the matters brought to the attention of the house by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

I should say at this point it is my understanding that the document which was the subject of discussion in the committee is the same as the document presented as a return to a Notice of Motion for the production of papers in this house on Wednesday, April 23, registered as Sessional Paper No. 22-B and laid upon the table on May 8.

It seems to me, having considered the available records both of the committee and of this house, that the matter raised by the hon. member is more properly one to be considered in relation to events as they occurred in the house rather than in a committee, in that the document in question, as I understand it, is the same in both cases. Therefore, it seems to me, the matter is one concerning the description of the document. It is a question of interpreting whether the document tabled is the paper the production of which the hon. member had sought by his Notice of Motion. I suggest that the matter raised does not constitute a question of privilege.

If the document sought by the hon. member has not been provided for him, in my view his remedy would be to place on the order paper a notice of motion in explicit terms asking perhaps—and I use his own words—for "a cost-benefit study as prescribed by Treasury Board Manual Planning Programming Budgeting Guide." This, presumably, will either be supplied or it will not be. If it is not, it is open for the hon. member to ask for the motion to be transferred for debate and the matter can be discussed and voted upon.

The Chair should say that on the evidence available it is impossible to make a determination as to whether the document presented is in fact the document sought by the hon. member. Hon. members know that the Chair has to rule primarily on whether there is a prima facie case of privilege. In view of the facts as I have been able to ascertain them, I must reach the conclusion that there is no prima facie case of privilege. I, therefore, suggest to the hon. member that he might consider the possibility of following the procedure I have just outlined.

The time being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

[Mr. Speaker.]

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, STANDING ORDER 58—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—GOVERNMENT MISMANAGEMENT CAUSING DETERIORATION IN POSTAL SERVICE

The house resumed consideration of the motion Mr. Macquarrie and the amendment thereto of Mr. Benjamin.

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, I was astounded at the heat with which the Postmaster General replied to the three opposition parties this afternoon. I know he is a virtuoso at setting up strawman arguments and then sending them crashing to the ground, but I believe he failed miserably in answering any of the basic questions raised by members of the opposition.

The minister stood with all his defence mechanisms working overtime, shouting irrelevancies in a strained and harassed voice, producing much heat but very little light on the real problems facing the users of the Canadian postal service. What infuriated me even more was the attack he launched against "an hon. member" for maligning the local Postmaster in Prince Rupert from the member's position of privilege. To use the words of the Postmaster General, it was a "deplorable position" to take since the civil servant had no opportunity to defend himself.

I am certain the Postmaster General will recall that before the "hon. member" took any position in this matter, he discussed it with the minister in this house on Monday night. The minister himself suggested, and both agreed, that two questions might be asked the following day during the oral question period. Accordingly, on Tuesday morning I sent a copy of two questions to the minister's office as notice, along with a covering letter. I sent these documents by messenger marked urgent. Incidentally, the envelope also contained all the pertinent documents which I had in my possession, and which I used to support my case on Tuesday evening.

I would like to quote from the letter and also read the questions, Mr. Speaker. The letter, signed by myself, is dated May 13, 1969. I quote:

Dear Mr. Kierans:

As a result of our conversation last evening please find enclosed the documents you requested along

with a copy of the two questions which we agreed would be asked during today's oral question period. If I can manage to get the eye of the Speaker I shall put these questions to you.

I trust that your office will be able to resolve this problem in Prince Rupert.

The Postmaster General had almost four hours between the time I gave him notice of my question and the time I asked it during the oral question period. If he did not have time to investigate the matters relevant to our discussion the previous evening, he could have sent me a note and I would have delayed raising the issue on Tuesday, but he did not do that.

During the question period I rose and asked question No. 2. When quoting the letter I failed to read the questions I referred to earlier. I will do so at this time. Question No. 1 is as follows: Does the Postmaster General have any evidence of racial discrimination directed against the President of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers in Prince Rupert, British Columbia? Question No. 2, which is the only one I asked, since I was ruled out of order, is as follows:

Did the Postmaster General or any of his officials authorize the telephone calls in the Prince Rupert post office to be monitored with an automatic tape recorder?

Since Your Honour ruled this question out of order, I posted the question for debate on Tuesday during the late show. I again remind the house the minister had at least five and a half hours in which to either complete his investigation or alternatively request that I postpone my debate, something I have done for other ministers and would have done again. I heard nothing from the minister or anyone in his office, so I proceeded.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that every step of this procedure was designed to avoid making the minister or the Prince Rupert postmaster the victims of a legislative ambush. I feel I was the one ambushed. I felt that I was operating in such a way as to ameliorate a difficult local situation and prevent a possible walk-out. Naturally, I was shocked when in reply to my speech the minister accused me of attacking a defenceless man and stated that he had not been given an opportunity to investigate the case. The minister at no time requested postponement on the grounds that his investigation was incomplete.

The minister's reply to me can be read. He did investigate some of my allegations because, as reported at page 8675 of *Hansard*, he lamely explained the reason for the presence of a recording device that had been attached to the receiver of the only telephone in the building. On our way out of the chamber I voiced my protest to the minister about the way he handled the whole matter and about the fact I had been accused of "taking a deplorable position", in spite of my efforts to avoid this position, while he, on the other hand, came out of this exchange as "Mr. Kleen", the staunch defender of personal freedom. At that time also I told the minister that if because of some misunderstanding between us, the minister and I, I had destroyed a defenceless man, I would publicly apologize. That offer still holds. The minister, in his anger, then replied that enough damage had been caused and that any more words on the subject would only make things worse. Therefore, I said no more.

• (8:10 p.m.)

But who raised this issue again today, Mr. Speaker? Who was it in an emotional diatribe this afternoon raised this matter once again in his infantile struggle to extricate himself from any blame for rotten postal service? It was none other than that great public defender, that Perry Mason of the postal service, the minister himself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot produce documentation of private discussions that took place prior to and throughout this issue between the minister and myself. It is his word against mine, and he usually has the last word. I know that some of my speeches in the past have harassed the minister, but I believed him to be an honourable man, even if I did not show equal confidence in his policies or administration.

I told the minister privately I would apologize if anything I said was unfair, and I do so again publicly. I am pleased that his office is continuing the investigation, as I understand the postmaster in question is in Vancouver today discussing the problem with some senior departmental officials. Incidentally, these departmental officials were not moved to such rapidity until this whole issue was raised.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have learned one thing from this whole exchange. This is the first and the last time I will ever share any confidences with the said minister or make any effort to seek a resolution to postal problems in a quiet, dignified, and what I consider to be an honourable way.

**Mr. Kierans:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. On Monday night at about a quarter to ten, it may have been twenty to ten in this house, the hon. member

came to me with copies of some correspondence relating to—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** On what does the Postmaster General rise, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Kierans:** On a question of privilege. He came to me with some correspondence from the Canadian Union of Postal Workers, and also with a series of telegrams and excerpts from letters to the editor in a British Columbia paper. He said, "I want to raise a question with you which I would not like to raise in the house." I looked at what he had and I agreed with him. I said, "Give me some time to check into this and I will see what truth there is in the material you have brought."

The next afternoon—and this was my understanding—I came into the house not having received the letter that the hon. member referred to, but I saw it right after the question period. In that letter, as he has already said, he wrote:

> As a result of our conversation last evening please find enclosed the documents you requested along with a copy of the two questions which we agreed—

And, I have a question mark here.

> —would be asked during today's oral question period.

We did not agree on this, and this certainly was not my impression. My impression was clearly that the hon. member was giving me time to call Prince Rupert and check into the facts.

Also, the material which the hon. member had shown me the night before contained no evidence whatever to form the basis for this question:

> Does the Postmaster General have any evidence of racial discrimination against the President of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers in Prince Rupert, British Columbia?

In the material which he sent over to me next day—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please.

**Mr. McGrath:** The minister has made his speech.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I want to remind the minister of Standing Order 37 which reads:

> No member may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood—

[Mr. Kierans.]

**Mr. Kierans:** Again on a question of privilege—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I want to know the question of privilege.

**Mr. Kierans:** My question of privilege as Postmaster General is that the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) has openly said in this house that unproven allegations of racial discrimination have been whispered about, and I would like to say he has no evidence whatever of who the "allegator" is, and he has no evidence whatever of any racial discrimination.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Kierans:** Let him produce his evidence, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. The hon. member for Fraser Valley West.

**Mr. Rose:** On a point of privilege, I would be very pleased if the Postmaster General would confine his remarks to the relevancy of what has been said today and not rehash an argument which he has raised twice on previous occasions.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Fraser Valley West has the floor.

**Mr. Rose:** I have concluded my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I hope that before the debate is over for the sake of the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) we finally establish who in fact the "allegators" really are. Mr. Speaker, I suspect the Post Office is plagued with "allegators". As somebody said, Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General sheds too many crocodile tears—"allegator" tears.

**Mr. Cafik:** Let us hear something worthwhile.

**Mr. McGrath:** I presume the hon. member is going to participate in the debate and not make his usual contribution from his seat.

Notwithstanding the usual eloquent contribution of the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie), who would make a first class Postmaster General and restore the postal service in this country to what is was and what it should be, one gets the feeling on

speaking in this debate and listening to other debates that have taken place in this house since the minister assumed this portfolio, that it is somewhat of an exercise in frustration.

One has the uneasy feeling that the Minister of Communications, as he is now known, does not really care about the postal service of this country. That is about the only way you can rationalize his behavior, his conduct, his reaction to the repeated criticisms, valid criticisms that have been made by all sides of the house regarding the way in which the postal service has deteriorated.

I was interested in an article which appeared the other day in the *Monetary Times* which referred to the minister's new department and his plans for it. The emphasis now is on communications, and I suspect the article was probably written by the minister's executive assistant, Mr. Richard Gwyn. At any event amongst numerous other assertions it said the minister "sees his department's role as that of a 'midwife'—helping in the birth of new projects and ideas, then turning them over to someone else to run." That may be so. Perhaps the minister is a midwife in launching the new satellite era, the new Department of Communications, but one also gets the uneasy feeling that he has been guilty of an illegal abortion on the postal service of this country.

It is about time that the minister and his colleagues in the government started to pay a little attention to what is being said in and outside this house, all across the country, regarding the very serious deterioration in the postal service. And, Mr. Speaker, I understand it is being said elsewhere. I am sure the backbenchers in the Liberal party are equally disturbed about the serious decline in postal services, and I am sure they must have made this known to the minister in caucus.

It seems to me that the job, perhaps to the minister the mundane job, of delivering the country's mail, has been relegated by him to a second class position in his list of priorities. Canadians in many parts of the country, and many in my own city have to suffer by going 72 hours without mail deliveries. As the hon. member for Hillsborough so eloquently said, we now have a five-day delivery and a six cent postal rate. That the postal service has deteriorated to a point where it is a question of national concern and alarm is, in my view, an undisputed fact.

• (8:20 p.m.)

We find ourselves in the rather anomalous position in this country today where the cost of the postal services is increasing and the postal services themselves are declining. It is no wonder, then, that there are those who would seriously call for the minister's resignation. I should like to quote briefly from a recent issue of the *Financial Post*, the edition of May 3:

> The taxpaying public would rather get its money's worth from existing postal services than pay for its rampant spread into new and fancy fields of endeavour.

I go on to quote again from this same article. I am quoting now from statements allegedly attributed to the Postmaster General:

> There is one clear message: we have until 1975 to put our house in order. That is when we can expect the big breakthrough in many technical advances now on the drawing boards.

I say that the country cannot wait until 1975 for the minister to put the house in order. The country wants the postal services put in order right now. We cannot afford to wait. The mails are late enough as it is, as my colleague has interjected. Last year, before the present minister became so involved in satellites and holographs, I would have been very much opposed to the idea of making the Post Office Department a Crown corporation. Now, however, I am convinced, especially since the passage of Bill C-173, the government reorganization bill, that this is about the only way we can have an efficient postal service restored in this country. I say "restored" because in my view we did have a good postal service in Canada before this minister and the government started tinkering around with it.

What is alarming to me today as a member of parliament, as I am sure it is to many members of parliament, is the fact that the postal employees, the 48,000 Canadians for whom the minister is responsible in this house, are demoralized. They are demoralized to the point that they are unsure of their future. Paradoxically, the new Minister of Communications does not seem to be able to communicate effectively with the people in the Post Office Department who are responsible for maintaining the postal service in this country. We saw evidence of that last February during the dispute with the letter carriers. We found ourselves watching the spectacle of the Postmaster General having to communicate with his employees in the Post Office Department by press release.

*Postal Service*

The postal service in this country is in a serious mess. The situation is alarming and is of alarming proportions. This does not seem to mean anything to the Postmaster General. All the criticisms and charges made during this debate and during the course of the debate on the government reorganization bill, seem to have fallen on deaf ears. In my own part of the country, in the city of St. John's for example, the population has more than doubled in the last 20 years; yet our people today still have to put up with the same postal service they had 20 years ago when the city was only half the size it is today. To my mind, in this day and age, this is not good enough. To the credit of the minister and the government, I note that they have already announced plans to build a new postal station in the northwest area of my city. That, however, will not be sufficient to fulfil the very serious needs of our people for postal service in my city. These can only be remedied by the building of another postal station to service the northeast area of my city which is one of the fastest growing sections in population and area.

The Canadian Postmasters Association has expressed concern to me, as I know it has to many members of parliament. The postmasters are demoralized. They are concerned about their future. They are concerned over the announcement by the minister of the government's intention to close down approximately 3,500 postal stations across the country. According to the Newfoundland branch of the Postmasters Association this will probably mean the closing down of some 300 postal stations. Until some definitive action is taken in this regard the postmasters who have been working for years for a mere pittance, but who have neverthelss provided the service, find their careers now in jeopardy; they find themselves without a future. How are the little people who have been served by these post offices to be provided service? It will be many years before the service by satellite ever reaches many parts of the country, particularly many parts of rural Newfoundland.

I say it is about time the Postmaster General or the Minister of Communications as he is now known should take seriously his responsibilities as Postmaster General. There is still a very serious need to deliver the mail efficiently and effectively in this country. If the minister does not want to take our word for it I suggest that he speak to the people across the country and check with members of parliament on all sides of the house who receive complaints from all over the country.

[Mr. McGrath.]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I must advise the hon. member that his time has expired.

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Speaker, I can complete my remarks in one or two minutes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Does the house give unanimous consent for the hon. member to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. McGrath:** In closing may I say that the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) is progressive enough to be very familiar with the need to engage in the satellite and telecommunications activity, but is also conservative enough to recognize the need to maintain a good postal service in this country.

**Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks concerning the deplorable manner in which the Post Office Department of this country is being administered. In the short period of 10½ months since the Postmaster General assumed the portfolio, there has been a continuing deterioration and erosion of postal services in the entire country. He has stated all along it is his intention to modernize the Post Office Department, to make it more efficient. He stated that he intended to apply certain business management principles to the administration of the Post Office Department. This he stated, would enable it to serve the public better. Yet, if the changes of the past few months are any indication of how the Post Office Department intends to better serve the public, I predict that before the next election the Pony Express will be handling the mails again.

We heard 30 minutes of whining from the Postmaster General and sneering at the opposition. He blamed the previous Conservative government for all the problems he has today. It would seem to be a habit of ministers to blame the opposition for the various problems they face. The Postmaster General is blaming the previous Conservative government for the gross inefficiency in the Post Office Department today. A month or two ago, before the standing committee on housing, the ex-minister of transport blamed the opposition for his inability to remove the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials. That was a little ridiculous. We have a government with a clear majority in the house trying to blame

the opposition for all the problems which result from its inefficiency and bungling. About two months ago the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) blamed the opposition for his inability to sell wheat and for the lack of grain to load ships at Vancouver. That again was said to be the fault of the opposition.

I think such comments by ministers perhaps indicate they are attempting to throw out a smokescreen of confusion. The Postmaster General criticized a previous Conservative government for not having a training program for the postal employees. He bragged that he has a beautiful program which will cost thousands upon thousands of dollars.

I have in my hand a speech made by the Postmaster General in January which indicates the extent to which mail delivery is delayed between Montreal and Ottawa. He said that this unfortunate situation could be attributed in the main to an unanticipated and unforeseen increase in mail volume which has exceeded plant and trained staff capacity. If he has such a good training program, why then is there a shortage of trained staff?

Before that, the minister attempted to confuse the country and the house by remarks intended to take the heat off his department. I suppose that I might be considered as making an allegation, particularly by the minister. This would make me an "allegator". Being an "allegator" I suppose I must substantiate what I have suggested.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I have in my hand another one of the minister's speeches. This one was delivered on January 22. At that time he said in reference to the closing of small post offices:

> To give you an idea of the dimensions of this problem I might mention that one-quarter of our 10,000 post offices earn less than $450 a year—

One week later, on January 29 of the same year he made a speech in which he said:

> —I might mention that one-quarter of our 8,000 post offices earn less than $50 a year—

There appears to be some discrepancy in the minister's remarks. I am wondering how much attention we should pay to what he says. I have copies of both these speeches from which I have read directly.

The Postmaster General tries to blame the former Conservative government for the situation in which he finds himself. This Liberal government has been in power since 1963. Why has it not solved this problem in the past six years, and why is it only suddenly this year that all these problems have developed?

In January of 1969 the Postmaster General made another statement in respect of the inefficiency of the post office. He said:

> —in one post office which came to my attention the sole customers were the postmaster and his family.

If this sort of thing is going on, it must have been going on for six years under the Liberal government. I do not suppose this is a particularly good example of efficiency; that is, keeping a post office open at a cost of $1,000 or more to serve a man, his wife and family, then blaming the Conservatives for it.

The Postmaster General concluded his remarks on that occasion by stating an old cliché we often hear from government ministers. He suggested that the Conservative party is simply resisting change. He said that we resist changes, and that is the only thing we do. That is kind of ridiculous.

**An hon. Member:** How true.

**Mr. Yewchuk:** It is true that it is ridiculous. The minister must admit that change does not necessarily mean progress. Progress should not be confused with change or associated with it, because sometimes change brings about a worse situation. I think that is what the changes in the Post Office department in the past ten months have accomplished. There has been no indication of progress. If there has been progress, I have not been able to see it. Before the minister suggests that we are resistant to change and before he brings about any change, he should make sure that the situation will be better as a result.

We have all heard many valid criticisms of the Post Office department. I do not think I need mention all of them as they have been mentioned before by other hon. members. I should perhaps refer to deterioration of the situation faced by post office employees, to say nothing of the situation which now exists between officials of the department and the postal unions. Many of the changes made allegedly have been to increase efficiency. Many speakers have referred to this situation. I wish to refer to what has been called the post office reorganization. The matter of immediate concern is what I refer to as the arbitrary decision of the Postmaster General to close down many small post offices in Canada. Apparently this has been done with little or no concern whatsoever in respect of

the provision of alternative employment for the employees of these small offices. The minister appears to take this whole matter quite lightly, but this matter is not taken lightly by those individuals who have lost their jobs. The loss of a part or the whole of one's income is a serious matter.

This situation is even more important because this action has been taken in areas where it is difficult for individuals to find alternative employment. The post office department has outlined certain criteria for the closing of post offices. The first is that a post office must not serve less than 30 families. If it serves less than 30 families it is not worth keeping open. That is a questionable criterion. Officials of the post office department fail to realize that these small communities are dependant to a great degree on post office services. These services are essential to these isolated areas. Transportation and communication in these areas are limited because of geographical location. The closing of a post office means increased isolation for these points.

Another criterion followed by the post office department is that if an office has an income of under $1,000 per year it should be closed. This is nothing short of an absurdity. Post office services should be provided to serve Canadians. That is the only function of a post office. This department has never had any other function than to serve the people of Canada who pay for this service through taxation. It is ridiculous to suggest that a post office should make money. If this were the policy adopted by the government in all areas, no doubt the first thing the government would do—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. Does the house give its unanimous consent to the hon. member to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Yewchuk:** Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members of the house for their kindness. I have only one or two more points to make. The post office service has for years supplied Canadians a means for communication. This service is being taken away in many instances with a complete disregard for the people in these communities and those employed by the department. I strongly protest against this policy on the basis of numerous representations made to me by individual employees concerned and other interested parties. The government seems to forget that there is more to Canada than the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. I strongly urge the minister to reverse this policy decision which is, I might say, not only unfair but at times highly discriminatory.

• (8:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, even if I am a member of the opposition, I would like to say that the service of the Canadian Post Office is one of the best in the world, and that even ten months of mismanagement will not have been sufficient to make it as bad as the previous members have just said.

It is true that the service is, at this time, rather slow, but, in my opinion, that slowness is mostly due to the Air Canada strike. Before that happened, I had the opportunity to get to Vancouver. There, I posted a letter on a Sunday afternoon and it was delivered in Quebec City the following afternoon, or 24 hours later. It is simply wonderful.

It is obvious that we enjoy an excellent service. In big cities the mail is sorted rather well, and for a long time now the mail carriers have shown their honesty and their cooperation. In good or bad weather, those rural mail carriers deliver the mail and they never even get a holiday. In any case, they are generally so poorly paid that they do not even think of it.

As our time is restricted to 10 minutes, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to deal with some specific cases. However, I feel duty bound to pay tribute to those rural mail carriers who are awarded their contracts through out-of-date procedures. We must realize that the situation is not the present minister's doing, but is due to obsolete methods for the awarding of rural mail delivery contracts.

In view of increased responsibilities, the high cost of gasoline, insurance, car maintenance and the cost of living in general, I think the minister should conduct survey on this matter.

I now want to mention the closing of numerous post offices, something which should make us stop and think. Indeed, I believe the minister would close all the post offices of the country, if he could. I may exaggerate a bit, for I think he would spare a post office per capital, which is the least he could do.

We recall a statement of last winter to the effect that some post offices would be closed. I will repeat what the previous speaker said, it

must have been post offices which did not sell a thousand dollars worth of stamps a year and which served less than thirty families.

In Portneuf, for example, every effort is made to close down a post office which happens to serve sixty families, as well as two companies employing 150 people. One wonders what the minister goes by to take the action he does.

The minister may not be responsible for that situation, because he did not have time to consider every case throughout the country. He is now assisted by a greenhorn from Toronto, who has never seen nor heard anything. I feel that if the minister relies on him, mistakes are bound to occur. That is why I take this opportunity to outline the case of Portneuf.

With regard to the post office in Chute-Panet, which the minister wants to close down, the present system provides for clearing of mail twice a day. Now the minister's assistant tells me: Mind you, that is not a problem; your fellow-citizens will all agree, because we will improve the rural service. But the service offered them is a daily delivery, 24 hours late in winter. It is no secret that in winter, Monday's mail is delivered on Tuesday only. If this is what is called improved service, I think it is already too late to speak about it, and the day which has been allotted to us comes too late.

This is why I am asking myself questions.

However, there is even worse than that since a parish of 90 families is threatened with the loss of its post office. This is a parish which has been in existence for 100 years, with its church, its pastor, its municipal council, its school board, its industries. Nevertheless, the authorities have been advised that the post office will close shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether it is necessary to close so many post offices, in order to be able to pay fabulous salaries to a few civil servants hired recently. Would it not be possible to find elsewhere the money necessary to pay lavish salaries to those peoples?

They talk to us about savings. There are several ways of saving money. If the minister would resign, that, in itself, would constitute quite a saving. If the post offices were kept open only to sell stamps and if, instead of giving the mail to a truck driver, the postmaster would burn it, that would be even more economical than moving it from one post office to the next.



Those are the suggestions I wish to make to the minister, because I feel that one or two department officials alone are upsetting the postal system throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, the minister told us that the post offices which serve less than 30 families would be closed. At the time, the measure seemed normal. We accepted the implementation of such a policy.

However, as concerns the Chute-Panet post office, which, again, serves 60 families and two companies, that is twice the minimum of users required, and the post office located in the parish of Sainte-Christine-de-Portneuf, where 90 families live, and which, therefore, serves thrice as many users as the required minimum, the minister made a statement in the house last winter. I repeat that we should be concerned, for the minister really made the statement. In that respect, hon. members can refer to the official report of the House of Commons debates. In my opinion, the minister is still much too young to allow himself to forget what he said.

It is not the officials but the minister who should be blamed. If the latter is irresponsible or incompetent, I have the duty to inform those capable officers that they have our support and that we rely very much on them for the restoration of a normal service.

[*English*]

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few observations in this debate. First, I think the Postmaster General, now called the Minister of Communication et al, should be given a "for ever" because without any shadow of doubt he has done his best and is trying very hard to make a success of his new portfolio. After all, why wouldn't he? Any one taking on these onerous duties would naturally try to do the best he or she could. The trouble is that the minister might very well be typified as a prime example of the old saying that the road to Hades is paved with good intentions. That certainly seems to be the result of his efforts. Perhaps Hades also has a five day a week letter delivery service.

The minister suggested to the house that any individual member having complaints about delays in the postal service should submit those complaints to him in writing. I think that was a very good suggestion by the hon. gentleman. I only hope he has enough staff to cope with the correspondence he is likely to receive. In the event that the minister's staff may not be able to cope with the

complaints received, there are one or two matters which, by way of example, I should like to bring to his attention. I received a letter yesterday which exemplifies the problem inherent in the five day letter delivery system; it took five days for a letter to go 100 miles from the town of Tillsonburg in southwestern Ontario to Toronto.

This afternoon I received an even more interesting letter from a lady travelling overseas in the *Empress of England,* one of the Canadian Pacific ships. She was without a passport. Heaven knows, we have had enough trouble in that department. This lady was told that her passport would be waiting at the dock when the ship left Canada. It was not there. She is now on the high seas, and I understand the passport is en route by air. I checked on this matter and ascertained that it takes six days to obtain a passport. The poor lady was lucky to get anything from the passport office, but it seems that the system fell down when it came to sending the passport from Ottawa to Montreal. There are limits to everything. I am sure the minister has good intentions, and I hope his staff will give him a little more support in this regard.

Early last December I had occasion to write to the minister about the non-delivery of a package to a foreign country. The package was consigned to the Falkland Islands, South America, to be exact. I received a very nice, prompt reply from the minister who said that the package was being traced and in due course he would let me know the results of the investigation. That letter of December 10 was the last I heard about the matter. I realize that it sometimes takes time to check these things, but I am sure matters could be speeded up a little.

There are two matters in particular which I should like to bring to the minister's attention. I shall be brief because of the time at my disposal. I know these problems have been brought to the attention of the minister, but sometimes repetition has a salutary effect. The first is the new postal rates and their effect on farm, trade and Canadian magazines generally. I do not think I need emphasize these problems because they have been brought to the minister's attention so often that he must dream about them. However, I should like to refer in particular to the magazine of the Royal Canadian Legion. The minister was questioned about the committee some time ago about this matter. He said he did not see why the government should subsidize magazines put out by the Liberal party,

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

the Conservative party, the Royal Bank or anyone else. I would agree with him, but it has always been customary in this country since the first world war to provide a little assistance to those who were associated with the defence of this country. After all, those who took on the burden of public service during the first and second world wars did take on some risk, unlike a good many others I could think of who were very anxious for public service at a later date when no risk was involved.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Incidentally, I am not in any way referring to the minister in this connection, because his record in this regard is very good. It has always been our policy to give a little help to veterans in any way we could and I do not see why a magazine put out by the Legion should have been dealt with by the department in such a summary way. I believe a little consideration might have been shown.

This leads to a final observation on the minister's views concerning the way in which we should pay for the postal service. It is apparently some sort of fetish with the minister, and presumably with the cabinet that the post office must pay its way. On the face of it, this sounds a good idea. There is only one thing odd about it, and that is that none of the other forms of communication operated by the government do so or are intended to do so. Look at the C.B.C. We pay $150 million a year sending messages to the Eskimoes. A good idea, and I am all for it. But why should the Post Office Department, which deals with communications between one person and another, be singled out for this kind of discrimination? The Post Office must pay its way but the C.B.C. gets a blank cheque for putting out a daily dose of communist propaganda—that is about what we get from them. And it is done at the public expense. There is no rationale to this. If all kinds of communications in Canada operated by the government must pay their way, then let the C.B.C. pay its way. That would really be a dandy! I should like to see it happen. On the other hand, if there are to be subsidies in Canada—and we have all accepted that principle—because some parts of our country are handicapped because of sparseness of population, and so on, why single out the postal service?

What has happened is this: rates have gone up but the quality of service has gone down to just about rock bottom. Last November one could post a letter in this building at seven in the evening and it would be delivered in my

city, some 350 miles away, by the following morning. Since last November it has taken up to three days for such letters to be delivered. I do not know what has gone on in the department. The minister has made a number of fatuous statements in the house but no one has given any explanation. I do not know what the answer can be, but some time after last November the service was just cut off. What has happened in the rest of Canada I do not know, but I gather it is the same story.

I hope the minister's good intentions continue and that he will even more ardently pursue them. I trust that even if he cannot reduce the rates, even if he insists on making the Post Office pay for itself when nothing else does, he will at least make it a little more efficient.

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** I have a couple of questions to ask the Postmaster General, Mr. Speaker. He is not sitting in the house but he can stay behind the curtains and enjoy his coffee since he can hear me from there.

My first question has to do with the policy of the Post Office Department, maybe it was not the minister's policy in the first place, with regard to rural post offices. I believe I am not the only member who has written to the hon. gentleman in this connection. My objection is this: the department is following a blanket policy which is applicable not only to the suburbs of urban areas but to the rural parts of Canada. I suggest that the situation in the rural areas is a special one and that the same policy should therefore not be applied.

As I understand it, under the formula presently favoured, post offices are to be closed where there are less than 30 patrons. To hon. members representing urban centres, 30 patrons may not seem very many, but in areas such as I represent, areas devoted to ranching and farming, it is not unusual to find no more than 30 patrons within a radius of 50 miles. It is possible the Postmaster General does not realise that in areas such as these a rural post office is essential, particularly when we bear in mind the difficulty experienced in keeping young people on the farms and ranches in the face of the attraction of the urban centres. It is hard to keep young people on the farms out west at the present time. One of the considerations which hasten the movement to the cities is the lack of an adequate postal service.

On a previous occasion I had an opportunity to prove that information received by the Postmaster General from his officials was entirely wrong. The information related to two post offices in my area, offices whose future was in doubt. The officials wanted to close one of them because, they said, people residing in that particular area went to the other area to carry out all the rest of their business. I wrote to the Postmaster General of that day pointing out that in each case the post office was located in a ranch home, and that the information supplied by his officials to the effect that the people went to one particular place to buy groceries and so on was erroneous. I believe this situation was dealt with.

We are now receiving protests and petitions from our constituents in areas which may lose the services of their local post offices. I could explain to the Postmaster General at great length why it is necessary to keep many of these post offices open, even if they do fall within the terms of his formula. I have written to the hon. gentleman on a couple of occasions in this regard and I must say these representations have met with partial success. But I suggest to the minister that he review this formula and even if he makes it applicable to some areas, it should not be made to apply to certain rural areas which some of his officials have, quite possibly, never seen and never lived in.

I agree with those of my hon. friends who have referred to the Post Office as a service department rather than a revenue producing department. If it had been regarded as a revenue producing department, I suggest the west might never have been built up. I point out to him that regardless of the places where people buy their money orders and their stamps, the revenue will still flow to his department. I ask him again to recognize the special conditions which exist in the farming areas.

The second point I wish to raise flows from a question I asked the Postmaster General the other day. I had intended to ask a supplementary question but I did not press it after Mr. Speaker pointed out there would be an opportunity to go into the matter later on. I asked the Postmaster General why the department had removed second class mail privileges from the Canadian Legion magazine. He said it was because the magazine represented a particular group.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Then, I asked this supplementary question:

Can the minister explain why his department, while lifting second class privileges from legitimate

labour union publications, has granted such privileges to a whole string of communist and subversive publications, such as *Canadian Tribune, Communist Viewpoint, Combat, American Exile in Canada?*

The other day I had forwarded to me an article which appeared in a United States newspaper regarding the situation now existing in Canada in relation to our mail service. This article was clipped from one of the Denver, Colorado, papers, and although I do not want to read it all it does make a couple of very interesting points to which I hope the minister will have answers. The article refers to the new postal policy of the Canadian government and reads in part:

The government has declared that all periodicals "under the auspices of a fraternal, trade, professional or other association, or a trade union, credit union, co-operative or local church organization" are not to be allowed second class mailing privileges. Commercial, profit-making publications will continue to enjoy the second class rates, which are quite low compared to other postal charges.

This means that labour papers will have postage increases of up to 2,000 per cent in Canada. Annual mailing costs of *Canadian Transport* will rise from $1,057 to $29,696, for example.

The other day the minister was asked a question concerning the postal rates, and his reply was: "Well, let them raise their rates". Since all other ministers seem to be talking about the ills of the country and are worried about inflationary trends at the present time I am wondering why the Postmaster General is suggesting some of these publications should pay 2,000 per cent more than they were paying in postal rates. This would not seem to me to curtail inflation in Canada, but is just one more cost that is passed on to the public.

This article then goes on to raise what I think is one of the crucial issues we will have to face:

The increased postal rates, applied to non-profit but not to profit-making papers, will no doubt put some labour papers out of business.

Ironically, the new ruling will cost some Canadian printers their jobs because some printing previously done in Canada will be moved to the U.S.

Then, a little further on the article reads:

But now those internationals likely will quit printing in Canada and print in the U.S. for Canadian members, thus taking work away from Canadian printing craftsmen.

The postage rate for these papers printed in the U.S. and mailed to Canada is established by an international treaty, and does not change because of the new Canadian government action.

According to Canadian Labour Congress, the driving of this mailing back to the U.S. will cost the Canadian post office money, because the U.S. gets the postage paid in the U.S. on mail going to Canada.

It would appear that the Canadian government is cutting off its own nose to spite its face.

Perhaps the whole of this article may not be true, but I should like the Postmaster General to explain the wisdom of a move that causes publishers of periodicals that were recently printed in Canada to cease operation here and go to the United States. These periodicals will then be printed by United States craftsmen and the postal revenue from them will accrue to the U.S. treasury instead of the Canadian treasury. If this be the case—and the minister has not refuted it—Canada is losing revenue. The minister is not only contributing to inflation, as I said before, but he is also contributing by his action to a depletion of treasury funds. I should like to know what value such an action has.

The minister also has another formula under which profit-making magazines are allowed second class privileges whereas non-profit magazines are not. In the case of the Canadian Legion publication, the minister says this concession is denied because the magazine serves the interests of a particular group. I suggest that the communist and subversive publications to which I have referred in the past are also serving a particular group.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please.

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate I should like to repeat the motion that is before the house today. It reads:

This house regrets that this government's mismanagement of the postal service imposes on the country a steadily deteriorating service at higher cost to the public and contributes to a declining morale among the postal workers.

It is with real sadness in my heart that I speak this evening. The affable, humane and personable Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) has been sitting across the way all day in lonely solitude, and he is not even on the roster. He has had to come here and present a case in an attempt to deflect some of the constructive suggestions that have come from those on this side. It has struck me as passing strange that instead of listening to the multitude of members who could have risen and given some solace to this hard pressed, well intentioned minister, we have had silence. Perhaps these hon. members have not yet received the letter the minister

may have written to them informing them that this motion was coming on today, since he only had 24 hours' notice. As we have already heard, mail dropped down the chute here today does not even get around these offices, let alone other government offices, within 24 hours, so perhaps it is understandable that no government member has spoken in support of the minister.

**Mr. Cafik:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Nowlan:** When the notice went to the whip's office—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Ontario is raising a point of order.

**Mr. Cafik:** Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather important that I indicate that I do intend to speak. I rose in my place to be recognized, but there seems to be a deferential attitude taken to the opposition side of the house.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. That is not a point of order. The hon. member will have an opportunity to make a speech.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Mr. Speaker, I am glad we have finally stimulated some interest on the other side in helping the minister.

I am not going to repeat what has been said here today about the 100 per cent increase in box rentals, the reduced service and the elimination of rural post offices, something that has affected my riding. Let me just put the subject of this debate into a national perspective. The people in my hometown, which is a pretty well populated and developed area of Nova Scotia, are articulate and like to write letters. It has been brought to the minister's attention that it took five days for a first class business letter containing payment cheques to contractors in Halifax to be transmitted 60 miles from Wolfville to Halifax. It also took seven days to send a letter from Wolfville to Ottawa.

If I thought we were being discriminated against in this respect I would read this letter, but I also received a letter from a very good friend of mine who is a member of a leading law firm in Vancouver. He wrote me complaining that one letter, took seven days to go from Victoria to Vancouver, and this in the merry month of May. I have not yet had a chance to give the minister details of this particular incident, so perhaps there is an answer to it.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I do not rise this evening for the purpose of complaining about individual cases of deteriorating service and increasing costs, but really to bring a philosophical touch if possible to this debate. I suggest there is a sincere sense of sadness in Canada today at the slow service and increased cost of our postal facilities as well as a disappointment with the minister himself. One year and six months ago there was great expectation when this man rode out of Quebec on his white charger and injected great excitement and clarity into the Liberal sweepstake race. Canadians were entranced and many of them, I know, sympathized with him—perhaps not with their ballots—and with his stand. They took notice of the questions he said Canadians should answer. He carried on a most constructive leadership campaign and Canadians seeing him on T.V. saw all the best qualities of a good Irishman. After all, he came from a proven administration in the provincial field. Unfortunately, for a multitude of reasons, his performance in the post office and communications field has been to say the least—and I use an understatement—disappointing. The irony and paradox of the matter is that the Minister of Communications has failed to communicate with hon. members here, including the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik).

**An hon. Member:** That's Irish irony.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Yes, that is Irish irony, to say the least. He has failed to communicate with the public. Our people are accustomed to television and may become accustomed to "telstar" communications. They are prepared to accept a message when it is well put and convincing. But the minister did not communicate with the public. When he dropped the ax, raised postage rates and failed to communicate with his own workers, the trouble began.

The first real mistake the minister made was in not following suggestions made by hon. members on this side of the house that his bill go to committee to be discussed. In this way there could have been communication, a little education, a little change and, perhaps, some constructive criticism. One can only be amazed at the poor performance of the minister when one considers his background. In fact, when you come down to it, we are all disappointed with the performance of the government and with the man who rode in on the white charger to stimulate Canadians to the point where he won the

leadership contest of his party and was elected Prime Minister. His performance these past two years has been disappointing. Although Spring has come and the flowers are blooming in Ottawa, I say that Canadians are not prepared to go on sniffing flowers. Long ago someone said that the people should eat cake when bread was scarce. Here we are in economic difficulties and the government is still sniffing flowers. School children may continue singing their hosannas, but Canadians are beginning to sing the blues because of the economic problems confronting the country.

Canadians have become apprehensive on seeing the deterioration from coast to coast of a previously good postal service. The Post Office performance was good in B.C. before E.K. You could speak about B.C. in times that were B.K. No matter how you fool around with the initials, Post Office performance has slipped and the Canadian public has become apprehensive about the administration of the department. Although the minister is interested in other areas of endeavour I am confining my remarks to the Post Office Department. At one time the phrase "post haste" meant something. It means little now when Post Office performance has been slipping.

Since I can only speak for ten minutes—and the time limit is somewhat restrictive—I wish to point out that we also have problems in the area of passports. Canadians legitimately are concerned about government inadequacies in Post Office administration and in matters relating to passports. Our people have become understandably concerned about government defence reviews, social welfare programs and a host of other matters coming under the purview of government policy. Where can the government employ this minister? If one examines the list of ministers one will see that they are reasonably secure in their slots. I, therefore, say that this minister will have to go.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

**Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario):** Mr. Speaker, I was prompted to rise in this debate because of the remarks of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). I see that he has returned to the house. First, I apologize for not being here for the entire debate, since I had to serve this afternoon on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. I wish to make a few brief comments about some of the matters raised this evening. On an earlier occasion when the government sought to bring forward legislation to increase postage rates, hon. members of the opposition indicated they were opposed to those increases. I merely wish to point out that in the Public Accounts Committees of previous parliaments, the views expressed by hon. members of the opposition were not the views they expressed publicly here in the House of Commons. To illustrate this point may I refer to the follow-up report of the Auditor-General to the Public Accounts Committee dated October 31, 1968. This document refers to the 4th report of the Public Accounts Committee for the year 1963 presented to the House of Commons on December 19 of that year. The document reads in part:

> The Committee expressed its belief that Early consideration should be given by Parliament to ways and means of covering the loss of the Post Office Department in handling second class mail and requested the Auditor General to keep the matter before Parliament in his annual Reports in order that subsequent committees may give consideration to it.

In its Fourth Report of 1966-67, the Committee stated in part:

> —that it feels that there is something wrong when no action has been taken with respect to, and apparently very little consideration given to, its recommendation on this matter. The Committee first drew the matter to the attention of the House in its Third Report 1958 and, while minor changes have been made, the annual loss has continued to increase and the Committee is of the opinion that sufficient consideration has not been given to the solution of this problem. It considers it essential that the Post Office Department or Parliament immediately find ways and means of covering the loss of the Post Office Department in handling second class mail without this being done at the expense of other classes of mail, keeping in mind, however, the need of assistance to small independently-owned newspapers circulating in rural areas.

The latter recommendations I believe were put forward by an all party committee of the House of Commons. In the first meeting of that committee in the twenty-eighth parliament—and I am a committee member—arguments arose as to whether those recommendations had been implemented. At that time the Auditor General indicated that some slow progress was being made towards achieving implementation of these recommendations. We all know that the twenty-eighth parliament has passed a bill to increase postal rates, particularly second class mailing rates. Hon. members opposite have argued that this was an unpopular and improper action to take. According to the information I have the opposite conviction was expressed by those same hon. members in the Public Accounts

Committee when they made their recommendations.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

• (9:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Cafik:** I do not believe it is fair to the Canadian people or this institution for members to talk one way in committee and another in the House of Commons.

**Mr. McIntosh:** The hon. member says that because he has not been here long enough.

**Mr. Cafik:** The postal rates which have been talked about today are fair and reasonable. Frankly, I do not believe it is in the interest of the taxpayers of this country to subsidize to a greater extent than we are presently doing those people using second class mail privileges. I think most Canadians would subscribe to this principle.

The next point is with respect to services in the Post Office Department. We must bear in mind one other step the department has taken, that is not only to increase revenues which will reduce deficits to the taxpayers but also to decrease operating costs. To some extent this move has contributed to the present upset in the postal service in Canada.

The decision to close certain rural post offices because they are not paying their own way has disturbed some postal workers. The move to a five-day week has certainly upset other people. These two decisions, plus necessary changes in procedure and training, were necessitated by increases in the volume of mail. As Canadians we must face the challenge and realize we are moving into a new kind of postal era. We must be willing to face the temporary problems that these necessary changes inflict upon the people of Canada. We must be patient. I honestly believe the Postmaster General is a man with the courage and capability of seeing this problem through and that in the long run we will have less costly and better service in the Canadian post office.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Until the last speaker rose, I was wondering whether any backbenchers in the Liberal Party would participate in this debate. I was glad to see one member had the courage to speak in support of the Post Office Department. As the Postmaster General was not receiving unanimous support from his own party, I was sure he would be the candidate for the next Senate appointment for the province of Quebec.

I concur 100 per cent with the mover of the amendment, the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) and other members who have spoken, such as the hon. member for Surrey (Mr. Mather). They express the concern of the average citizen of this country as to what is happening in the Post Office Department today. I will not waste time by repeating arguments put forth by other hon. members.

I would like to mention one or two fundamental principles that have been violated by the Post Office legislation. First and foremost, there are minorities who have been throttled because of the increased rates in postage. I am speaking of some ethnic groups and church groups. Secondly, aspects of the postal legislation are contributing to the selling out of Canada, in particular to the United States. I refer, of course, to subsidies granted to *Time* Magazine, *Reader's Digest* and to other aspects of the bill. Even more important, the postal legislation is following the way of many other items in the government. What is happening in the government is summed up in an article, written by Steven Clarkson of the University of Toronto, which appeared in a Toronto newspaper. He said that the concept of participatory democracy has been changed by this government to that of participatory autocracy.

The decisions are made by fewer and fewer people every day in many fields of jurisdiction. As time goes on more and more people are expendable. Fewer and fewer people are making the decisions which count in this country. I agree many reforms have to be made in the Post Office Department. Many groups and organizations being subsidized were basically freeloaders. When making changes and reforms, we must be careful where the changes are going to be made and who they will affect. The financial burdens of some minorities should not be increased.

What is efficient is not always the most effective for all people.

Some of the most efficient organizations in the world are not effective for most of the people which they are supposed to serve. The basic priority of the Post Office Department is that it should be a service to the people regardless of the economic and social background of those people. The hardest hit were church groups, labour groups, farmers, co-operatives, the ethnic press, political journals and magazines. Many of these minorities do not have a voice in the big daily presses of Canada.

Many small journals and periodicals are no longer able to get their point of view across. Some have ceased to exist. Those that do exist have had to cut down content and reduce frequency of publication. This means that essentially the power of the press is being concentrated in fewer hands in Canada. Consequently, there are fewer dissenting voices in the communication industry today than even four or five months ago, so, public participation and involvement in many of the issues important to us has also been reduced. This is happening at a time when the opposite trend should be encouraged and pursued in this country.

One of the essential factors in democracy is to have people participating and involving themselves in all levels of society. People should be encourage to criticize institutions. The basic right of dissent should be protected. We must fight for the voices of the minorities. It is even more important now; in an age that is affected by automation and technology because in this automated world people are often dehumanized and depersonalized. Cities are often concrete jungles with the result that many people are frustrated and alienated. People want a purpose. They want some part in the decisions which affect their lives. They want equality of effort and a purpose for their life. They will not tolerate a denial of their rights. If they are denied participation and equality of effort, they are going to criticize. This is a natural psychological phenomena.

It is only about 14 months ago that I was a university student, and watched the Liberal leadership campaign with some interest. All of us interested in political and current affairs on the university campus were quite in agreement that the present Postmaster General was one of the more progressive people in the leadership campaign. He seemed to have a social insight and understood some of the basic problems confronting us. He has been a big disappointment to me, for now he is one of the most conservative people in the government. In fact I think the Leader of the Conservative party (Mr. Stanfield) would agree with me on that. I often wonder whether the minister is not just a Joe boy to the system, because this is what we have all around us. Today power is controlled by fewer and fewer people. It does not matter what field of jurisdiction is involved. In foreign affairs you see a government that does not want to become involved—

[Mr. Nystrom.]

• (9:30 p.m.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but we would like to see him come back to the Post Office.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point I was making was that what is happening in the Post Office today is not isolated from what is happening in other aspects of government. You see this refusal to get involved on behalf of people in almost every field. I have mentioned foreign affairs. Those of us who come from the west know it is happening in agriculture. We heard the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) say, "Why should I sell wheat." This is just one example of what is happening, and where the government refuses to involve itself.

Now, returning to one of the basic issues that are important in this debate, the denial to minorities of the voice that they should have, I point out that the increase in postal rates is more than 2,000 per cent in some cases. These increases have caused many journals to fold up. Others have had to cut down on frequency of publication and others on content. In this connection I should like to quote from the *Canadian Railwayman* of April 12, 1969 an article headed "Labour Papers Hard Hit by New Postal Increases."

> The increase has forced the *Labour Statesman*, official organ of the B.C. Federation of Labour, to cease publication on a regular basis after 45 years. It now will be published periodically on special occasions.
>
> *Canadian Transport*, official journal of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport and General Workers, which formerly was issued twice monthly, now will appear only once during June, July and August... the official publication of the Quebec Federation of Labour is to appear only six times a year instead of monthly.
>
> We deplore the philosophy behind the legislation: profit-making periodicals such as *Reader's Digest*—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. The hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief so as to give the hon. member opposite the opportunity to take the floor in a few minutes.

However, I should like to state quite simply that I have every reason in the world to believe that the new policy of the Department of Communications is the best one ever insofar as it meets today's needs of the Canadian Post Office.

I fully trust in the minister's and the government's skills to take the bull by the horns and to bring it to reason. My remarks are not directed here to Post Office employees in my area, because they are good public servants, and I am proud to underline their efforts towards a better Canada by going their humble way rain or shine.

However, there are things which I find difficult to understand sometimes, and I want to deal particularly with the city of Edmundston, where I settled two years ago. This is not some sort of destructive criticism of the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans). I simply want reasonable explanations, and I feel that between reasonable people, it is possible to come to terms.

Some time ago, I asked the Postmaster General to consider opening two sub-offices in the city of Edmundston. After an inquiry by his officials, the minister granted my request, for which I thank him.

However, as a consequence, it was decided to close on Saturdays the main post office located in Edmundston-Center, and the sub-offices, located in Edmundston West and in Edmundston East remain open.

Now, on Saturday, the post office in Edmundston Centre being closed, people are told to purchase their stamps at the post offices in Edmundston East or Edmundston West. Of course, people do not accept that.

**Mr. Caouette:** It is not a good system.

**Mr. Corbin:** As reasonable people, we should be able to come to an understanding.

There must be a reason for that. If the Minister of Communications would give us an explanation, I would accept it, and I can give you my word that my fellow-citizens would accept it also.

Maybe I am a little pessimistic, but sometimes I have the impression that the Minister of Communications is being brainwashed by some officials. I cannot prove it, but I have serious doubts about this.

**Mr. Caouette:** How true!

**Mr. Corbin:** I have serious doubts, and this not only as far as the Post Office Department is concerned but in the case of other federal government departments.

Once more, I am glad to emphasize the fact that the government is looking into those matters and that it is making an inquiry regarding all the complaints received in this respect.



**Mr. Caouette:** The same situation prevails in the constituency of Bonaventure.

**Mr. Corbin:** It is quite possible but, for the information of Mr. Caouette, I do not live there.

As a proof that the Liberal government has turned its attention to the postal service in Canada and particularly in my area, Mr. Speaker, I submit that since 1964, more than 14 regional rural post offices have been established to serve a total population of 55,000.

As I said a moment ago, this proves two things. Firstly, that the Liberal government has met the Canadian citizens' needs; secondly, that it has made up for the harmful effects caused by the previous government's inaction. And for that, I wish to congratulate it warmly.

The postal service has been greatly improved and as far as my own riding is concerned, there remains only a little polishing up to do over the service, as a whole.

We are going through difficult times, from an economic point of view. My fellow-citizens are ready to tighten their belts—

**An hon. Member:** It is not true.

**Mr. Corbin:** It is quite true. They have done it in the past and they are ready to do it again in the future.

Mr. Speaker, through you, I wish to assure the Minister of Communications of my constituents' admiration and I want to tell him that I shall vote against the motion under consideration.

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have a few moments to speak on this non-confidence motion concerning the government's mismanagement of the postal service. I congratulate the two members of the Liberal party the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) and the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) for rising and trying to defend their minister. It is the first time since I became a member of this house that so few speakers have risen to protect a minister of any department.

I wish to congratulate especially the hon. member for Ontario who is also a member of the Public Accounts Committee which it is my honour to chair. He is quite right when he says we did report to the house that there should be ways and means found to cover the loss on second class mail. However at no

time did the committee feel we were going to get less service following an increase in rates. This is the problem today. I do not think there is any member of this house or any person in all of Canada who goes to the post office to buy a stamp who does not realize he is paying more and getting less service.

Last fall when the Post Office bill, Bill C-116 was before this house we in the opposition begged and pleaded with the minister—and even moved an amendment—to refer the bill to a committee so that organizations, companies, newspapers and individuals who were going to be affected could appear before the committee. But the minister would not listen. He said, "no; I have given you a white paper. We will ram this through." He rammed it through and now where does he find himself? He begged for the bill to go to the committee. What do we find now? Newspapers are dying by the week. Many have gone out of business. They were denied a hearing before the committee, and this has happened. I believe much of this distress could have been avoided had the minister allowed the bill to go to a committee where hearings could have been held. Then there were the surveys which the minister has had. Some of the information contained in these survey reports was not according to the facts. The Postmaster General was told in the case of one newspaper that the papers had to be sorted and carted here and there. Now we find this is not the case. The newspapers are delivered in bags which are already addressed.

The minister mentioned the training of personnel and what little the Conservatives did about this. I do not wish to become involved in politics in respect of this matter. I may say, however, that with the untrained men we apparently had then better service was given than is given today. With untrained men, we had excellent delivery. We did not have a situation like this: a letter from my home city of Guelph was posted Monday night at six o'clock. It went through the stamping machine at eleven o'clock on Monday night and arrived on my desk this afternoon, Thursday. This is five day delivery and we used to have next day delivery.

Before you rise, Mr. Speaker, to advise me that my time has expired I should like to ask what the answer is. I know the Postmaster General wants to get out of this mumbo-jumbo in which he finds himself in respect of the Post Office Department. I think the only answer is to return to the six day a week delivery.

There is not another country in the world which attempts to deliver a week's mail in five days. It is not done in the United States. We in Canada, however, think we can deliver a week's mail in five days. It has been proven now that we cannot do it and at the same time give service. We are paying more for less. If the people were dealing with something else they could go to another store and obtain better service, but in this case they do not have that opportunity. It is up to the government and parliament to provide the people of Canada with more service for the amount of money they are paying.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. It being 9.45 p.m. it is my duty, pursuant to section (9) of Standing Order 58 to interrupt these proceedings and forthwith put every question in respect of the proceedings now before the house.

The question is on the amendment to the main motion. All those in favour of the amendment please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Those opposed please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

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

*And more than five members having risen:*

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

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Benjamin), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

| | |
|---|---|
| Aiken | Gilbert |
| Alexander | Gleave |
| Alkenbrack | Grills |
| Barnett | Gundlock |
| Bell | Hales |
| Bigg | Hees |
| Broadbent | Howe |
| Burton | Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) |
| Caouette | Lambert (Edmonton West) |
| Carter | La Salle |
| Code | Lewis |
| Crouse | MacDonald (Egmont) |
| Danforth | MacEwan |
| Dinsdale | MacInnis |
| Dionne | MacInnis (Mrs.) |
| Downey | Macquarrie |
| Forrestall | |
| Gauthier | |

McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Noble
Nowlan
Nystrom
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rondeau
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Skoberg
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Winch
Woolliams
Yewchuk—67.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Basford
Béchard
Benson
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brown
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Danson
De Bané
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Émard
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Mongrain
O'Connell
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Pilon
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Rochon
Rock
Roy (Timmins)
Ryan
Serré
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Whelan
Whiting—99.



*Division*

• (10:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost. The question is now on the main motion.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Macquarrie) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Barnett
Bell
Bigg
Broadbent
Burton
Caouette
Carter
Code
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Downey
Forrestall
Gauthier
Gilbert
Gleave
Grills
Gundlock
Hales
Hees
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lewis
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacEwan
MacInnis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Macquarrie
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Noble
Nowlan
Nystrom
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rondeau
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Skoberg
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson
Winch
Woolliams
Yewchuk—67.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Badanai
Basford
Béchard
Benson
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brown
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Danson
De Bané
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Émard
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans

*Division*

Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Mongrain
O'Connell
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Pilon
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
Richardson
Roberts
Rochon
Rock
Roy (Timmins)
Ryan
Serré
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanbury
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Whelan
Whiting—99.

• (10:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

### MOTION TO REFER BILL TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** I wonder whether I could be permitted to revert to motions for the purpose of making a motion that has been discussed with the house leaders of other parties.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. MacEachen:** The purpose of the motion is to provide that Bill C-120, the official languages bill, be sent to a special committee rather than the committee on justice and legal affairs. Therefore, with the unanimous consent of the house I move, seconded by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand):

That a special committee be appointed to consider Bill C-120, An Act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to print from day to day its evidence and proceedings, to sit while the House is sitting, and to report from time to time;

That the said committee consist of 12 Members to be designated at a later date; and that Government Order Number 4 on the Order Paper be amended to reflect the proposed change in the committee to which the bill will be referred.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Speaker:** It being after ten o'clock, this house stands adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

At 10.18 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Friday, May 16, 1969**

The house met at 11 a.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### LABOUR, MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Sixth report of standing committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration—Mr. Caccia.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

RESPONSE BY GOVERNMENT TO INFLATIONARY PRESSURES

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Since the consumer price index rose by 1.9 per cent in the first four months of this year, is the government still working on assumptions made at the time of the budget that the inflationary factor during this fiscal year would be 3.5 per cent? Is the government still basing its plans on that forecast of inflationary factors, or has it revised its plans?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I really could not answer as to the 3.5 per cent. I know we have not changed our general assumptions. In any event, this is the kind of question the Minister of Finance will be discussing in his forthcoming budget speech.

**Mr. Stanfield:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sure this matter is of interest to parliament and the country. Is the view of the government still, as expressed earlier in the year, that inflationary pressures in Canada have begun to ease, or has the government revised its attitude as to the urgency of inflation?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, one of the things we have thought about most is the necessity of curbing inflation. I commented on this question last week. Those comments did not imply that we are not still concerned about inflation and that we are not bringing to bear policies and measures intended to curb it.

**Mr. Stanfield:** A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it still the view of the government that inflationary pressures this year, as compared with those of last year, have begun to ease?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Well, Mr. Speaker when we said they had eased, I suppose they had eased. Of course whether they have eased is a matter of fact. It is our impression that the pressures have eased, and must continue to ease. Whether those pressures are less now than they were then is something I do not wish to speculate about.

### THE BUDGET

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PRESENTATION OF BUDGETARY PROPOSALS

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the Prime Minister always chooses his words very carefully and since he said a moment ago that the Minister of Finance would be making a budget speech, does that mean we are to have another budget?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we said that time would be set aside in June for the budget debate. That means there will be a budget debate.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Will there be a budget?

### INDUSTRY

AUTOMOBILES—ALLEGED REVENUE LOSS THROUGH CANADA-U.S. AGREEMENT—PARITY PRICES

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Since he is not in the house may I direct it to the Prime Minister. Does the government intend to recover by any means the $80 million lost in customs duties to the automobile industry as a result of a recent order-in-council?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I will take this question as notice.

[*English*]

**Mr. Broadbent:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce was about to rise to answer my previous question. Perhaps he could be recognized.

**Mr. Pepin:** Mr. Speaker, I was indeed about to rise.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I notice the hon. member for Wellington wishes to ask a supplementary question. Perhaps the minister could answer both questions at the same time.

**Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a supplementary question to the Minister of National Revenue. Will he assure the house that his department will collect all taxes due and owing under the United States-Canada Auto Pact in the normal way, and remit taxes in accordance with the terms of the pact.

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, I think that question has already been answered on the order paper.

**Mr. Broadbent:** May I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Mr. Speaker. Does he intend to take steps in the near future to compel the auto industry within a reasonable period of time to effect price parity in the automotive industry of Canada vis-à-vis that industry in the United States.

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, this is not part of the automobile pact. It is certainly, however, the intention of the government and of the industry to get parity of prices as rapidly as possible. Improvements have been made toward that objective.

If Your Honour will allow me to answer the general question, which pertains to the Departments of Finance, National Revenue and myself as responsible for the automobile pact, I will say that the automobile industry has done a very good job of implementing the pact and getting all the possibilities out of it. I think everyone recognizes this. I see some hon. members on the other side nodding in approval of that. The industry has done so—



**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It seems the minister is now making a very general statement. I would not think that would be in order at this time.

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister consult with his colleague the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs as to whether the pricing policies of the automobile industry warrant an inquiry under the Combines Investigation Act?

**Mr. Pepin:** Mr. Speaker, the administration of the auto pact is difficult, and in doing it one must bear in mind the spirit or intention as well as the letter of the agreement. I think in all these matters the spirit is more important than the letter. In implementing we have been looking at the general results, at the growth in production, in productivity, in exports, in employment, in taxes collected, investments made. This is why we have been quite willing to accommodate the industry when some technicalities arose. This is what we have done in the remission of the $80 million potential tariff which the government of Canada could have collected under the agreement.

**Mr. Hales:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the minister will realize the law is also important. Does the minister agree with his colleague, the Minister of Finance, when he said those who had slipped by a slight amount were not now going to be penalized and forced to pay the $80 million?

**Mr. Speaker:** The question as asked is not in order.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Will the minister agree that the automotive industry on the Canadian side of the border, according to most efficiency experts, is now just as efficient as the industry south of the border?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think the question is argumentative.

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the minister spoke of all the facets he was considering, he forgot about the Canadian prospective buyers having to pay through the nose. What has been done for the Canadian buyer of cars—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** When the minister was looking at all the advantages of

the trade pact did he also look into the question of the prices charged by the automobile manufacturers to Canadian purchasers of automobiles? Is he really satisfied that his so-called narrowing of the gap has met with the spirit of the pact which aimed at parity of prices?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. When asking the second supplementary, the hon. member was asking for an expression of opinion. I doubt whether that would be in order. The minister may wish to answer the first question.

**Mr. Pepin:** I was so interested in the second question, I lost track of the first one.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. While the hon. member reflects on the supplementary perhaps we might give an opportunity to other members to raise other subjects which I am sure are important.

**Mr. Lewis:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. When answering the question the minister spoke a great deal about the spirit of the pact being more important than the letter, and indicated a number of ways in which he thought the pact had worked out advantageously. With great respect it seems to me it is not out of order to ask him, in the words he used, whether the soaking of the Canadian purchaser is within the spirit of the pact.

**Mr. Speaker:** What I am suggesting to the hon. member at the moment is that we have had a sufficient number of supplementaries and I think we might go on to another subject.

[*Translation*]

## TRADE

### WHEAT—INQUIRY AS TO SALE OF SURPLUS

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Does the minister foresee any new possibilities of selling the surplus of wheat that we have at the moment in western Canada?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** No, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

### ADHERENCE BY AUSTRALIA TO INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of recent reports that the Australian government is not willing to divulge the price at which recent sales of wheat were made to China, can the minister assure the house that this information is available to the signatories of the International Grains Arrangement within the International Grains Council, and can he inform the house whether any real progress is being made toward stabilizing prices under the International Grains Arrangement?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, I could not give an absolute answer to this but I understand that the lines of communication between exporters, and in particular between Canada and Australia, are extremely good.

**Mr. Gleave:** As a supplementary question could the minister give the house an indication of whether or not it is the government's intention to establish a firm support price for farmers at the minimum levels of the International Grains Arrangement? Is this under consideration? Our farm people would very much like to know.

**Mr. Pepin:** I have already said that all these suggestions made on all sides of the house, and by different associations representative of farmers, are being studied by the government, and any new policy will be announced in due course.

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Has the minister made any real attempt to determine whether or not Australia intends to recognize the International Grains Arrangement for the next crop year or for any date in the future?

**Mr. Pepin:** Because I spoke with the minister of trade for Australia I know that Australia has the same difficulty we have in respect of marketing wheat. I know the Australian government has decided to take responsibility for marketing only 357 million bushels out of a possible 500 million bushels and more. The farmers of Australia apparently will have to adapt to the circumstances. I was given assurances that Australia was and will be living up to the I.G.A.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## MR. SPEAKER LAMOUREUX

FELICITATIONS UPON CONFERRING OF HONORARY DEGREE BY DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I know I am clearly out of order, but I also know you have to leave the chamber, and so may I take this opportunity personally, and I am sure on behalf of the house to express felicitations to you as you depart to accept an honorary degree, which you certainly justly deserve, from a great university in an important part of the country. May we all extend our very best wishes and congratulations to you.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

## AIR CANADA

STRIKE OF MECHANICS—INQUIRY AS TO PROGRESS IN NEGOTIATIONS

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Transport are not in their places today, and since this concerns western Canada probably more than any other part of the country, I wish to ask the Prime Minister if he has anything to report about the negotiations in reference to the Air Canada strike?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** No, Mr. Speaker, I know the negotiations have been going on for part of the night and that the Minister of Labour has been attending them. I had a report this morning that things were looking up and that we might be optimistic, but I do not know how long it will take.

## ESTATE TAX ACT

REQUEST FOR SUMMARY OF INTERPRETATIONS BY OFFICIALS

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Will he give to this house the list or summary of the interpretations given by his officials with regard to the Estate Tax Act and the gift tax that was passed recently by this house, in accordance with an undertaking which the minister gave before a committee of the other place?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I think the committee hearings in the other place will be published, and of course they will be available to all members of this house. I believe members of the committee in the other place indicated that they were going to have a large number of extra copies published so that they would be available to the public generally.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated that he himself would give a summary of the interpretations of his officials that have been made with regard to the act. This is what I am after; not what was said in the other place.

**Mr. Benson:** Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to supply this in due course.

## GRAIN

WHEAT—GRADES IN POSITION FOR SHIPMENT

**Mr. George Muir (Lisgar):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the minister told us he would be making a report on the shipments of grain for export. Is he prepared to do that today?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** I have figures with regard to the Lakehead and the movements from there. I cannot say whether this is for export or upstream—I don't know what the word is, but there must be a word, possibly storage. The movement—

**An hon. Member:** Do you know what you are talking about?

**Mr. Pepin:** Much more than you know.

**Mr. Hees:** So there; so there!

**Mr. Pepin:** The movement up to May 7 this year is 30.3 million bushels as opposed to 31.7 million bushels last year. So, it is about the same. With regard to Churchill, the elevator of Churchill is full to its working capacity of 4.7 million bushels. The rail movement of grain to Churchill will commence about July, just before the opening of the Churchill shipping season which extends from the last week of July to mid October.

**Mr. Muir (Lisgar):** Since the minister is so full of spirit today I wonder whether he could instil some of it into our grain export.

**Mr. Pepin:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development with reference to the revolving loan fund which

has been set up to assist our Indian people in the field of agricultural land development. Can the minister advise the house whether a further allocation of funds is expected and when he expects these further funds will be available to take care of the loans which have not yet been approved?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I am aware of this problem which is corollary to the loans program operated under the Farm Improvement Loans Act and I know that officials of my department were in Manitoba yesterday or the day before, to speed up approval of pending applications.

## NATIONAL PARKS

GASPÉ—AGREEMENT BETWEEN PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

**Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Following the Prime Minister's statement, yesterday, concerning the latest proposals made by the federal government with regard to Forillon park, could the minister tell the house whether the Quebec government has finally agreed to the principle and the main conditions of the development of that park?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had telephone conversations with the Quebec premier and his Minister of Tourism yesterday, and we agreed in principle. The Minister of Tourism is coming to Ottawa next Tuesday to finalize the agreement.

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development regarding Forillon park.

I understand the minister must go to Val-d'Or today for the inauguration of the airport. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I am wishing the minister a nice trip in that beautiful area of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, does the minister have any idea when the federal-provincial agreement on Forillon park will be reached, so that we can immediately start developing this park?

**Mr. Chrétien:** I think we will be able to reach a definite agreement next Tuesday.

[*English*]

SECOND NATIONAL PARK IN SASKATCHEWAN

**Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister a supplementary question in respect of parks. On April 22, 1965 the federal government announced a second national park for the province of Saskatchewan. Can the minister indicate what progress is being made in this regard?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, negotiations are still under way and I hope that we will soon be able to make a regulation in the best interest of the citizens of Saskatchewan and of all Canadians.

[*English*]

JASPER—INQUIRY AS TO EASING OF RESTRICTIONS

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, during the minister's recent visit to Jasper National Park did he meet with the citizens of Jasper and was he able to give them some assurance in respect of an easing of the heavy hand of government and bureaucracy in that park?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I met—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I have some doubts about that question. It seems to me to be argumentative.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, was the minister able to meet—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Possibly the hon. member would like to rephrase his question. I have ruled it out of order, so I do not think there can be a supplementary question.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** I shall rephrase the supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister meet with the residents of Jasper National Park and was he able to come to any agreement in resolving their current problems?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, I met at least 600 citizens from Jasper as well as the members of the Chamber of Commerce. We dis-

cussed all the problems of interest to the people of Jasper park and even if we have not solved them all I think we have made good contacts which will lead to better understanding in the future.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate that as a result of these conservations he was able to obtain assurance that there would be no interruption of services to the booming tourist industry in that part of Canada?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, I heard the representations from Jasper businessmen and we discussed problems together. If some businessmen want to close down their establishments this summer, I cannot prevent them from doing so. However, it must always be kept in mind that national parks exist first of all in the interests of all Canadians and not only in the interests of businessmen who make profits in that area.

## TRADE

### ORANGE JUICE—DUMPING PRACTICES IN TORONTO AND MONTREAL MARKETS

**Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance.

Is he aware that some American dealers are dumping their dirt cheap soft drinks on the Montreal and Toronto markets?

[*English*]

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** No, Mr. Speaker.

## PUBLIC SERVICE

### SUPERANNUATED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF COMMITTEE REPORT ON INCREASED PENSIONS

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the President of the Treasury Board based on a statement contained in his speech in Montreal on May 8 to the first annual conference of the Canadian Pension Conference—and I thank him for sending me a copy of his speech. In view of his statement that the report of a special committee referred to by the Prime Minister, which dealt with the question of increasing the pensions of retired public servants, has been received, can the minister say whether a copy of this report will be tabled?

[Mr. Chrétien.]

**Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, this is not a report which was made to me. I do know that it was prepared for internal use only and I cannot give a definitive answer without consultation. I suspect it will not be tabled.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell me whether this question of increasing the pensions of retired civil servants is now under serious consideration, active consideration or hopeful consideration?

**Mr. Drury:** Mr. Speaker, it is under all three.

## TRANSPORT

### INQUIRY AS TO TABLING OF STANFORD STUDIES

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the acting government house leader in reference to the Stanford report on the Northumberland causeway which the President of the Privy Council said would be tabled here, subject to the agreement of provincial governments. Since the Premier of Prince Edward Island some time ago declared publicly that Prince Edward Island was anxious and New Brunswick was agreeable, will the minister ascertain what is now holding up the release of this important document?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to do that.

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

### SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS—EMPLOYMENT OF TEACHERS

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that thousands of university students across the country are unable to find summer employment, is it the intention of the minister to announce any government plans in the near future to provide additional employment for university students?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I have the impression that the question has been asked before. If there is in it a degree of urgency that is not apparent to the Chair, the minister may want to reply; otherwise I suggest that the question has been asked before.

**Mr. Nystrom:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member may wish to rephrase his question, but he cannot ask a question supplementary to one that has been ruled out of order.

**Mr. Nystrom:** I should like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration when he will be in a position to make a statement on motions regarding this question.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I appeared this week before the standing committee, on my estimates. I made a long statement on all matters respecting the department, including student employment. I will be happy to send the hon. member a copy of that statement.

[*Later:*]

**Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Now that the summer is here and the minister has had an opportunity to assess his program for student employment in the summertime, is he satisfied with the results of the program and does he intend to carry on the same program next year?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

## EDUCATION

ONTARIO—SURPLUS OF PUBLIC AND HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, concerning the surplus of school teachers this year, particularly in the province of Ontario. Is the minister's department setting up any special program for the employment of these teachers in the federal service or any interprovincial field to take care of the surplus of public and high school teachers?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the actual facts that my hon. friend mentions. I do know that last year Canada brought into the country about 8,000 people in the teaching profession from various countries. We do not believe that Canada itself will be able until 1972 to supply the demand for university teachers in this country. With regard to secondary school teachers, this is a question I would have to look into further.

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker, I know I am not permitted to give information, but perhaps the minister would look into the fact that very recently, within the last two weeks, there has been an obvious surplus in Ontario of several thousand teachers.

## THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

BUDGETARY ACTION TO CONTROL INFLATION

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Finance a question for the purpose of clarification. The minister will be making a budget speech in June. Will he at that time reveal the government's attitude toward the strong inflationary trends which exist at the moment, and is it the intention of the government to introduce a budget at that time?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Would the minister say whether it is the intention to bring in legislative measures during the course of his budget speech in order to meet these inflationary trends?

**Mr. Benson:** Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman will have to wait and see.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** You don't know yourself.

## AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT FOLLOWING MEETING WITH PROVINCIAL LEADERS

**Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. It has been intimated that the right hon. gentleman is holding a series of private meetings with provincial government and agricultural leaders. Will there be no announcement in the house regarding the government's solutions to the economic problems in western and eastern agriculture until these meetings have been concluded and an assessment made of the information obtained?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to make any announcement. Any such announcements are made by the Minister of Agriculture.

**Mr. Danforth:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I ask the right hon. gentleman whether we can expect no announcement in the house until these meetings have been concluded.

**Mr. Trudeau:** We make announcements all the time on various subjects, Mr. Speaker.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## FINANCE

POLICY TO COUNTERACT U.S. TAKE-OVERS

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the continuing incidence of take-over of Canadian firms by American concerns, will the minister undertake to make an early statement indicating whether the government has a policy to counteract this trend?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** I will consider the suggestion of my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker.

## CANADA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister of Finance indicate when it is his intention to bring before the house the act establishing the Canada Development Corporation?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Soon, Mr. Speaker.

## INCOME TAX

EXEMPTION FOR EXPENDITURES ON DRUGS AND OTHER MEDICAL EXPENSES

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Due to the widespread uncertainty of taxpayers, can the minister say whether the personal expenditures for drugs, appliances and medical expenses not covered by medicare payments will continue to be treated as an income tax exemption as in the past?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** I would like to consider this matter, Mr. Speaker. It is a matter that should be dealt with and will probably be dealt with in my budget speech.

POSSIBLE WITHDRAWAL OF EXEMPTION EXTENDED TO FOREIGN TEACHERS

**Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Mr. Speaker, I have supplementary question arising out of the questions directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. My supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that there are now apparently sufficient teachers being trained in Canada to meet Canadian needs, is the minister examining and perhaps considering abandoning the two year tax holiday from income tax which under the present regulations foreign teachers enjoy when they come to Canada?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, this matter is covered in our tax agreements. I would think that when we have a white paper on adjustments to income tax, corporate and personal, in Canada the matter of the tax agreements will also have to be considered.

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance. Would the minister, when he is undertaking this review of the income tax legislation, consider giving the same kind of tax break for the first two years to teachers trained in Canada?

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

CONSULTATION WITH TEACHERS OVERSEAS BEFORE CONTRACT CHANGE

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. I ask whether he has met with representatives of the Canadian Teachers Federation with regard to their submissions concerning the agreements with teachers overseas under his department. Also, was the minister able to give them an assurance of future consultation?

**Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I met this morning with representatives of the Canadian Teachers Federation. The meeting was short, cordial and productive. It ended with the sharing of a friendly cup of coffee between my officials and the representatives.

**Mr. Lewis:** Was that Irish coffee?

**Mr. Whelan:** Naturally.

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** Before they partook of this cup of coffee I did assure them that instructions had already been given to the officials to consult with the Teachers Federation before any changes were made in the contracts.

## AIR TRANSPORT

NEWFOUNDLAND—REFUSAL BY UNION TO SERVICE NORDAIR AIRCRAFT

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Transport in the absence of the minister, who I hoped would be in the house today to reply to this question on a matter which affects the province from which we both come. I refer to a decision

taken recently in the province of Newfoundland by the machinists unions there not to service Nordair aircraft flying a supplementary service to replace the Air Canada service. What steps is the government taking to ensure that Nordair aircraft are properly serviced, thereby ensuring the safety of the travelling public?

**Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services):** Mr. Speaker, as this matter is in the area of labour, I believe the question should properly be addressed to the Minister of Labour.

**Mr. McGrath:** I would redirect my question to the Acting Minister of Labour, who is also supposed to be here today but is not; therefore I direct it to the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Labour.

**Mr. Jim McNulty (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, the minister will be in his place on Tuesday. He is aware of this and is looking into the situation.

## GRAIN

### PHASING OUT OF FEED GRAIN SUBSIDIES

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Perhaps if neither the parliamentary secretary nor the minister replying for the Minister of Agriculture is prepared to do it now, this question can be taken as notice.

In view of the concern expressed by the B.C. Federation of Agriculture and the maritime co-operatives arising from the recommendation of the task force on agriculture that feed grain subsidies be progressively phased out, will the minister give an assurance that this will not be done before the affected industries have an opportunity to make adequate representations? Furthermore, will the task force on agriculture institute further studies on the effects of this proposal on the livestock and poultry industries in British Columbia and the maritimes, as to whether they can remain economically viable if this subsidy were withdrawn—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### FURTHER TIME FOR DISCUSSION OF ADJOURNMENT DEBATE SUBJECTS

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to make sure that certain understandings that we have had are firm, and I believe they are. I think it will be found that there is agreement to bring into play at four o'clock today Standing Order 40 and take up a number of the questions that are set down for the adjournment debate. This would take the place of using the hour between four and five o'clock for private members bills. I think that this is agreed to and perhaps the acting house leader might ask for it to be made a house order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** This is agreeable, Mr. Speaker, and if we can make it a house order under Standing Order 40 it can become effective at 4 p.m. today.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is so ordered.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

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

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Prime Minister)** moved that Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose of the bill of which we are beginning second reading today is to give equality, by legislation, to the two official languages of our country, insofar as the matter comes under the jurisdiction of the federal parliament. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has already said that this measure is extremely important in the view of the government because it touches the very foundation of Canadian unity.

Indeed, this bill is a gesture of faith in the future of Canada, a hope and a pledge for most Canadians, who wish to fix their sights and determine their common objectives well beyond the differences that are threatening to divide us today.

It does not often happen that the citizens of a country find themselves able to open up new horizons, to exert a decisive influence on the historical development of the community

which they constitute. It seems to me that this bill is now providing us with just such a rare occasion. We are today together catching a glimpse of the possibility of taking an important step, of leaving the past behind us. With a minimum of common sense, of open-mindedness, of realism and of good will, we can rejuvenate the face of Canada, enrich our society, make it more alive, more radiant and more just, in other words a better place in which to live for all who belong to it.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*English*]

**Mr. Pelletier:** This is an undertaking worthy of us all. We often hear much about petty politics; here is a measure reflecting high ideals and important consequences.

No doubt there is a risk of encountering many petty objections. For example, there are people who will object with a narrow, conformist attitude, contending—perhaps sincerely—that unity demands and presupposes uniformity. For such people it is inconceivable that a country where two languages are spoken could ever achieve a satisfactory degree of cohesion and unity. They thus conclude, being consistent with themselves, that French speaking Canadians, at least those who live outside the province of Quebec, must accept, must even seek, rapid and final assimilation. To hear such people talk one would think that unity can be achieved only if all the citizens are cast in one single mould. This is the price, such people think, that Canada must pay to become a coherent and harmonious country.

[*Translation*]

At the other extreme, we find another attitude—contrary, but equally intolerant—which tends to prevail. For this second group of extremists, Canada seems to be made up of two communities so different from each other and so completely devoid of common interest that no central government could represent its citizens as a whole. The adherents of this position consider the government in Ottawa to be an English-speaking government. Such people refuse to accord the Ottawa government any call to speak French—a call they also refuse to any provincial government with the exception of the government of Quebec.

They thus resemble the extremists of the other group, in that they condemn to oblivion all the French-speaking communities in Ontario, New Brunswick, Manitoba and the other provinces where English is the majority language and where French-speaking citizens live. Of course, without always knowing it, they condemn the English-speaking minority in Quebec province to the same fate.

[*English*]

Is it acceptable that the cultural future of linguistic groups that form 10 or almost 10 per cent of the Canadian population should be decided so lightly and in such peremptory fashion?

It goes without saying that the government accepts neither one nor the other of these extreme positions, either one of which would sooner or later entail the falling apart of our country. Such extreme views are in fact only two facets of one and the same thing—separatism.

People holding such views are indifferent to the fundamental fact that we are all of the same clay, of the same country, however large it may be, that we all belong to the same Canadian society, and that the greater number of us by far have every intention of remaining so.

The government of Canada is as truly and fully the spokesman for all Canadians at the federal level as the provincial governments are for their citizens at the provincial level. Any misunderstanding on this point can only create anarchy, since it touches the very foundation of federalism.

On the one hand, all the provinces must feel free to develop without impediments their special characteristics within their own sphere of competence. Yet it remains true that the government of Canada, in its own domain, must remain free to act for the country as a whole. This domain includes, among other realities, the linguistic duality that has always characterized the whole of Canada. Indeed, our common life is expressed through two official languages and has always been based on two distinct cultures. These are resources that we have no right to imperil or to leave in jeopardy. This dual linguistic heritage and the many cultural contributions of millions of Canadians whose ancestors were neither English nor French form an integral part of the reality, of the grandeur of Canada. A foremost duty of the Canadian government is to ensure that these resources are not destroyed through negligence, intolerance or narrow-mindedness, still less through fanaticism of any description.

What we wish to achieve in these areas within our competence is the equality of our two official languages. Once this equality has been recognized and accepted, many difficulties will be solved. But above all we shall

come to realize that we are closer to each other than we had ever thought before, and that the inheritance of two great civilizations, far from weakening us, strengthen us as a people and enriches us.

[*Translation*]

May I hasten to emphasize that in the bill there is no question whatsoever of forcing English-speaking persons to learn French, or of imposing the use of English on French-speaking persons. Still less do we wish to create cultural hybrids, or adepts in "franglais". Certainly it would be desirable for an increasing number of citizens to have both French and English at their command. But the Official Language Bill has nothing to do with all this.

Indeed, it is important to define very clearly what bilingualism is and what it is not. The many prejudices entertained on this subject are disconcerting. The purpose of the present bill is not to regulate the language which citizens must speak, but to ensure that they may address the federal government agencies in the official language of their choice. The bill concerns not individual bilingualism, but institutional bilingualism; that is, the use of the two languages by government services in their dealings with the public.

We intend to establish here the right of all Canadians, whether they live in Saint-Boniface, Sudbury, Trois-Rivières or Moncton, to communicate with the federal government in their own language.

A second erroneous interpretation of this bill is that one of the unavowed purposes is to push French-speaking Canadians towards slow assimilation, encouraging them to learn English. Whatever its origin, this interpretation borders on bad faith, because quite to the contrary, the practical result of the act will be to make available to French-speaking minorities throughout the country services in French which hitherto all too often have been lacking, and, conversely, to make the same services available in English to isolated English-speaking minorities.

• (11:50 a.m.)

[*English*]

There is a third erroneous interpretation. It has been claimed that the bill and the measures it involves would be prejudicial to the language and culture of other ethnic groups established in Canada. To understand the falseness of this argument we have only to refer to the text of the bill or to the general policy of the government. Furthermore, clause 38 provides that nothing in the bill may affect "the acquired rights and privileges" of the other languages.

These are not empty words. Before the courts, for example, those who do not understand or speak French or English may call for the services of an interpreter. The bill in no way attempts to limit or lessen the rights and privileges of citizens. On the contrary, its purpose is to extend and strengthen them.

The same is true of the bilingualism policy of the government. I know that in certain areas of the country some people have difficulty in understanding it and others in accepting it. But I also know, having discussed it throughout the country, that the majority of citizens approach the question with a great deal of open-mindedness and good will. The task of applying this legislation will be greatly simplified if we all keep our cool, if we refuse to listen to alarmists, if in the final analysis we are prepared as reasonable men and women to put forth a concerted effort against fanaticism, prejudice, fear and bitterness.

[*Translation*]

There is one point, however, on which there must be no question of compromise. The government feels that we belong to a privileged society, precisely because we have refused assimilation and conformity and on the contrary, recognize the advantages of linguistic duality and cultural diversity. On this matter, any change of attitude is out of the question.

Our undertaking is original; it is no doubt difficult to achieve, but its meaning is simple and clear. We have simply to recognize the facts. In this country there are two great linguistic communities: English and French. And if we are concerned with this problem from a Canadian point of view rather than from a provincial or regional point of view, we cannot deny this fact. Nor can we deny that, in the past, one of these two groups has enjoyed privileges refused to the other. Is it not just to correct this imbalance? Is it not urgent to take the necessary measures to preserve Canadian unity by making sure that from the language point of view there is only one class of Canadians?

It is true that our Constitution already provides for the use of both languages. At present, however, section 133 of the British North America Act applies only to the National Assembly and courts of Quebec and to the federal parliament and courts. Though in no

way amending the Constitution, the bill which is being submitted to you does concern language usage in connection with the federal government and parliament and the institutions thereof. Seen in this light, the present bill represents the culmination of an extensive evolution.

During the debate on the resolution which took place in the house, the Prime Minister referred to a series of important measures which the government had adopted in order to encourage bilingualism in the public service. At the time of the Constitutional Conference held a year ago in February, the federal government announced its intention of proposing legislation which would be based on the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism to apply to all areas of federal jurisdiction. Where language rights are concerned, this Constitutional Conference was unanimous in recognizing the principle by which French Canadians living outside Quebec would enjoy the same privileges as English-speaking Canadians in Quebec.

Most provinces have already realized the importance of these language rights. A year go Quebec was the only province which officially recognized the right to use both French and English in the Legislative Assembly; today half the provinces accept the same principle. This in itself is a promising start.

[*English*]

Progress has been made in the field of education as well. For the first time all ten provinces recognize in theory the use of the minority official language as a language of instruction in the schools and are applying this principle in varying degrees. These facts represent important steps toward linguistic equality, and in consequence toward Canadian unity.

The bill before the house is still another step in the same direction. Clause 2 establishes the following basic principle:

> The English and French languages are the official languages of Canada for all purposes of the parliament and government of Canada, and possess and enjoy equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all the institutions of the parliament and government of Canada.

Consequently all official documents issued by the parliament or government of Canada, by a federal court or by any government body whatsoever, must be published in both official languages.

The bill, however, does not stop there. It provides for the establishment of federal bilingual districts in all regions inhabited by both French and English speaking citizens, as long as 10 per cent or more of the population, with certain exceptions, use the minority official language as their mother tongue. The geographical limits of these bilingual districts will be set by proclamation after the bilingual districts advisory board has submitted a report on the subject to the cabinet. The establishment of these bilingual districts in no way indicates that the government intends to restrict its services outside these districts. On the contrary, clause 13 states that the same services customarily made available to the residents of these areas will be continued. We thus wish to maintain, and in fact improve, government services in both French and English.

• (12 noon)

[*Translation*]

It is, however, in the bilingual districts that the system defined by the bill can be applied in its entirety. The establishment of these bilingual districts has given rise to a great deal of controversy since the idea was launched. Some provinces actually oppose the idea openly, whereas others see no point in such a project. I should therefore like to clarify the position of the federal government on this subject. The establishment of bilingual districts was first recommended by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. While studying the Commission's recommendations the Cabinet discovered that such a system would enable it to progress along the path which it had set for itself. We are of course prepared to consider any changes likely to increase efficiency. Bilingual districts constitute simply a means and not an end. If better methods are suggested to us, we shall be only too happy to examine them.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) will report Tuesday on the consultations held with the western provinces, Quebec and some Maritime provinces about the amendments proceeding therefrom. I will today restrict my remarks to the subject matter of the bill.

Provision is also made for all departments and bodies of the Canadian government, all federal courts, quasi-judicial and administrative bodies and Crown Corporations to ensure that both official languages are used in all their relations with the public and for all the services which they are called upon to render, both in the National Capital region and at their headquarters. Furthermore, all services offered to travellers, within Canada and

abroad, should be made available in both official languages. This means, for example, that Canadian diplomatic, consular and immigration offices, as well as the Canadian National Railways and Air Canada, will have to provide services in both languages throughout the world, except where the demand for such services is extremely limited. We shall thus present, both within Canada and abroad, a true reflection of the bilingual country we are in the process of creating.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Pelletier:** Similarly, there are a number of provisions affecting the courts. All federal agencies of a judicial or quasi-judicial nature, and all courts dealing with criminal matters, will have to ensure that persons testifying before them are able to do so in either of the official languages. Every federal court of record will have to provide interpretation services at the request of a party to the proceedings, except in cases where the court is satisfied that the absence of an interpreter will not place the party concerned at a disadvantage, or where the court finds it impossible to obtain such services, after taking all reasonable steps in an attempt to do so.

Finally, the bill deals with the appointment and duties of a Commissioner of official languages for Canada who will be, like the Auditor General, a servant of parliament, and not subject to the authority of the executive. The Commissioner will be responsible for ensuring that the status of both official languages is recognized in practice, and that the spirit of the law and the intention of the legislator are respected in their entirety. The Commissioner will have power of inquiry and of intervention in order to satisfy himself that the spirit of the law is being respected in matters involving the conduct of the affairs of parliament, or the activities of the Canadian government or any other federal agency. He will submit an annual report to parliament, but he will be free to make a special report whenever he thinks fit. In other words, he will be the guardian of the language rights of the citizen in the latter's dealings with parliament or the federal government, or, to borrow a term used by the Royal Commission, he will act as a "linguistic ombudsman".

[*English*]

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the most important provisions of the bill now before the house.

As I have already stressed, the bill represents in itself nothing more than a new point of departure as far as the official languages are concerned. However, if the provinces adopt, as we hope they will, the legislative and administrative measures advocated by the Royal Commission, a great deal more will have to be done. The commission strongly recommended that the use of either language, and the right to education in either language, be guaranteed by constitutional means. This bill, I repeat, does not amend the constitution, although the federal government has begun a dialogue with the provinces on that subject. Constitutional guarantees affecting language use and education are not a mere formality. On the contrary, they are of vital importance if we are to ensure the inviolability of the language rights of minority groups and if we wish to forge really strong links between French speaking and English speaking Canadians.

The bill does not cover the possible forms of future federal government assistance to the provinces, but we have already put forward a number of proposals in this regard. Nor does the bill deal with the status or the future of the National Capital Region. This matter was the subject of one of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism; it is now being studied by a preparatory committee whose work, as yet unfinished, also covers many related subjects.

Such subjects are outside the scope of this bill. Its provisions will nevertheless establish the language rights of the French and English minorities in Canada. Full implementation will take time, and the necessary delay is provided for. Time, however, is not the only requirement; another is money. The government nevertheless believes that statutory recognition of language rights is well worth both the time and the money. The bill will assure the French speaking minorities in New Brunswick, Manitoba, Ontario and elsewhere that their case has been heard and that they have the right to deal with the federal government in their own language in all bilingual districts and in the national capital region, a right that also applies to all Canadians when they travel abroad. The bill offers an identical guarantee to the English speaking minorities in Quebec, a guarantee that has long since been honoured by that province.

The entrenchment of these rights is imperative. They must be recognized by the law of the land. The time is ripe, and we must put an end to all hesitation.

[*Translation*]

In conclusion, it is important that this bill be accorded its rightful place in the Canadian

context. This done, it will be realized that the undertaking has little chance of complete success unless all people of good will can be won over to its aims. What is involved is a long and difficult process which will bring about profound changes in this country. We are called, then, to a common endeavour, far-reaching in scope, in the full knowledge that it will be difficult, that results will be slow to appear, but that we must see it through if we are to give this country the cohesion it lacks. To fail could be fatal, for the time is past when the individual, within the borders of his province, could agree to live apart from the rest of his fellow countrymen.

I believe that all Canadians are well aware of the seriousness of the choice they must make. I also believe that the great majority of them will choose federalism, with all that it entails. I believe, finally, that Canadians, over and above constitutional or political considerations, recognize that a man loses nothing by granting justice to his neighbour, and that stretching out one's hand to another is one of the few noble gestures this life affords. To do this, we must have the support of every Canadian. We are counting, especially, on the young people, who must rise above prejudices in order to embrace the collective vision of a future of greater justice and brotherhood.

[*English*]

This country belongs to all of us and its future is the future of us all; this undertaking has been postponed too often and we must now set a date for its fulfilment.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I support the reference of this bill to the committee and, therefore, the adoption of the motion that has been proposed.

I regret to have to begin my remarks by making a protest in the strongest possible terms. The government has not seen fit to tell hon. members about the amendments it proposes to introduce. I do not wish to inject any heat into the discussion; I have always tried to avoid this. But, Mr. Speaker, one must ask what games hon. gentlemen opposite think they are playing in refusing to tell the house about these amendments. How can anyone expect me, as Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the New Democratic Party and other leaders to discuss this bill intelligently when the government withholds essential information?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

**Mr. Hees:** That is the new Liberal dialogue.

• (12:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I will leave that topic. This bill is placed before the house to strengthen rather than weaken Canadian unity. It is put forward for the purpose of making Canadians, whether they speak English or French, feel at home in this country to the extent that this is practical, and making federal government services available in the two languages. This is the principle which was discussed at the resolution stage. It was warmly accepted by all parties, including the New Democrats and Creditistes. Our task now is to judge the bill in the terms of these general purposes.

[*Translation*]

The purpose of this bill is not to compel English-speaking Canadians to learn French, and vice versa. This bill is aimed at providing French-speaking or English-speaking minorities with all federal government services in the language of their choice, as far as it is practical. If the purpose of this bill were to impose bilingualism, I would oppose it, as I believe virtually every member of this house would.

The principle of making federal services available in both languages, as proposed today, is intended to really Canadianize all English-speaking and French-speaking minority groups, wherever it is practical to do so.

[*English*]

If the purpose of this bill were to impose bilingualism, I would oppose it as I believe virtually every member of this house would. As I understand the purpose, it is to make the services of the federal government more broadly available to the people in the one of the two languages of their choice.

In considering Canada, we must of course consider the country as it exists. It might be easier for some of us if we had only one language. It might also be easier if Canada, long ago, had adopted the melting pot theory. That, however, is not my view. 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.

Perhaps the most profound concern lies in the administration of the bill. If this bill is not administered fairly and sensibly it can very easily create more disunity than unity. I say that in all sincerity. We could very easily create more new grievances in trying to remove old grievances. We must consider the possibility of imposing hardship upon Canadians who are already in the public service and are not bilingual. I speak with some knowledge when I say it is not the easiest thing in the world to become proficient in the second language, particularly when one is not as young as he once was. I hope my hon. friends in the house who have a facility in the two languages will not minimize the difficulties that many people have in acquiring a second language. I hope they will not overlook the fact that it is so difficult as to be virtually impossible for many Canadians, particularly those who are rather mature.

This bill must be administered in such a way that it will not destroy the careers of the many Canadians now in our federal public service who are not bilingual. I suggest the emphasis ought to be on providing bilingual government services to the extent it is practical rather than upon the public servants providing those services being bilingual. This must be done to the fullest extent possible so that both French and English speaking persons will feel at home in the federal service. The emphasis should be placed to the fullest extent practical upon the bilingual aspect of the service rather than the bilingual aspect of the servant.

What I am suggesting may involve some extra costs, but what we are talking about will involve costs in any event. Confederation has always involved extra cost. I sincerely urge the government to consider my suggestion and provide the people of this country with firm assurances in this respect.

There is concern in the country that the bill may eliminate the possibility of careers in the public service for those growing up in the unilingual parts of Canada, whether these be French or English, where there is little opportunity under present conditions to acquire such a facility. I realize that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and perhaps the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) have given assurances to those who may enter the public service in the future that facility in the two languages will not be required but a willingness to learn the two languages will. I urge the government to keep in mind that the facility to acquire a second language is not really available because the ability is not always there. It is virtually impossible for some persons to learn a second language. Hon. members who have a facility in both languages ought not to overlook this fact. I suggest that the concept of the bilingual public servant ought not to be pushed farther than necessary. The emphasis ought to be placed on the bilingual nature of the service rather than the bilingual nature of the servant to the fullest extent possible and also to the extent that is fully consistent with French and English Canadians being able to pursue careers in the public service.

• (12:20 p.m.)

There are these fears regarding administration and I have to say that they have been enlarged by the unfortunate remark, offhand, I think, by the Prime Minister with respect to elevator operators. And there have been other rather sweeping remarks made by officials associated with the public service which have created fears. If this bill is to create more unity than disunity firm and unequivocal assurances must be given in these respects. I suggest they be written into the act to the fullest extent possible in order to allay these fears.

If we are to create a feeling of greater unity we have to think in terms of enlarging rights and opportunities, and not of restricting rights and opportunities.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Stanfield:** We have to think in terms of expanding the quality of federal services and their general availability in the two languages and not necessarily, and certainly not unduly, restricting the opportunities of unilingual Canadians in the public service.

We must remember too that a substantial proportion of Canadians are of origins other than French or English. We have to remember that the ability of many of these Canadians, at least initially, in the English and French languages is limited. I suggest that to the fullest extent possible it ought to be the policy of the federal government to provide government services in these other languages as well—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Stanfield:** —and that the provision of such services—

**An hon. Member:** There we go.

**Mr. Stanfield:** My hon. friend says "there we go". I want to emphasize to him that what

I am trying to urge and create is an atmosphere of national unity and not disunity.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I suggest this is important in order to create a sense of belonging for these many Canadians, a sense of belonging to the country, of participation in its life, as well as providing a service of very real assistance to them.

And I suggest it is also important at this time, when we are considering the extension of government services in the two official languages, French and English, that we encourage and recognize the existence of these many other cultures of native peoples who have come from many other lands, and that we must go to some trouble to indicate to them that this step that is being taken does not in any way allow them to feel that their cultures are not appreciated, are not welcome.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I would suggest in all seriousness that it might be possible for the committee to devise a preamble to the bill which would have such an effect.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) also spoke about instruction. I know it is the policy of the governments in many of the provinces to provide courses in other languages where it is considered that the number of people is large enough to justify this procedure. I would like to think that at the time this step which we are discussing today is being taken the federal government will positively encourage the provinces to continue this policy and perhaps assist them in amplifying it. I am not talking now of languages of instruction but rather of instruction in these other languages. It is important in trying to take a necessary step to increase national unity that we do not create new forms of national disunity, and I feel we can do this if we set our minds to it.

Virtually everything in the bill is now within the power of the Governor in Council without legislation. I am so advised by lawyers I consider competent. Therefore it is not a question of the bill providing the government with additional authority. The bill is not, therefore, a sort of Magna Carta. It is rather a declaration of policy by parliament, and a declaration of the means of implementation of this policy. Again, sir, whether it works for good or ill will therefore depend to a very large degree upon the administration of the bill.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

One defect in the bill as it is now drafted is that it provides inadequate opportunities for parliament to examine and criticize the manner in which the bill is administered and the practices adopted under it. For example, there is provision for the reports of the commissioner to be tabled in the house, but there is no way to get such a report off the table unless the government takes it off or unless the opposition uses an opposition day for that purpose. The bill even makes provision for the commissioner to make a report to the Speaker where the commissioner considers a matter of sufficient urgency, but here there is no provision for this report to get before the house for discussion. I think the committee should carefully consider increasing and improving the opportunities of the house to examine and discuss the administrative practices that are adopted in connection with the bill.

The bill does not name the responsible minister. Here I am getting on to a subject of some delicacy, Mr. Speaker, but I have emphasized the importance of administration. I have emphasized that the bill will either help or harm national unity depending on how it is administered, and therefore it is essential that the minister in charge of the administration of the act be a man who has the confidence of the Canadian people in terms of fairness and good sense. I am sure it does not matter to the Canadian people whether he is French speaking or English speaking, but it is of vital importance that he be regarded by the Canadian people as an open-minded, fair-minded and sensible Canadian in this regard.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Stanfield:** No doubt we will be suggesting amendments, but it is difficult to discuss this at the moment. We do not know what amendments the Minister of Justice will be bringing forward, a procedure which I again say seems to be absolutely inexcusable in the discussion of a measure that is designed to bring the house and the country together, but I would certainly urge the committee to examine methods of improving the opportunities of the house to scrutinize and discuss the manner in which the bill is administered. I would hope too that the committee would consider the definition of the bilingual districts to see if it can be improved upon.

• (12:30 p.m.)

I come back, sir, to the evidence that there is widespread concern and misunderstanding—concern regarding the way in which the

bill will be administered, concern regarding the reluctance of the government to be frank and open with what it proposes to do, what it proposes to suggest to the committee, and concern regarding the lack of firm and satisfactory assurances about the way in which the bill will be administered. Many misunderstandings exist about the bill. I believe many Canadians have the idea that the effect of the bill will be to compel them to learn both languages, French and English. Again I shall be getting on ground on which I do not like to tread, but I must ask why the Prime Minister has not gone across the country, particularly to those parts of the country where there is the deepest concern, and explained the bill. I know my hon. friend the Secretary of State has gone across the country but—and this is in no way personal—I think this is a task which should have been accepted by the Prime Minister. I know the Secretary of State is a very stable man but I do not believe his talents lie in the direction of quieting fears or assuaging doubts concerning the purposes of this bill.

I sincerely suggest it is the first duty of the Prime Minister who is sponsoring the bill, which I accept as put forward to further national unity, to make certain that any bill relating to national unity is fully understood throughout the country. I suggest that very little effort has really been made to ensure that the people of the country understand what this bill is about and that very little effort has really been made to remove the misapprehensions concerning what the bill will do. It is very important that the bill not be launched in an atmosphere of apprehension and concern in many parts of the country.

This bill, after all, is perhaps a small part of the total process of strengthening the bonds of union within Canada. There is the major question of constitutional reform on which there has been much discussion but very little progress to date. Progress on constitutional reform can be made more difficult if any unnecessary misapprehensions are created in the course of the progress of this bill. I say it is very urgent in terms of national unity generally and very urgent in terms of the future progress of constitutional discussions that the fears which exist regarding the administration of this bill be removed by the Prime Minister and his associates who are sponsoring the bill. A very determined effort should have been made long since to explain the bill in great detail to the people of this country in order to remove the misapprehensions which we all know are in fact widespread. It is important to have these assurances and explanations. It is also important, of course, that there be full co-operation and consultation with the provinces. This is essential in any event, of course, if the concept behind the bill is to be really effective and meaningful.

Doubts have been expressed about the constitutionality of the bill. The Minister of Justice reports that his law officers have advised him there really is no question about its constitutionality. He did hold some discussions and is proposing some amendments which may remove some of the constitutional doubts which were raised by the representatives of some of the provinces at the federal-provincial conference. I recognize the position being taken by the Minister of Justice. I do not know, other than from what I have read in the newspapers, which I do not think is a position I or any other member of the house should have to be in today, what amendments he will suggest. Some doubts, however, have been expressed by some persons who have occupied high places in the courts. The committee should examine very carefully and fully the question of constitutionality of the bill and should be prepared to take expert advice in an effort to satisfy members that the bill is either constitutional or as to what amendments are necessary in order to remove any real question about its constitutionality.

We must consider the future of our country, the tensions which exist in our country and the urgency of easing these tensions. The bill will not be welcomed by all Canadians. It is my own belief that we must be prepared to pay some price for Canada, some price for the country that was established 100 years ago and some price for a country which we believe to be a good country, a country in which it is good to live and a country which has a great contribution to make to the world.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Stanfield:** But it is a country which is diverse and complex. There is a constant problem and there must be a constant process of readjustment and reconciliation. The people in all parts of the country have a right to expect adequate consideration of their problems. There is a widespread feeling in many parts of the country that economic problems are being neglected by the government.

Part of the difficulty in the present context is the feeling that the government has been

neglecting economic problems and giving priority to questions like the Criminal Code and the language bill. This difficulty would not exist if there were a general feeling throughout the country, for example, in the Atlantic provinces and the west, that the government is paying adequate attention to the problems of the people. When there is a feeling of dissatisfaction and a feeling that there is a lack of consideration in respect of economic problems, this too can create national disunity. It is creating national disunity. The people of the Atlantic provinces, the people of the western provinces and the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson) have been speaking about the neglect of their parts of the country.

Part of the problem the government has created, part of the reaction against this bill, results from the failure to convince the people in the many parts of the country, not just the Atlantic provinces and the west, that the government is earnest and is giving the necessary degree of priority to their economic problems. I cannot put too much stress upon the importance of the government grappling with these economic problems in an effort to convince the people in the country as a whole that the government is concerned about their economic problems. This conviction of neglect is unfortunately an important part of the context within which we are considering this bill.

• (12:40 p.m.)

I say in closing, sir, that matters affecting our ability to live together as a people, especially French speaking people and other Canadians, are of vital importance. We are all making a special effort and we must all make a special effort to understand each other. I assure you, sir, that in considering this bill we bear in mind that we are talking about something very close to the very fabric of our nation. It is in this sense that we will consider the bill. It is in this sense that I urge the house to send the bill to the committee and urge the committee to consider the matters I have mentioned in order that the bill can become as satisfactory and as effective as possible.

I urge the government in the name of this country to make a serious effort to explain to the people of Canada what this bill means, what it does not mean, and to give the assurances to this country which are necessary for the administration and implementation of this measure. After all, we are trying to create unity, not disunity.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Before recognizing the hon. member for York South I might take this opportunity to advise the house as to the questions to be dealt with between four and five this afternoon pursuant to the special order made earlier this day. These questions are as follows and in this order: the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett)—Post Office Department; the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier)—Agriculture; the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom)—Trade; the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert)—housing, and the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell)—Saint John harbour fishing restrictions.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

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

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen (for the Prime Minister) that Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the subject we are debating I would personally be very grateful if I could make my remarks in one piece rather than in two pieces. I wonder whether there would be a disposition on the part of hon. members to permit me to call it one o'clock.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being one o'clock this sitting stands suspended until two o'clock this afternoon.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

### AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I am also forced to begin my remarks this afternoon by protesting as vigorously as I can

the failure of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) to inform members of the house whether any amendments are to be proposed to the bill, whether, if there are such amendments, they will be major or minor and what parts of the bill they will affect. The fact is that we are debating a bill without knowing the precise nature of it. I am sure the Secretary of State would reply by saying we are debating at this stage only the principle of the bill. I say to him that that is sheer, shabby semantics, because the principle of the bill can easily be affected by changes made to it. There are doubts and fears across Canada about the way in which this bill may be implemented. If amendments are to be proposed which might serve to lessen those fears, the principle of the bill would be very desirably and seriously affected.

It seems to me it is an immense discourtesy on the part of the government to act with such insolence at this stage of the bill. I say to the government that it is worse than that. If the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the members of the government are as serious and sincere as they profess about the importance of this bill and, if I may say so, as I am about its importance, it was their duty to introduce the bill in such a way as to create a pleasant and co-operative atmosphere instead of immediately arousing resentment. You do not deal with this kind of delicate subject, which requires a great deal of understanding and tact, in a tactless way. This is precisely what we have seen happen today. I can only reach the conclusion that members of the cabinet have not yet agreed about what amendments, if any, there should be; they are still arguing about it.

Since every one of us expected the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to introduce the bill rather than some other minister, I can only conclude that the Minister of Justice has been in some way demoted and someone else has been put in his place. It was the Minister of Justice who travelled across the country meeting the representatives of provincial governments. It was from him that we expected to hear the results of those conversations. Instead, we had a very charming lecture from a long-time friend whom I like and admire, the Secretary of State, who told us as much about the bill as any commentator has written about it in the last six months. Instead of explaining what is involved and telling us what amendments will be proposed, instead of indicating the way in which the act will be administered, instead of telling the Canadian people what the commissioner will actually be asked to do, instead of dealing with these matters that concern the people of Canada, the Secretary of State gave us a very interesting, pleasant and charming speech that I suggest advanced this debate not one iota.

Please believe me, Mr. Speaker; I say this not for the purpose of political needling but precisely because I am passionately in favour of the principle of bilingualism in Canada. The government, instead of introducing this matter in a way which would win widespread support and sympathy, has immediately fumbled the ball and introduced it in the most outrageous way. I understand that the Prime Minister has engagements elsewhere in the country. He drafted this bill and I would have thought he would be interested enough to make sure he was here on the day it was discussed by parliament so that he would be able to guide his cabinet and the commissioner in future in light of the debate on the bill.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sure the hon. member does not want to leave the impression that the Prime Minister was not here when the bill was introduced this morning. He was right in the chamber. The hon. member knows that full well.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I will now make my point very clear because I believe it is of importance. I am, of course, aware that he was here when the bill was introduced. I am aware that he was here while the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) spoke. I am not sure whether I saw him here when the Secretary of State spoke.

**Mr. Hees:** He was here for just part of the speech.

**Mr. Lewis:** It may be the other way around. Whatever it is, if this measure is as important as he claims it to be, he is in charge of the program of parliament and if he had to be away today, which obviously he did—I do not begrudge him that or criticize him for it—it was within his power to make sure that the bill was introduced on a day when he could be in the chamber to listen to the discussion. I do not think it helps this delicate matter, this basically important matter, to treat it in this cavalier way, with the Prime Minister not here when the debate takes place, with the minister who introduced the bill not telling us what amendments, if any, are to be proposed, thus defying parliament and the people of Canada. One does not have to be a person with the experience in

communications which the Secretary of State possesses to know that today's debate is likely to receive more attention from the people of Canada than some other debates and that if this debate had started properly, if this parliament and the people knew exactly what this bill was about, the purpose and the objectives of bilingualism in Canada would have been well served. But in the way the bill has been introduced those objectives and that purpose have been ill served.

• (2:10 p.m.)

I rise on behalf of the New Democratic party to support the principle of the bill before us and to support its referral to the special committee. As hon. members know—if they do not, may I tell them—our party has consistently expressed support for the desirability of widening the recognition of the bilingual character of Canada. Permit me to emphasize that this policy dates back to the first day of the founding of the New Democratic party. A policy in support of Canadian bilingualism has been adopted at every federal convention of the New Democratic party, first at the founding convention in 1961 and then at subsequent conventions in 1963, 1965 and 1967. In parliament we welcomed—and I was the spokesman at that time as well—the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism when it first appeared. Also, last fall I spoke on behalf of my party in support of the resolution which preceded this bill. In short, my party's position on bilingualism has been consistent and unequivocal although, I must add, it is true that there are questions and anxieties among some members of the N.D.P. as there are among other groups in this country.

In speaking on the resolution last fall I said that personally I looked upon the measure now before us in the light both of our country's past and of its future. I emphasized that I regarded recognition of the two official languages of Canada in the way in which they are being recognized in the bill as redressing a profound oversight and an injustice which has haunted Canadians throughout the first century of our existence as a united country. I underlined my hope at that time that this long overdue step would contribute to greater understanding and unity in the future.

Canada to me has always been a bilingual country whose bilingual character has often been overlooked and ignored. I became acutely conscious of this as I grew up in Montreal and later began travelling across our vast and diverse land. The extent to which Canadians outside the province of Quebec regarded Canada as a unilingual country was to me deeply disturbing, and this was particularly true of Canadians whose mother tongue was, like mine, neither English nor French.



I have said in many speeches I have made in many parts of the country to many minority groups of this land that they are profoundly mistaken in their attitude toward language in Canada, that it is better for them and for me as immigrants to Canada to recognize the bilingual character of the country, and above all to recognize that bilingualism is the major factor in our country's life which has prevented Canada from becoming a melting pot and has made possible the recognition of and respect for the languages and cultures of other minority groups in this land.

Bilingualism in Canada has been of great benefit to newcomers to our country, as it has been of great benefit to me and my family and to those who came to Canada at the same time as we did in the early 1920's. We learned immediately that in this country neither one language nor one culture dominates but that there are two official languages and two major cultures and that the languages and cultures of the minority groups that came to this country before us and will come after us are respected and recognized by Canadians of English and French origin. I say to them, and I say to hon. members who have sympathy for the fears of the minority groups—I share their sympathy but not their fears—that in a sense it is an insult to French speaking Canadians to insist that the English language has priority and that the French language cannot be equal to it. This kind of attitude on the part of some newcomers to this country derives from a misunderstanding of what Canada is and what Canada is about and serves to divide this country and to threaten its future in a way which none of these minority groups wants to see.

Therefore I appeal to fellow Canadians whose origin is neither English nor French to recognize the bilingual character of Canada and to recognize that no one in this country with any sense of responsibility, not even the members of this government who may not always be described in the words that I have just used, intends to force either of the two languages on anyone in this country. They will be free to learn English or French as they like, but whichever language they use they will have equal rights and equal opportunities in the federal institutions and federal

organizations of this country, and only in them so far as this bill is concerned.

I said last fall in speaking on the resolution—and I think it is important enough for me to repeat—that as I watch Canada's independence being eroded by the economic domination of our industry and economy by the country to the south of us, eroded in the international sphere in which we so often fail to speak independently and so frequently act like mere satellites, and eroded by the so-called culture which comes at us over the air waves and through the screen, I know there is one official language and one official culture in this country which United States culture and United States programs cannot overwhelm and inundate. This culture and language will remain Canadian and no U.S. influence can affect and destroy them. The degree of our bilingualism is a measure of the enrichment of our country.

But there are still people, many of them, unfortunately, whose attitude toward bilingualism remains questioning, doubtful and fearful. I say to the government—and I am sure it realizes this as well as anyone else—that this attitude will not be changed by this bill or any other law. This will require time, patience and understanding. I say that it will not do to match intolerance and prejudice with impatience and rancour. Extremists on both sides feed on each other's intolerance and render difficult a rational, civilized and meaningful exchange aimed at reaching a greater and deeper understanding of what Canada is about. I sincerely hope that both in this parliament and throughout the country we will avoid this attitude on the subject in our debates here and in discussions across Canada.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is really a pity to see how much the climate in favour of bilingualism has deteriorated recently. A year ago, the Canadian people believed in the necessity of bilingualism and seemed to approve the language policy suggested both by the Laurendeau-Dunton report and by the present bill.

Unfortunately, this eagerness, this sympathetic approach are no longer there. On the contrary, doubts and opposition are now growing in several parts of the country. The series of demonstrations staged against the English language in the schools of the province of Quebec have in no way helped to improve the situation.



Such events have rather done a disservice to the cause of bilingualition and, indeed, made things worse, not only in Quebec but also across the country, especially in the provinces where the French-speaking citizens are a minority.

The present situation in Canada makes it an increasingly heavy responsibility for the politicians, for the party leaders, for the members of parliament, for all the information media to educate the Canadian people and to make them aware of the fact that bi-lingualism is something essential to the unity of this country.

It falls on us, as Canadian citizens, to emphasize this necessity as an essential feature of the mutual understanding, equality and justice that should prevail in our country. In my view, it is our duty to try to solve the problem, to bring about understanding and sympathy instead of laying obtacles in the way leading to our objective by encouraging language prejudices and altering the truth in the necessary dialogues between our two language groups.

[*English*]

I ask myself, what are the reasons for the worsening of the climate on this issue? The last couple of years have been of great significance for our country. We faced a crisis of mistrust two or three years ago. Then the B and B report appeared and evoked a measure of understanding and an honest exchange of views. This was followed by the "Confederation for Tomorrow" conference of provincial premiers in Toronto. After some exchanges the leaders of the provincial governments seemed to gain an understanding of the problem of bilingualism and to exhibit a genuine sympathy toward the need to solve this problem in a just and equitable way.

Then came the federal-provincial conference on the constitution of February, 1968, under the chairmanship of the right hon. Lester B. Pearson. It showed further progress on this issue and we had reason to look hopefully to the future. But when the federal-provincial conference on the constitution resumed in February of this year, positions had again hardened and reflected a regrettable slide backwards on this basic and important Canadian problem.

What happened to change the atmosphere during the course of just one year? In my view, one of the reasons is obvious and important. The worsening climate was created by the fact that the official languages bill and the entrenchment of language and other basic

rights in the constitution were presented as the solution to the problem of national unity in Canada. This was patently misleading and was bound to arouse bewilderment and resentment. Language rights have always been and are today an important step toward more meaningful national unity. But the continuing social and economic problems which press on the Canadian people are even more basic and have taken priority in their minds and in their hearts.

The Quebecker looks at the high rate of unemployment in his province, at the low rate of investment, at the inequalities from which he suffers, and his impatience is fed by social and economic insecurity. In this context, I submit that the promotion of bilingualism appears to him to be a gesture rather than a meaningful accomplishment for his life and that of his family. The fact that he may now be able to speak his native tongue in a federal office in Manitoba can hardly move him to gratitude while he is unemployed in Quebec.

Similarly, the western Canadian sees his economy badly damaged by a continuing drop in farm income and he begins to resent the fact that the government and parliament are preoccupied with matters which he may or may not recognize as important but which he knows cannot assist him and his neighbours in their mounting difficulties. Across the country, the failure to deal with regional inequality, with pressing problems like housing, high rents, mounting interest rates and destructive increases in the cost of living, creates an atmosphere in which discussion about language rights seems secondary, if not irrelevant.

**Mr. Pepin:** How can it be irrelevant?

**Mr. Lewis:** I said, irrelevant in people's minds. I say, Mr. Speaker, not with partisan satisfaction but with deep regret, that the worsening climate for a better understanding on the issue of bilingualism is due directly to the failure of the Prime Minister and the government to appreciate or, at least, to act as if they appreciated the fundamental social fact that the unity of a people must be grounded in social justice and equality. It cannot be patched up by action in other spheres which are in themselves important but which do not directly attack the anti-social priorities forced on our society by irresponsible corporate power. History has shown again and again that prejudice feeds on poverty and insecurity. And although the people of Canada are blessed compared with most people of this unhappy world, Canadians rightly resent the avoidable and heavy burdens which millions of them are forced to carry despite our immense riches.



I also say—I am sorry to be so emphatic about this, Mr. Speaker, but I believe this should be said—that even the priorities imposed by the government on this parliament will add to the misunderstanding reappearing in some parts of the country. The other day the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) spoke in Halifax and underlined the fact that the development of the disadvantaged areas of this country requires an industrial incentive program immediately; but his bill is not before us.

We have had a housing crisis that has mounted in severity. The crisis remains despite the fact that the Prime Minister refuses to recognize it. We have had the resignation of a senior member of the cabinet over the issue. To meet the difficulties created for him by the resignation of the minister, the Prime Minister acted in uncharacteristic haste and himself introduced a housing bill. My colleagues and I do not see in that bill any solution of the most urgent part of the housing problem, but why, one asks, is not even this housing bill dealt with now?

Where lies urgency in the light of the crushing social and economic problems facing our people? Or has this legislative priority been imposed on parliament because the two bills are pet projects of the Prime Minister which he introduced in his former capacity and which served to bring him into public prominence? We therefore have this bill before us immediately following upon a long and sometimes acrimonious debate on the omnibus bill amending the Criminal Code, without legislation to deal with the most crushing matters concerning the people of Canada being interposed. I can only hope that this thoughtless intransigence on the part of the Prime Minister and the government will not do harm to a cause which is important to Canada and in which I believe as deeply as does the Prime Minister himself.

• (2:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

However, Mr. Speaker, I admit right away that the matter of bilingualism in Canada remains important and that this bill has to be passed without delay, or prolonged and bitter debate.

We are in favour of this bill because we think that it is fair and necessary and even

essential to the future of Canada, in particular for the welfare of the young people in our society. Bilingualism has become a more urgent necessity today than ever before.

Technological development, the age of cybernetics, the steady increase in the number of students in our colleges and universities, create an increasing mobility all across the country.

I think it is urgent for the French-speaking people of Quebec to feel at home everywhere in the country; they have the right to live with dignity, to express themselves in their own language, and to live their culture.

In the same line, provision must be made so that the English language remains a living language in the province of Quebec and the English-speaking people may also continue to live there in a proper climate.

When we consider what is happening now in Canada with regard to bilingualism, we note a significant fact in those parts of the country with an English-speaking majority: older people are opposed to the development of bilingualism in Canada. The English-speaking youth in schools and universities show a great deal more understanding in this field and are enthusiastic about the development of the French language and culture. They recognize in it a possible enlargement of Canadian life.

Recently I had the opportunity of visiting a few universities in so-called English-speaking provinces. I also had the opportunity of addressing various groups of young listeners.

I then had the pleasure of finding out that English-speaking youths can adopt a sympathetic and understanding attitude towards the development of the French language and culture. I stress this fact because it gives me hope for the future of our country.

I am convinced that we can make the changes necessary for the development of the bilingual wealth of Canada. We, as members of parliament, have the opportunity for encouraging that rational and civilized thinking amongst the young; we can give them a striking example of co-operation and dedication to the idea of a united and bilingual Canada. It is in that spirit that I call upon all my colleagues in this house to discuss the objects of the bill now before us.

[*English*]

I say, Mr. Speaker, that acceptance of the principle of this bill does not necessarily mean it cannot be improved upon with further study. Fears have arisen which must be calmed. There are fears in the federal service of Canada. There are men and women who have given long service in the administration of this country who fear that because they were taken on at a time when they were unilingual they may not be given the opportunities they would have had if this new attitude and new policy had not been introduced. I do not see that there is in this bill any reason for such fear. I do not see that it is necessary to fear that one will be disadvantaged. Nevertheless, there already have been examples of the kind of thing I am referring to in Ottawa, when janitors and others have felt that as a result of the policies of this parliament they have been given less advantageous shifts or less advantageous positions or tours of duty than they would have been given if they had been bilingual. I say, Mr. Speaker, that we must make sure that one injustice is not replaced by another.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Lewis:** We must make sure that the people of Canada realize that this is a matter of agreement and consent and necessity and desirability, and not a matter imposed upon them from above. Canadians who have given long service in our federal administration must be assured of security and the same chance of advancement whether they are unilingual or bilingual. The introduction of bilingual districts and of the other official language should have the support of the surrounding community. The development of the objectives of this bill can be beneficial only if it is based on consent. These aims must be nurtured like a plant lest the frost of misunderstanding kills them at the roots. Unless we make certain we do it this way, unless we persuade the Canadian people of the values and benefits of bilingualism, and unless we make certain we do not impose it on them without understanding their position, the plant may well be killed at its roots.

Above all, the commissioner to be appointed under this bill must be a wise and flexible Canadian who is animated not only by the law but also by a sense of fitness and appreciation of Canadian unity. He must have that sense if he is to make this legislation into a unifying instead of a divisive instrument. As with many other desirable laws, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that much more will depend on the administration of this law than on the wording of the bill. If the commissioner to be appointed is a hard-nosed guy who is determined to ram things down people's throats, then this measure will be a disaster

for the future of Canada. If the government and the commissioner in particular appreciates the need to win support for what is being done, to win the consent of the people who are to be governed by this law, to remove fears, to allay doubts, to produce and evoke co-operation and sincerity, then this law will be a great step forward toward the greater unity of the people across this great land.

As one looks round the world, Mr. Speaker, one sees internal conflict everywhere. One is saddened by the fratricidal war in Nigeria-Biafra, by racial conflicts in the United States, by the inhumanity of white rule in South Africa and Rhodesia, by the purposeless religious strife in Ireland and by the occasional outbursts of violence between the two linguistic communities in Belgium. On every continent, in every part of the world, there are conflicts among tribes and, among peoples of different languages and cultures. There are wars and near wars. I watch these and other destructive events across the world and I pray, as I am sure all hon. members pray, that my country may be able to avoid fratricidal strife and that our people will find rational and humane solutions to the differences which divide them and to the potential conflicts which darken our future.

It is in this context that I regard this bill as a necessary step in the direction of Canadian unity. Other steps will have to follow quickly and resolutely in the social and economic spheres of our collective lives. We will have to take steps much more quickly than this government has been willing to take them to deal with the high cost of living, with the regional inequalities in the country, with the foreign ownership of our economy, with the ruthless use of power by the corporate conglomerates of this country and with the way in which the lives of our people, their future and security are overlooked and even ignored by events over which they have no control.

We shall have to find quickly and resolutely ways in which the people of this country can play a meaningful part in deciding their own destiny and in overcoming the alienation from which they suffer in a society governed by big government, big industry, big unions, big corporations and bigness of every sort. Much more quickly and resolutely than this government is willing to do, we shall have to find ways to deal with the problems arising in the ever increasing urban communities of this country and make the collective life of our people in our cities a good deal more pleasant and meaningful than it is now.

[Mr. Lewis.]

It is the totality of these measures and not only language rights, it is the totality of social and economic solutions to deep-seated social and economic problems, which will lay the true foundation for unity in this country and which can make us in Canada an example of rational development and achievement. In the meantime I express the hope that the long overdue recognition of the bilingual character of Canada which is embodied in the principle of the bill before us will be accepted with grace and understanding in all parts of this country.

• (2:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker—

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Order. Does the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce wish to put a question to the hon. member for York South?

**Mr. Pepin:** I should like to put a very serious question to him, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member for York South is giving us excellent reasons to show that the bill is most important for our young people, for the minorities, for French-speaking Canadians, etc. At the same time, he tells us that the bill should not have been introduced at this time. If absolute priority is to be given to social and economic questions, as the hon. member suggests, when then could a bill such as this be introduced?

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, true bilingualism would have it that the minister speak French and that I might answer him in English.

[*English*]

I say to the minister that it would have been sensible, responsible and sensitive to have spent a period of approximately ten days between the Criminal Code amendments and the languages bill dealing with bills such as the industrial incentive bill, housing, a bill dealing with higher pensions for retired civil servants or some other matters. There would still have been time enough to deal with this bill as well. The point I was making, Mr. Speaker, and the minister's question gives me the opportunity to emphasize it, is not that I necessarily oppose this priority because I am afraid of what may happen by virtue of this bill. I have no such fears.

But it would have been much wiser psychology, after having spent two or three weeks on the amendments to the Criminal Code, which are important but do not put bread on anybody's plate, to deal with some matters for a week or two that may put some bread on somebody's plate before entering a discussion on this bill. It would not have lessened the priority or importance of this bill. It would have shown the people of this country that the government is not merely concerned about dealing with pet projects of the Prime Minister but is also concerned about matters just as important and equally pressing as language rights.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I listened very attentively this morning to the remarks made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), and the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis).

At the outset of their comments, the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for York South blamed the government for keeping silent about possible amendments to the bill before us, but they were very careful not to mention the ones they would favour. They said, further on, that they accepted the principle of the bill but that amendments should be made to the bill in order perhaps to modify its principle. Therefore, there is nothing very clear in all that.

Mr. Speaker, the clearest thing at this stage is this: Bill C-120 was put on the order paper of the house under the authority of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

The Prime Minister, as can be seen, is absent. He was here this morning during part of the speech made by the Secretary of State and part of the speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition. Then, he disappeared. Maybe he has other engagements but—and here I agree with the hon. member for York South—he should be here, at least to have an idea of the various parties' points of view on this first day of debate on the official languages bill.

**Mr. Mongrain:** He can read *Hansard.*

**Mr. Caouette:** The hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) says that the Prime Minister can read *Hansard.* He does not even have time to read it and one of his assistants will no doubt report to him what was said in the house.

At any rate, we regret that the Prime Minister is not here on this first day of the debate on this bill.

We think that Bill C-120 is not a bill of utmost importance for Canada. Other subjects might have been discussed; namely the economic situation.

The unemployment rate is increasing and I think this is more important than to know whether the unemployed speaks English or French. It is also more important to know whether our needy mothers must have something to eat, something to wear, a convenient place to live in than to know whether they speak English or French.

This does not mean that the official languages bill is not important, but I think it should rather proceed from an economic and social system enabling every human being to enjoy at least security and freedom. Then, we could discuss the matter of official languages in Canada.

We approve the bill on the official languages, but we still maintain that it is not essential, that it is not the question we should now be discussing when the Canadian people need specific and constructive measures from the government.

• (2:50 p.m.)

But the government prefers to let us play around for four weeks with the bill on official languages. I hope it will be dealt with fairly quickly and that it will be passed without delay by the house.

Now, the unfortunate thing is that in many regions, as the hon. member for York South said a while ago, the question of national unity and bilingualism has lost ground in Canada over the past year, and that we probably should have dealt with it over a year ago. Then the hon. member contradicts himself and says that the question is not all that important. But it is one of two things, either it is important or it is not.

Is bilingualism losing ground in Canada? I do not think so. I had the opportunity of visiting western Canada, just a few weeks ago. I went to Vancouver, Edmonton, Regina and Winnipeg. There I met people of English, Ukrainian, Polish, German, Italian origin, in short, people of all nationalities or languages; they are worried because people of bad faith told them that the bill on the official languages would force them to speak French or English, when they know nothing of either language.

Therefore, the meaning of the bill is completely misunderstood there, as it is also in eastern Canada. People think that when the bill is passed, a 65-year old English-speaking man will have to learn French, and vice versa.

This is not the object of the bill. The passing of a bill designed to have both official languages recognized does not necessarily mean the establishment of bilingualism. It merely means the recognition of the fact that there are two official languages in Canada: English and French.

We could also have included Chinese in the bill. We would then have had three official languages. This does not mean that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) would have to learn Chinese. But it would have been an official language if the legislation had contained a provision to that end.

**An hon. Member:** It would be a Chinese trick.

**Mr. Caouette:** Yes, indeed. I thought the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) would have included a third official language, Chinese, in view of the current discussions aiming at a commercial agreement with Communist China. It seems to me we might improve our diplomatic and commercial relations with China, if we knew that language.

However, this was not done, and the bill provides only for two official languages, without for all that depriving any Canadian of his rights.

When I travelled through the western provinces, I found that people were confusing the official languages bill and bilingualism, which are two different things. One is bilingual when one speaks two languages. But, one may be in favour of two official languages and yet, speak only one.

It is the case, for instance, of my colleagues who have no knowledge of English and who accept the principle of two official languages. Since some English-speaking members have no knowledge of French, they will recognize, I hope, this principle.

Once the principle of the official languages is explained, people understand what it is about and then, we can speak about bilingualism. At the national level, it is the business of the federal government. But, at the educational level, bilingualism comes under the jurisdiction of the provinces.

Therefore, all the federal government can do is to suggest, on the occasion of federal-provincial conferences, that English and French be taught in schools, since education falls under provincial jurisdiction, a principle to be fully respected.

The federal government should not in any way whatsoever intervene in provincial fields.

Mr. Speaker, I said in western Canada that perhaps the official languages bill should never have been introduced in the house. If, 50 years ago, for instance, people had shown more good will on both sides, everybody would officially recognize both languages today and the subject would not have to be discussed in the house.

Because some people failed to take their responsibilities in the past, because some people on both sides proved narrow-minded and unwilling to reach some understanding, after 102 years of confederation, we find ourselves in 1969 discussing language rights to determine whether French and English should be recognized as official languages in Canada. However, better late than never. I wish to repeat, at any rate, that the principle of the two official languages does not constitute bilingualism.

Now, to get back to what I was saying a while ago, with regard to bilingualism in western Canada, everybody should not be compelled to learn both languages at the age of 50, for instance. Shall I ask my 81-year old father who has never spoken English to learn it? I would rightly be told that I am stupid.

Shall we ask the same thing to the English people? This is what the people out west are afraid of, to be compelled by the federal government to learn French. This is not the purpose of the bill. I told them that bilingualism will be a fact in Canada within a few years if all Canadians show the least bit of good will.

There is only one way to have a bilingual country where the people will understand one another all across it. The provinces must accept this principle and teach from the very first grades in school the two official languages of Canada—French and English—everywhere, in every Canadian school, in Quebec in British Columbia, in the Maritimes.

In five or six years from now, our youngsters who are now 6, 7 and 8 years old will be 12, 13 and 14 and then they will be perfectly bilingual. It is only then that we will have a bilingual country.

However we should not ask older people to become bilingual. We should not make matters worse. Do people know that this solution for teaching in schools has been approved in western as well as in eastern Canada?

Today, the head of a famliy who is 50 years old and who has five or six children at home wants his children to learn both languages and to become bilingual.

As for myself, I have two sons, who are 30 and 29 years old. When they were 3, 4 and 5, my neighbor in Rouyn was a Ukrainian who had a boy the same age as mine. After three or four weeks, my two boys would come back for dinner and speak to each other but I could not understand a word. My two boys spoke Ukrainian to each other, simply because they had been playing in our backyard with a young Ukrainian boy.

Children can learn anything. We who have raised children know that for a fact. It is even said that they learn much too fast in some areas. As for languages, it would be easy to teach French in every school, in the very first grades, and after a few years, Canadian children all over the country would be bilingual.

Today, there are clashes. Why? Because in the past, some people did not take their responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in Victoria last year, I wanted to send a telegram to a person who does not speak English. I wanted to dictate the message in French, in Victoria, but it was impossible. Nobody understood a word of French, at the Canadian National. Then, I had to spell each and every word, and when the telegram arrived, the letters were all mixed up. In fact, it was incomprehensible.

• (3:00 p.m.)

In my opinion, this is not logical.

If, for instance, an English-speaking gentleman comes to Rouyn and wants to send a telegram in his own language to somebody in Victoria, is he not happy to be attended to in English? That is understandable, and that is what the bill is designed to establish, not for the sake of bilingualism, but to recognize the two official languages in the federal departments.

Mr. Speaker, once again that does not mean that everybody must learn French. The solution I have to put forward relates to education. If everywhere, in Quebec as well as in other provinces, both languages are taught since the beginning of schooling, the trick will be done in a few years hence and parents will be happy to have bilingual children.

In the last few years, exchanges of students between eastern and western Canada have been very few. Such exchanges, we have found, have been very beneficial to the students involved and have resulted in better understanding between different regions of the country.

Last Wednesday night, I spoke before the members of the Pro-Canada Association in Montreal, whose founder or president is the mayor of Pointe-Claire, Mr. Séguin, who is also a member of the Quebec National Assembly. At that meeting, I met Germans, German-speaking Canadians, Ukrainians and French-Canadians. The object of the Pro-Canada Association is to promote Canadian unity. There was a choir from Trois-Rivières, the *Sing-Out* composed of 80 young boys and girls, aged 10, 12, 13 and 14, who sang in French and in English with an enthusiasm and a warmth which are rarely seen.

I had a vision, Mr. Speaker, I thought I could see the Canada of to-morrow. These young smiling people were acting with precision, quite spontaneously. They were tremendous.

That is why I asked the hon. Secretary of State if it would be possible to subsidize such groups, in order to encourage such an attitude throughout Canada.

At that time, my question was ruled out of order. I welcome the opportunity, as we are considering the official languages bill, to point out how much good such a singing choir could do for national unity throughout this country.

Mind you, they are young French-Canadian boys and girls from the city of Trois-Rivières, who sing in English, and who were applauded by English-speaking and French-speaking people, because they sing Canada. They do not sing of division, of separation or even of destruction, but of Canadian unity. It is with such choirs that we can really establish or strengthen the ties which must bind all Canadians together, without exception.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I asked the Secretary of State whether it is possible to grant subsidies to such groups. In the province of Quebec, thousands of dollars are appropriated for cultural exchanges with France, or Italy or every European country.

However, I should like to ask a few cents for similar small organizations which I feel are most important. Governments declare themselves unable to help those young people to travel across Canada to promote better understanding among Canadians. It is a shame to go and seek culture elsewhere when

we can develop our own by helping our young people, such as those from the Trois-Rivières choir. We have many such organizations. It is high time, I believe, that the federal government and the provincial governments should allocate some money to youth organizations such as those. These are not organizations eager to destroy everything. We should stop financing the latter and open the doors wide to the former.

It does not behoove me too much to discuss provincial policy, but, as I am a citizen of Quebec, I have the right to express an opinion. We spend, I repeat, thousands of dollars for cultural exchanges with foreign countries, when we have no money to help our own youth to acquire a certain degree of culture.

I saw some young people in Montreal on Wednesday night. They were not hippies, nor were they the kind that are to be found on street corners throwing stones in the name of Quebec separatism. They were smiling young Canadians, who were full of life and who have faith in the future of their country.

And we, as members of parliament, would not help these young people who will continue tomorrow the good work we have undertaken. I swear to you that, on Wednesday night, when I saw those young people from Trois-Rivières, I was sure that they had not been assimilated.

And I shall repeat here that even if we French-speaking Canadians are only a minority in Canada, we shall probably still be here in 50 or 100 years. It is a fact that any minority made up of cowardly, irresponsible and destructive people is bound to disappear. On the other hand, any minority composed of vigilant, determined and responsible people will survive anywhere, even in India. That is what we must recognize.

And to think that in the province of Quebec there are some who maintain that we are in the process of losing our language. Now I say it here, in this federal parliament: one hundred years ago, we were not even one million French-speaking Canadians in Quebec, while now we number six million. Are we disappearing? And the quality of spoken French is much higher than that which we knew a mere 40 years, and even 30 years ago.

My father, who is 81 years old to-day and still going strong, lives in Rouyn. He attended school four or five years; he did not learn much French, and he never learned English. On the other hand, nowadays our youngsters all attend school at least up to the 11th or 12th grade.

[Mr. Caouette.]

The quality of the French language is better now than 25 years ago, and we will hear prophets of doom claim in Quebec that we are in the process of extinction. They will disappear one day, indeed when we die, but as long as I live, in Canada, I will remain above all a French-speaking Canadian. That is my status, and it is not a special status. It is a natural right just like the one enjoyed by the English-speaking Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, we have enough of those who spread panic in the province. This morning, I was reading in *Le Devoir* an article on René Lévesque, leader of the *Parti Québécois*, who stated—everybody knows his political platform—that we had to secede, then try to unite in order to establish an economic association. We are part of Confederation, let us remain in it. Let us improve the situation if we are not satisfied.

Similarly, when we say that the French-speaking Canadians of Quebec contribute 30 per cent of the national budget, that is a large amount; however, those who are not French-speaking supply for their part 70 per cent of it.

Even Mr. Gilles Grégoire's salary, when he was here was paid in a proportion of 70 per cent by English-speaking taxpayers and of only 30 per cent by French-speaking ones.

We are told in Quebec that we are about to disappear, while Mr. Lévesque, when told about the possibility of Créditistes getting involved in provincial politics, said yesterday that this would only help—

—to confuse the issues—

On the contrary, this would clear things up.

—and to put off the taking of the necessary stands and decisions. Anyone who is the least bit sensitive can see that there is a vacuum in Quebec—

He did not think that one up.

—and that the two old parties are no longer in the game. Opportunists may think there is something in this for them, but they will not be able to confuse the issues much longer.

Lévesque dixit. He goes on, and he sees things very clearly:

The pro-sovereignty member for Laurier stated that at a time when Quebec is trying to move towards a clear choice, the attempt of Caouette's group, if at all realistic, will only spread confusion.

You will agree with me that his position is not so clear as all that! We know that some people, instead of giving their vote to the

Liberals or the Union Nationale, would support Lévesque, not because they are separatists but because they are fed up with the two parties in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, does that mean that Mr. Lévesque offers a clear choice to the population? Besides, he himself is all mixed up. He says that in Quebec, only French must be learnt as the official working and promotion language. If ever Mr. Lévesque becomes premier of Quebec—I hope that will never happen—and must borrow from the United States, before inviting Americans to invest money in Quebec, will he require as the main condition that the American investor speaks French, and that his working language be French? No. It would be quite the opposite. Mr. Lévesque will go hat in hand to Washington and New York, and beg in English, like everyone else.

He hardly protested when the agreement for the purchase of hydro-electric power from Churchill Falls was negotiated in English. Now he shifts his position slightly and says that there is more for him in the substance than in the form. The form is English but he would like to have it French which would be—quite an acrobatic feat.

Mr. Speaker, at any rate, I do not intend to discuss here provincial politics. Perish the thought. However, I intend to say frankly that both official languages must be recognized, not only in Quebec but everywhere in Canada. It does not compel anybody to learn French or English, but it is advisable to learn both languages.

Today, we note how much importance the English-speaking and the French-speaking Canadians give to the teaching of both languages at all school levels.

When we refer to bilinguism in areas where there is a sufficient number of French Canadians, it means that the people should speak French. We all know this.

But, in the province of Quebec—and here I wish the minister could lend me his ear—we have some areas where there are practically no English-speaking people but where the federal employee is required to speak English. There are very few federal civil servants in the province of Quebec who are not bilingual. In many cases when competitions of the federal Civil Service are held, a French Canadian is required to speak English, while an English-speaking person is not required to speak French.

Therefore, this must stop. The same requirements must apply to both.



• (3:10 p.m.)

I have said again and again: Up to now in Quebec—and I hope it will stay that way—English-speaking people have been put on the same footing as French-speaking Canadians.

In Amos, Abitibi, Quebec, I started to learn English in school. There were no English-speaking people in the small municipality of Amos in 1920, 1922 and 1923.

I was happy then to start learning English. I was glad to do so because I was convinced that a person who knew two languages was superior to another who knew only one. I have always thought so.

This does not mean that one has to neglect his maternal tongue in order to learn the other one. It seems to me that the culture of a bilingual person is more complete than that of another who can only speak or understand one language.

For instance, when I went to Czechoslovakia some four years ago, I found that most people could speak three, four, five, six and even eight different languages. It was wonderful to hear those people go from one language to another and talk with someone who spoke a language completely different from theirs.

In Canada, and most particularly in my region, Polish, Ukrainians are learning French and English; they keep their mother tongue. I am most pleased to find that those young people who attend our schools speak their own language at home. They speak three languages fluently. I feel that this enriches their culture. They speak a flawless French as any French-Canadian. They speak a flawless English as any English-Canadian. This is seen more and more today across the country.

If people recognize that they enrich their culture if they learn Spanish, Italian, German, and so forth, they should recognize all the more that it is enriched through a knowledge of at least our country's two official languages. It is essential, it seems to me.

Then again, that does not force our citizens to learn a language against their will. I believe that jurisdiction in matters of bilingualism belongs much more to the provinces than to the federal government.

At the present time, the federal government resorts to suggestions or measures on bilingualism within federal departments, but such departments do not represent the major part of Canada.

In the end, the provinces themselves account for the majority of the population. Therefore the provinces are in a better position to take effective action with regard to bilingualism, since education comes under their jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, government policy on bilingualism, according to a statement made by the present Prime Minister's predecessor on April 6, 1966 is the following and I quote:

> —it will be normal practice for oral or written communications within the service to be made in either official language at the option of the person making them . . . communications with the public will normally be in either official language—
>
> The linguistic and cultural values of both English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians will be reflected through civil service recruitment and training; and
>
> A climate will be created in which public servants from both language groups will work together towards common goals, using their own language and applying their respective cultural values, but each fully understanding and appreciating those of the other.

That is exactly, I believe, what the Créditistes have been preaching in Canada for many of years. It is precisely what I said in the house almost seven years ago. Mr. Speaker, our attitude in this regard does not change.

I think it is possible to maintain unity in Canada. But to do so, the language problem is not the only one to solve. There are also economic matters to be considered, as the hon. member for York South said a moment ago.

The problems in the west are similar to those in the east. The wheat growers' problems are exactly the same as those of eastern dairy farmers and those of Ontario corn growers, and so on.

There is a high priority the government could have looked after. The government might have decided to introduce a positive legislation regarding Canadian economy. Instead, the government preferred to introduce the official languages bill.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot oppose this bill: On the contrary, we shall support it.

As far as the amendments referred to by the hon. member for York-South and by the leader of the official opposition are concerned, we shall probably know of what nature they are after the study in committee. Until then, what we must know is whether or not both languages, French and English, will be recognized as official languages, from St. John, Newfoundland, to Vancouver and Victoria, from coast to coast. We support Bill C-120.

[Mr. Caouette.]

Créditistes will probably make certain reservations regarding the enforcement of the language bill in the federal service. At that time, the recriminations or complaints we shall have to make will be put forward frankly and freely before the responsible minister and the right hon. Prime Minister who sponsors the bill.

This Mr. Speaker is all I wanted to say this afternoon. We believe it is possible for French-speaking Canadians to fight for their rightful place within Confederation and for English-speaking Canadians to know what their position is.

In conclusion, I am still convinced that it is impossible to make an English Canadian out of a French Canadian or vice versa. However, both can make good Canadians.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*English*]

**Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Mr. Speaker, before I go into the principal points I want to make during this debate I should like to deal with a few of the remarks made by the leaders of the opposition parties. The leaders of these opposition parties never cease to amaze me. They come into this chamber and state with great passion that they favour the bill, yet they drag out red herrings and set up straw men to be knocked down. Many of the things mentioned really have nothing to do with the bill.

• (3:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Dinsdale:** They at least think for themselves.

**Mr. Allmand:** Perhaps if you listen and you will find out whether they do. The leader of the Créditiste party said at the beginning of his speech that he would like to know why the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is not here this afternoon. He pointed out that the Prime Minister was here this morning. The Prime Minister flew to Moncton, New Brunswick, this afternoon to receive an honorary doctorate degree from the University of Moncton, which is I believe the living image of growing bilingualism in the maritime provinces. That engagement was a long standing one. I do not think anyone would suggest the Prime Minister should have remained this afternoon and passed up the opportunity to fulfil that engagement. The spokesman for the New Democratic party and the Leader of the Conservative party were greatly incensed because the bill was introduced for second reading by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) and they

were not informed of the amendments that would be made to it. It is my understanding that the Secretary of State is the minister responsible for this bill. As such, it is usual and traditional for him to introduce the bill. I also point out that this is a debate on second reading, a debate on the principle of the bill. It is a debate which, under the new rules, takes place before the bill is sent to committee to be considered in detail.

I understand, nevertheless that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) will, when speaking to the house on Tuesday, relate frankly what minor amendments he proposes to the bill. I think it is nit-picking to be greatly incensed about these matters when we are supposed to be discussing the principle of the bill. The Secretary of State deals with the principle of the bill, and the Minister of Justice does not—

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

**Mr. Allmand:** I would like to deal with questions at the end of my speech, if the hon. member does not mind. I shall be pleased to answer his question at that time. The principal purpose of my participation in this debate—

**Mr. Peters:** We would like to hear that.

**Mr. Allmand:** I have listened to you, and now you can listen to me. I will tell you why I am participating in the debate. The reason is that I am in this house as an English speaking representative from the province of Quebec. I represent a minority group in that province which for many years has put forward the proposition that the French speaking people in Canada outside the province of Quebec should be treated as we have been treated. For many years, the English speaking people in the province of Quebec have been treated with great justice. In recent years, since about 1960, there have been growing in the province of Quebec movements of extreme nationalism. These movements of extreme nationalism—I do not believe they are the answer to the problem—have in many cases been based upon valid complaints and grievances.

It is true that for many years, not only outside the province of Quebec but within it, the English speaking establishment that controlled the industries and much of the economic life of that province was very insensitive to the French speaking people in the province. It was very difficult for the French speaking people to participate in the business community in their own language. There were justifiable grievances. But with respect to the solution of these grievances I support not the extreme solutions of the separatists or nationalists, the solutions of Mr. Lévesque and Le Partie Québécois, but the solutions of our Prime Minister. I believe his solutions will do more to unite this country and defeat any type of separatist movement.

There have been nationalist movements in Quebec in the last few years. So far, fortunately, these nationalist movements have not attained any great power. They have made a great deal of noise; they have, in some cases, damaged life and property, but they have not attained any political power. We have seen, however, a serious case of injustice when such a movement has attained power. I refer to the Catholic School Board in the municipality of St. Leonard. The decision was made to gradually take away the right of the English speaking people in that municpality to an education in their language. Last year this right was removed for the first year of a child's education, and starting this fall it will be removed for the second year.

The people in the municipality took this matter very seriously, as did many other people in Montreal. I give great credit to Mr. Robert Beale who has been a leader in the attempt to obtain private schools for these people. These are working class people; they are not rich. They have scrimped and scraped and saved small amounts of money with which to rent classroom space, provide books and teachers for the pupils. This they have done on their own.

I am rather amazed that the spokesman for the New Democratic party should set up a straw man by saying we should be debating another bill because other legislation is more important to the people of Quebec. If we had come forward with another bill I think he would have asked why we were not dealing with this bill. This is his usual type of politics.

This bill was introduced and given first reading on October 17, 1968. We are now dealing with second reading. I do not understand how anybody can pretend we are pushing this bill forward because it is a pet project of the Prime Minister. It has been on the order paper for a long time. While listening to members of the opposition I counted the number of bills which have been passed since this bill was given first reading. Forty-one bills have been passed by this parliament

since we began our session in September. The spokesman for the New Democratic party said we have not given priority to economic matters. Less than a month ago we were dealing with the bill concerning regional economic expansion. This was one of the major planks of our platform, and the program will do a great deal to help people in Quebec and other parts of Canada who are economically depressed. Therefore, it is incorrect to put forward the argument that this party is trying to push pet projects and give them higher priority than other matters. To say there are priorities greater than those which give our people national and political rights is, I think, to mislead the people.

The people in St. Leonard are very hard pressed, economically, but they are doing their utmost to establish the schools they need. They are doing this because they believe they are right. To say that economic matters always come before other things such as language and culture is, I think, to misread history. How can anybody tell the people in Biafra that they should be reasonable, and economics are more important than their culture, language rights, and so on? If we consider the national problems of many countries we will see that people have felt so strongly about such things as language, culture, religion, and so on, that they have been willing to fight for them despite the economic losses they might suffer.

As the minister said this morning, many people in this country have been waiting 100 years for justice in respect of language and cultural rights. It is about time we did something about this. I enter this debate as an English speaking person from the province of Quebec. I sympathize fully with the English speaking and French speaking people of Canada who have been denied their rights. I refer again to St. Léonard. Many people might say that this example of injustice to the English speaking people is a minor one compared with the injustices perpetrated upon French speaking people during the last 100 years. They are right; there are many examples of greater injustices being perpetrated on the French speaking people of this country.

• (3:30 p.m.)

But I do not think we can take the attitude that because the St. Léonard situation is less of an injustice, we must tolerate it. I think it is time that we in this country acted, not only through the federal parliament but also through the provincial legislatures, to correct all these injustices. We should act to turn back the clock of history and try to put right the wrongs done in Quebec and in other provinces, especially in other provinces vis-à-vis the French speaking Canadians.



Some people might say—and this point has not been raised once in this debate—that they are becoming a little impatient with the French speaking nationalist movement in Quebec. One is beginning to hear some English speaking people in this country say "let Quebec go. We have had enough. Let them do what they want, we will do what we want". That is a very inward looking and unreasonable position.

To begin with, people who talk that way do not realize what Quebec is and they do not realize the value of knowing two languages. I myself have had the good fortune of having lived in four provinces. I went to school in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec. When I completed my schooling in Quebec I was behind my colleagues in school in my knowledge of the French language. When I graduated in law I could barely read French and could not speak it at all. However, I realized that if I were to earn my living as a lawyer in Quebec I would have to learn the language of the province, and I did, although with great difficulty. I am far from perfect or fluent in French now, but I can communicate in that language quite well. It was a difficult task. Now, I feel a much richer person because I have acquired the ability to understand and to communicate to a certain extent in another language which is, I would say without a doubt, one of the major languages of the world.

We are lucky to have as our two official languages two languages that are spoken so widely throughout the world. Recently when we went to Belgium with the Standing Committee on External Affairs we came into contact with Flemish and French speaking Belgians. One of the difficulties there is that one of the languages, the French language, is spoken widely throughout the world but the use of the Flemish language is very restricted. It was difficult to convince some French speaking Belgians that they should learn Flemish. However, I cannot understand why Canadians would not quickly reach out for the opportunity to acquire these two very important languages, the use of both of which is world wide.

Now, I want to make it clear that this bill does not seek to impose the French or the English language on anyone in Canada. This

was made clear by the minister this morning, but I think it must be stressed again. The Leader the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) said that we must do everything to clarify the principle of the bill. I have been trying to do that, and so have many members of this party. I hope that all members of this house, when they speak about this bill in their constituencies, will stress the point that this bill does not seek to impose the French language on English speaking people or the English language on French speaking people.

**Mr. Forrestall:** Is that the principle?

**Mr. Allmand:** The principle of the bill is to provide services in federal institutions for both the French and English speaking people in this country, wherever they may be in sufficient number. The principle is not to force people in mainly English speaking parts of Canada to speak French but rather to provide services in governmental institutions at the federal government level so that French or English speaking persons who approach such an agency or Crown corporation may speak with someone in their own language. What this might mean is that in an area of Ontario where there is a certain number of French speaking people there will be enough sales people and information people at a post office, a C.N.R. office or an Air Canada office to deal with requests for tickets and information in either the French or English language.

The same will hold true in a place such as Chicoutimi or the lower St. Lawrence or other parts of Quebec in relation to the English speaking people. In these areas the English speaking people who are in the minority should have the right, if there are enough of them, to go to these federal government offices and obtain service in their own language. This is all that the bill attempts to do. It says that the institutions in Canada under the federal government must be so established that the French and English speaking people of Canada can obtain service from the federal government in their own language. This does not mean that everybody in that office must speak both languages. It just means that there should be a sufficient number of employees in the office to deal with the public in the language that the public wishes to speak. In some areas this might mean that one out of ten persons must speak French or that one out of twelve must speak English.

I should like to speak now about some of the objections that have been or might be raised against this bill. The Leader of the Conservative party said there was concern about the administration of this bill. He said that he supported the principle of the bill but that injustice could be done if it were not administered properly. I think we all agree with that. Of course, the best of laws can be administered improperly and thus bring about injustice. I think the minister and all the members on this side of the house would agree that if the situation is to be improved, there must be a proper administration of the provisions of this bill. There is no real division of opinion on that.

Members of the opposition parties who spoke also raised the complaint and the fear that perhaps people who are unilingual in Canada—I think they were referring to unilingual English speaking people—might not be able to have a full career in the civil service or in some Crown corporation. It is my feeling that there is provision for that in the bill. I do not believe that any person who speaks only English will be prevented from having a career in the civil service or in a Crown corporation because there is no requirement that everybody must speak French and English. However, there is an implication in this argument with which I think I should deal. It should be made clear that for many years, whereas a person who could speak only English could join any Crown corporation or any government department and, advance without any difficulty, the person who spoke only French had to learn English to do so. I think it should be a two way street. I am not saying that everyone should be bilingual. I think that in some parts of Canada unilingual people can serve well in the civil service. However, I think that the people who make the accusation that we are forcing English speaking people to learn French if they wish to advance in the civil service should remember that we have been doing that for years to the French speaking people.

The Leader of the Opposition stated that it is not easy to learn two languages. I agree with him; I had to start learning French at the age of 25 and it was extremely difficult. But, as I pointed out, it can be done, and when it is accomplished there is a great sense of satisfaction and a great gain.

The Leader of the New Democratic party and the Leader of the Conservative party

brought up the point that we should be dealing with bills that relate to economic conditions and that a bill of this nature which deals with language rights is not the only answer to regional grievances. The government of Canada has never disputed that. That is why I say a strawman is being set up to knock down. The speeches made by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) during the debate on the bill to establish his department made that very point.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The point has repeatedly been made by the Prime Minister that we do not satisfy people in the west or in the maritimes or in Quebec by passing measures that point only in one direction, such as extending language rights in a certain area of Quebec. This point has been emphasized also by the leaders of other parties. The government has tried to do something about this question and it will continue to try. I think this should be made clear and members should understand it.

In conclusion, I urge the rapid adoption of second reading of this bill so that it may be sent to the special committee where it will receive more detailed scrutiny. I think the bill is extremely important for the English-speaking minorities in Quebec and the French-speaking minorities outside Quebec. I think the people of Canada gave this government a strong mandate to put this measure through, since it was one of the leading planks in the Liberal party platform during the election campaign last June. For the first time the people of Canada returned a majority government because they felt the unity of the country was threatened and that the policies put forward by the Prime Minister would bring about unity. Thus, I feel the government has been given a strong mandate to put forward this kind of measure.

However, let me also make it clear that I do not feel this bill is a full and complete answer. I fully support the initiatives of the Prime Minister in trying to entrench the bill of rights in the constitution of the country, a bill of rights that will contain guarantees in regard to the French and English languages. The bill before the house today deals only with bilingualism in institutions within the jurisdiction of the federal government.

Many injustices with regard to language rights—such as the injustice to which I referred at St. Leonard, Quebec—fall within provincial jurisdiction. School rights and education rights have to be protected by provincial legislation of a kind similar to this legislation. However, I think it would be even better to put these rights beyond the ordinary legislative competence of the federal parliament or the provincial legislatures by entrenching a bill of rights in our constitution, one which would protect language rights, as suggested by the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism. If that were the case, no extremist provincial or federal government that wished to crush these rights would be able to do so. I feel that this is really what is required.

I urge rapid passage of the bill so that it can be sent to the committee, and I urge all hon. members to support the bill.

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member now permit the question I wanted to ask him?

**Mr. Allmand:** Yes.

**Mr. Aiken:** The hon. member rather brushed off the amendments to be proposed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). Can he tell us whether these amendments that are being proposed will be fundamental to the bill, or minor?

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the cabinet and I do not know what the amendments are. However, my point is that the Secretary of State is the minister responsible for this bill. On second reading we deal with the principle of a bill, not its details. I doubt whether the amendments would deal with the basic fundamentals in the bill. The government is committed to the principles contained in the bill. I can only speculate that the amendments deal with matters that are not basic to the bill. As the hon. member knows, detailed amendments, if they are announced—and I suppose they will be announced by the Minister of Justice on Tuesday—will have to be moved in the committee and dealt with there; they cannot be dealt with in the house. However, as I say, as a backbencher I do not know what the exact nature of the amendments will be.

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I had intended to make some preliminary points prior to getting on to my main criticisms of the bill, but since I have little more than ten minutes before the

debate is adjourned I propose to dispense with what I intended to say by way of opening remarks. I would like to say, however, that I, too, was surprised to hear the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), speaking for the New Democratic party, say he was appalled at certain of the conditions that the clauses of the bill seemed to impose upon the people of Canada. I listened to his speech with much interest, and it seemed to me to be a speech intended for the consumption of those in western Canada as well as those in eastern Canada, depending on which part of his speech one read. In other words, it seems to me that the position of the N.D.P. on this bill is one of riding the fence.

**Mr. Gilbert:** Do not worry about the New Democratic party.

**Mr. McIntosh:** I would never do that because I doubt whether I will live to see the N.D.P. form the government of this country.

In rising to take part in this debate, I fully realize that what I have to say is my own opinion and is not intended to be a reflection on anyone. What I say may be twisted and misinterpreted in an attempt to belittle me as a bigot and possibly a reactionary. However, let me repeat that what I am going to say is my own opinion.

This morning when the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) commenced his speech he said that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had already stated this measure was extremely important in the view of the government because it touched the very foundation of Canadian unity. I think he also said that language rights were the very core of unity within our country. I entirely disagree with him on that because I think this bill will become the core of disunity in this country in places where there never was disunity before.

The Secretary of State also said no doubt there is a risk of encountering many petty objections. For example, he said there are people who will object because of a narrow, conformist attitude. It is an unfortunate fact of life in Canada today that anyone who feels compelled, as I do, even by conscience or principle, to question measures such as the one now before us in Bill C-120 runs the risk of being branded a WASP racist. I do not care how I am branded; I feel, as a matter of principle and conscience, that I must have my say.

A disproportionate number of pundits, academics and politicians who prefer theories and paper solutions to hard headed, workable legislation have blindly accepted the idea that our only hope of national survival lies in trying to legislate unity. This cannot be done. You cannot impose equality of race and language by federal coercion.

These apostles of the B and B commission, whose high priests I might say, are the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State, are like propagators of new faiths throughout history, narrow, fanatical and inflexible. They are the evangelists and sole trustees of the latest gospel; those who differ with them are infidels and heretics. To question the dogmatic assertions of one of them is to open the floodgate of their collective wrath. This I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, and this I am prepared for. But I believe that it is high time for some plain speaking, for the voice of inexpert, unacademic, ordinary Canadians to be heard on this question of race and language.

The bogey of separatism has been skilfully inflated, the facts of history and of current events so expertly distorted, that ordinary Canadians in many parts of the country have been hoodwinked into believing that massive concession to a minority is the only answer; that the "gospel according to St. Pierre" provides the only way. Bilingualism and biculturalism have become what is known as the "in" thing. It is fashionable today to sprinkle French cliches into your cocktail chatter, to talk of total immersion, and to discourse on the need for linguistic equality. We just heard what the last speaker said a few moments ago. Too few of those who have adopted this fad have paused long enough to consider the facts and implications that are the guts of the whole question with which Bill C-120 attempts to deal. For too many Canadians it is sufficient that the "B & B" Commission is popular, and the current "thing" is to be "for" it. But this debate, Mr. Speaker, is not a cocktail party conversation. This legislation is not just an interesting and provocative theory. This debate is a deadly serious discussion of tremendous importance to the everyday life of Canada and every Canadian. This legislation will become a hard and binding fact affecting everyone if it passes through parliament.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Because it affects the whole nation so intimately and so radically, I believe it should not be allowed to be whisked through parliament without there being the most searching and candid examination. I am opposed to this bill as bad law, bad politics and bad public

relations. I believe it to be unconstitutional, undesirable and, in the light of the other grave problems confronting us, most frivolous.

Aside from my personal belief that this measure is unconstitutional, I think that parliament must give serious consideration and weight to the position taken by several of the provinces that the bill is unconstitutional. We may disagree with the views of the provinces but we cannot take exception to their right to hold those views and their equal right to challenge this bill on the basis of those views. The provincial governments had the counsel of their law officers in this regard just as, one presumes, the Prime Minister and his colleagues had the advice of the principal law officers of the government that this measure is constitutional.

I suggest to the house, Mr. Speaker, that we will achieve little if we adopt the line taken by some of the more fervent supporters of this legislation, particularly some members of the cabinet and of the parliamentary press gallery, who condemn provincial premiers and others as insincere obstructionists when they voice honest criticisms. To criticize or even question, however honestly, this measure is to call down invective and malicious distortion on your head. This is part of the behavior I alluded to earlier.

By adopting an arrogant and arbitrary attitude with regard to this bill, the government has made sure that the bill will be considered with a maximum of emotion and a minimum of mind. Considering what the British North America Act provides, fails to provide and actually prohibits, I question the constitutionality of this measure. My starting point for argument is Section 133 of the B.N.A. Act which reads as follows:

> Either the English or the French Language may be used by any Person in the Debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those Languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those Languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the Courts of Quebec.
>
> This Act of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those Languages.

Thus we see that both French and English are constitutionally established and are to be used in the parliament of Canada and the legislature of Quebec. The law says no more and no less. Nowhere in the B.N.A. Act is there any reference that French and English are established as the official languages of the government of Canada. I refer to "government" as contrasted to "parliament", the two being obviously quite different entities. Yet, without a shadow of constitutional authority, clause 2 of Bill C-120 which is the declaratory clause of the bill says:

> The English and French languages are the official languages of Canada for all purposes of the Parliament and Government of Canada, and possess and enjoy equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all the institutions of the Parliament and Government of Canada.

Surely it is obvious that this language goes far beyond the language of the original Section 133 of the B.N.A. Act. It must be obvious that it effectively changes the substance and import of this section and that it clearly represents an amendment to Section 133. On that ground alone it would appear, even to one who is not a lawyer, that the bill as presently constituted represents an attempt to amend the constitution, and is, therefore, beyond the power of parliament. This attempt to amend the constitution in violation of constitutional law and practice is emphasized even more in subsequent clauses of Bill C-120. Clauses 3, 5 and 7 merely reinforce the unconstitutional approach laid down in clause 2.

Section 133 of the B.N.A. Act sets out quite clearly and distinctly the official position of the two languages. Any attempt to change this section by a simple act of the Parliament of Canada, is, in my view, unconstitutional.

Another section of the B.N.A. Act explicitly prohibits the federal government from acting in certain spheres. Section 91(1) forbids the government to tamper with language questions. This situation was brought about by means of an amendment to Section 91 of the B.N.A. Act, engineered in 1949 at the request of the St. Laurent government. In part the amended section now reads:

> —it is hereby declared . . . the exclusive Legislative Authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all Matters coming within the Classes of Subjects next herein-after enumerated; that is to say—
>
> 1. The amendment from time to time of the Constitution of Canada except as regards . . . the use of the English or the French language—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Order, please. It being four o'clock, in accordance with the special order made earlier this day a motion to adjourn the house at this time is deemed to have been moved and seconded. Therefore, the question is that this house do now adjourn.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

FISHERIES—RESTRICTIONS IN SAINT JOHN HARBOUR AND BAY OF FUNDY

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (St. John-Lancaster):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to take everyone here to the quiet and peaceful waters of Saint John Harbour, because I want to speak about salmon fishing. This is the third time that I have availed myself of the opportunity to speak on the so-called late show. Both my previous efforts were crowned with success. I know that the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) could not be here at this time. I know he is keenly interested in the matter and has suggested that it may be brought up at some later date when he is in the house. Unfortunately, the salmon season has begun. At this time I wish to put on the record a story of hardship existing in the area I represent. I hope the situation will be remedied. Since the minister is not here and since it is late in the week I will keep my remarks brief. When the minister returns to Ottawa I hope he will read my remarks in *Hansard* and try to remedy some of the matters which officials of his department have overlooked.

It seems that the department has moved too quickly and too drastically in my area in the field of conservation. We are all in favour of conservation. Salmon fishermen of Saint John have always supported any measures that were required. They are in the business of catching salmon in Saint John Harbour and in the Bay of Fundy, and they sell their luscious fish to markets in New York, to the Seignory Club, the Rideau Club and to others who can afford it. We do not see it in Ottawa and it is not served in the parliamentary restaurant. Instead we seem, in our restaurant, to invest our money in expensive western beef. If we were really interested we might obtain some of our delightful Saint John River salmon, one of the great gourmet fishes of the world.

There has been in St. John Harbour and its vicinity a fishing season of 66 days. Because of a government edict, that season has now been reduced to 46 fishing days. In other words, the salmon fishermen had five days a week in which to fish. Now, without any notice or consultation with the industry, someone in Ottawa has pressed the button and the fishermen in Saint John can now fish only two days a week.

• (4:00 p.m.)

A year ago the fishermen were told they required a licence. They were told this without any prior notice. Some fishermen made heavy investments in equipment. Some got their gear together, purchased new boats, made plans to share their catches and contracts were set up. They were all set for a good fishing season this year. They were prepared to play their part in the economic life of this community when all of a sudden they were told they could fish only two days a week. This made a very serious impact on their catches. There are days when the water is not right for salmon fishing. I do not imagine too many people in this area know too much about salmon fishing or angling. Those who have tried to catch salmon know the conditions have to be right. Even a southeast wind can make a difference. If it is raining or not the right tide, this will affect their catch.

The number of fishing days has been reduced from 66 days to only 21 theoretical days. This will spoil the markets which have been built up in Boston, New York and exclusive places in Ottawa, Montreal and Toronto for this delicacy. These are now going to be lost. Two days a week for fishing will make a difference to the storage of the salmon prior to shipment. Shipping it will no longer be an everyday occurrence.

I hope there will be a reply from a representative of the minister to my sincere suggestion that the government take another look at the situation. I do not blame the government. They are trying to do something. Salmon fishing is on the downgrade, and there is a lack of salmon all over the world. We know the Russians and Japanese are fishing in our waters, but why pick on little old Saint John Harbour? There have never been any other changes with regard to the east coast. I stand to be corrected on that, but I have not learned of any other restrictive changes of this nature with respect to salmon fishing on the east coast.

I checked with the fisheries critic of the opposition and he has informed me he has no knowledge of any similar restrictions. This is not the west coast, but the east coast to which I am referring. I suggest the government check to see whether this was not too drastic a step taken too soon and without notice. Perhaps from the goodness of their hearts the civil servants might give the fishermen in

Saint John Harbour an extra day or two as the season progresses.

I want to interject that as far as pollution is concerned, this has been going on in Saint John Harbour. It is nothing new. The few salmon caught in the harbour will not affect the anglers or conservation up-river. I make this humble plea on a Friday night in the hope it will be heard by someone who can protect these fishermen who are doing the best they can for the economic life of our community.

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** When the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell) raised this matter in a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) on Tuesday, the minister replied as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, there will be restrictions to two days for both sports fishing and commercial fishing for salmon in the areas the hon. member has mentioned. This is to permit greater escapement of salmon from the Saint John River which, I might add, is in a desperate condition so far as salmon spawning is concerned.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Saint John River is in a desperate condition as far as salmon spawning is concerned. In fact, the future of the salmon fishery in the entire river is in great jeopardy. It is for this reason that the action was taken to restrict both the commercial fishery and angling for salmon to two days each week between the opening date of May 15 and until an adequate escapement of salmon for spawning purposes has been obtained, or July 12, whichever occurs the earlier.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that if the Department of Fisheries and Forestry has assurance that adequate salmon spawning stock has escaped or will likely escape before July 12, then the department will certainly be prepared to increase the fishing time beyond the two days a week. This is in line with the hon. member's request.

Natural runs of adult salmon and grilse to the upper reaches of the Saint John River system have been declining rapidly during recent years. The counts of salmon through the Beechwood Dam, 85 miles up-river from Mactaquac have dropped from a record 8,334 salmon in 1963 to 1,210 in 1966 and to only 64 last year.

The natural escapement past Mactaquac in 1967 was very limited and the spawning escapement came almost completely from a total of 1,223 salmon and grilse trucked from below Mactaquac and released upstream. Last year Mactaquac Dam formed a complete obstruction to natural upstream passage and the total escapement above the dam of 1,116 salmon and grilse was obtained by trucking the fish.

The spawning grounds upstream from Mactaquac can support as many as 10,000 to 12,000 spawners and from this there could be a take of 2,000 to 3,000 by the anglers. The 1968 run to the Mactaquac collection facilities totalled only about 2,000 fish, around half of which were taken for hatchery brood stock purposes. It is felt that for 1969 serious efforts should be made to allow 5,000 to 6,000 salmon and grilse to reach the Mactaquac collection facilities. Approximately 1,000 would be used in the hatchery; the remainder would be trucked upstream to provide for natural spawning and some angling.

If this action is not taken immediately, salmon fishing on the entire Saint John River system in the 1970's could be eliminated entirely.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—COURTENAY, B.C.
—INAUGURATION OF CARRIER SERVICE

**Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** I asked the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) when he would inaugurate letter carrier delivery service in the city of Courtenay which now qualifies under the rules. In his reply the minister said something about doing this when the freeze is lifted. I asked him, why the freeze?

I feel this question is not redundant even after yesterday's debate. The minister did not come to grips with this or any other aspect of the policy of administration of his department. I must admit I have seldom heard a minister sustain a more prolonged and bruising attack than that delivered yesterday. There were moments when I almost felt sorry for him; however, I did feel the attack was justified. It was a natural reaction against what I would describe as the meat axe techniques being used by the minister in respect to the way in which postal services are being carried on in this country.

I think the feeling of shock and dismay which many members and citizens have experienced was typified by the rather whimsical fashion in which the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) launched his attack against the minister. It symbolized some of the shock and dismay which many of us felt about the course of action being pursued by the minister. I had not known the

minister except by repute until I met him recently in this building. When I learned of his appointment to this particular post, I expected there would be some acceleration in a cohesive manner of the modernization of the postal services of this country. Instead of this, the minister seems bent and determined that we are going to return to a 19th century level of Post Office services. The situation I am describing is a prime example of what I mean.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I have always understood that one of the first principles of a democracy is that there should be equallity of treatment of citizens before the law. But I do not think since I first came to this house I have seen a worse example of direct discrimination against a particular body or group of citizens in this country than this refusal to inaugurate postal service by letter carrier in the city of Courtenay. It is heightened by the fact that the neighbouring community of Campbell River, which is almost the same size, qualified for this service. The two communities were almost neck and neck but Campbell River happened to get under the wire and now has delivery service.

The community of Courtenay not only does not have this service but its lock-box post office is bursting at the seams and its citizens are now paying double the rate for a less fair and less adequate service than that enjoyed by their neighbouring community. It seems to me unthinkable that this sort of meat axe technique, this blind lashing out in some mysterious economy drive or whatever rationale the minister may be prepared to put on it, should take place in this day and age when the government of Canada has available to it the advice and the knowledge of economists and technologists almost without number.

I had expected that we would be moving forward so that our postal service would be keeping pace with other forms of communications that are developing as technology advances. It seems to me there is no possible answer that the minister can give in equity, justice or common sense than to get up and say this letter carrier delivery service will be inaugurated.

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his good wishes and his implied compliments, in which he repeated some of the sentiments expressed last night by my good friend from Annapolis Valley. I am sorry to have disappointed the high expectations of these people but I can assure them that all of us in the Post Office are doing the very best we can to provide the best possible service under the circumstances.

We have reached a threshold where the increasing volume of mail can no longer be handled with the manual methods that have been the traditional policy of governments during the last several generations. It is in the process of making the change to accommodate ourselves to the needs of our times that we are having our present difficulties, by the way difficulties which are much exaggerated by the hon. members opposite.

With respect to the city of Courtenay itself, as I explained to the hon. member although I did not give him the precise date, on March 1 of 1968, a well known economy drive was launched by the government of the day, and a freeze was instituted in virtually all of the departments in an attempt to limit spending and to reduce the burden of the taxpayers who, incidentally, are the electors of hon. members opposite as well as of members on this side of the house.

As a result of this, Courtenay is one of 24 communities where a letter carrier service is justified under our criteria, but where for lack of funds we cannot introduce it until such time as this freeze is lifted. Until that is done we will simply have to provide the traditional service to which these communities have been accustomed, and it is our intention to continue to do so.

The cost of introducing a letter carrier service is approximately $50,000 per community, and so we are really contributing to reducing the burden on the general funds of government by the amount of $1,200,000. I suppose I could appeal to my colleagues in the cabinet to reduce expenditures by a similar amount in the fields of medicare, old age pensions and welfare, but this I am not prepared to do. I feel that if it were explained to the people of Courtenay that as soon as this freeze is lifted and the funds are available we intend to proceed to implement our program of instituting letter carrier service in that town, they will accept this with their usual good will.

[*Translation*]

THE GUARANTEED INCOME OF FARMERS OF SAGUENAY-LAC ST-JEAN

**Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, further to the question I put to the hon. minister on May 1, I must say that I am very

glad to see that the parliamentary secretary is here; having been a member of farmers' associations, he is the right man to provide us with a workable solution.

This answer should relate to a question raised at a meeting held with farmers, on April 28, 1969. Four members of the house of commons attended that meeting during which a problem kept cropping up namely that farmers had no official representatives with the responsible authorities; they urged us to ask the minister whether he could allow them to be represented on the task force.

They wanted to know whether the minister would accept the setting up of a negotiating committee made up of delegates of the Dairy Commission and of the representatives of the agricultural organizations and would let farmers be heard before the official dairy policy were announced.

We feel that the hon. minister and his parliamentary secretary should give an answer to the farmers who put the question, so that the possibility of establishing a negotiating unit might be considered.

• (4:20 p.m.)

They criticized the government for not allowing them to give evidence and to discuss dairy policies at the level of the C.F.U. organization. The parliamentary secretary knows all about the work of the C.F.U. and that is why I asked the Minister the following question:

Could the Minister tell the house whether it is his intention to allow the C.F.U. in the Saguenay-Lac Saint-Jean area to be officially accredited as the negotiation unit for questions regarding our area, especially as far as the guaranteed income of farmers is concerned?

It does seem to show that I saw things eye to eye with the farmers. Where their income is at stake, it seems normal that they should have their say when their share of revenue for a dairy year is being decided upon. I wonder if the parliamentary secretary is willing to tell the house whether some formula has been devised to provide closer discussions between farm organizations and the Dairy Commission or the department represented here by the Commission. This should be the first step towards an agreement between the farmers and the Dairy Commission which has final decision as to what it will be able to offer to milk producers. The Commission determines also the income those farmers may expect for the coming year.

I simply wish to direct my question on the specific aspect, of establishing a negotiating unit so that farmers will be able to discuss and to participate in the formulation of the government's dairy policies.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

**Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, as an answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier), I think he knows as well as I do that the government, when discussing farm policies or any change in these policies, never fails to take into consideration, all recommendations coming from farm organizations.

I would like to point out to him that he missed a very good opportunity to let the population know that their representative is a member of the committee on agriculture.

So, in that capacity, along with a few other hon. members, he might have explained the beneficial effects of the Canadian Dairy Commission, which negotiates directly with farm associations.

In the May 7 issue of *La Terre de chez-nous*—not so long ago—the new farm policy was announced. On page 12, the Quebec Federation of Manufactured Milk Producers explains the beneficial effects of the Canadian Dairy Commission. It is said that such results were obtained due to the commendable co-operation of the Federation of Manufactured Milk Producers.

I suggest that the hon. member should explain to his constituents that good results were obtained, that considerable work was done, and that the Federation of Manufactured Milk Producers co-operated.

After all, the president of the Federation of Manufactured Milk Producers, who lives in the Saguenay region, is a member of the board of directors of the Canadian Dairy Commission.

If such co-operation is required, it is because the hon. member for Roberval was a bit concerned when he was asked that question, and he did not know that those who were asking it were members of a committee who happens to have negotiated the decisions taken by the Canadian Dairy Commission.

The hon. member for Roberval, every time he attends the meetings of the committee on agriculture, expresses, I think, worthwhile opinions. I would ask him if it is possible, as we have a role to play as members of parliament, whatever the party we belong to, to try to say a great deal of work is done, because farm associations are not in a position to criticize us when they cannot understand our policies.

Those who are not on the government side are in a good position to use those criticisms, but we must try to explain our policies and all the work that is done to our farm associations. So, I can say, Mr. Speaker that the hon. member for Roberval could have been a good member of parliament, because in the—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Côté (Richelieu):** —committee on agriculture—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Côté (Richelieu):** It is perhaps a good thing to know.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

[*English*]

TRADE—WHEAT—STATIONING OF SALES REPRESENTATIVE IN MAINLAND CHINA

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, on May 8 I posed a supplementary question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) in which I asked him whether the Canadian government would consider stationing a permanent sales representative of the Canadian Wheat Board in China once diplomatic recognition has been achieved. Of course, the motive I had in asking the question was that at the present time procedures are in process to recognize China diplomatically. While these discussions are going on, I think the government should be talking about stationing a permanent trade mission in China because this is one of the largest potential markets in the world. I believe it is one of the markets on which Canada should capitalize for the benefit not only of ourselves but the international community as an entirety.

I congratulate the government for undertaking diplomatic manœuvres designed to recognize China, but I also criticize the government for the long time it took in considering such a move. I think this should have been done years ago. I know that as a new member, particularly a member of the younger generation, I find it unbelievable that there still are members of parliament who say we should not recognize China diplomatically. I am very disappointed, particularly with some members of the Conservative party. I think their attitude results from nothing but intellectual constipation. I believe they are so far out of touch, it is beyond comprehension.

I think we should establish a trade mission in China for two reasons. First, I believe there is a domestic reason. I believe the biggest problem on the prairies today and in the farming communities is lack of cash. We need an immediate source of cash and some long range planning as well. I think in China we have a market which must be pursued. I think the Chinese economy today is better organized than it has been in years past. I believe we have there a potential market among the 600 million or 700 million people. I think we should take advantage of this opportunity to build up a trade market, because I believe eventually the other nations of the world will become interested in this area.

Secondly, I think China is very valuable politically. About one quarter of the world's people live there and I think we must bring them into the world family. I think it is insane to believe otherwise. One way to do this is through diplomatic recognition, but there must also be as much trade as possible. It is my opinion that there should be a comprehensive trade program. It would be insane not to do something like this because if we leave these people outside the world community, we will only increase the danger of world trouble and world insecurity.

I should like to stop here and ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to comment on the idea of establishing a permanent trade representative or mission in China. This is only a start on what I would like to see in the way of more trade and cultural exchanges between our countries. In this way we can improve not only our own conditions and give more security to our own economy, particularly that of western Canada, but also create a more harmonious international community.

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, there would appear to be some slight confusion in the use of words. The hon. member refers at times to a "trade commissioner" and at other times to a "Canadian Wheat Board representative". There is a difference. Of course, it is too early to announce what form the Canadian mission to Peking will take if and when the Chinese Communists accept Canadian recognition. It might be a bit premature to say this afternoon who the mission would include but it would seem normal that it would include a trade commissioner such as we have in many other countries of the world.

In the meantime my hon. friend is aware that we have trade commissioners in Hong Kong. One of them was recently at the Canton Fair. So there is knowledge from Hong

Kong in respect of the economic and trade situation in China.

With regard to having a representative of the Wheat Board in China, this would be a matter of Canadian Wheat Board policy and in due course we will see what it is. In the meantime, as is also known, the Wheat Board is in contact with potential buyers in China. Just recently the assistant chief commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Lawrie was in Hong Kong where he met with an association called the Chinese Resources Commission or something like that, which represents the Communist Chinese government in wheat trade matters.

• (4:30 p.m.)

## HOUSING—REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

**Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview):** Mr. Speaker, on May 8 I directed a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. In substance, the question asked the minister whether he would make any amendments to Bill C-192, the housing legislation which was recently introduced. I am very happy to see the minister take his place in the house, and I should like immediately to congratulate him on his appointment as minister responsible for housing. He did a very effective job in the department of Indian affairs, even though new legislation was not forthcoming. Nevertheless, he was at home in that department and his efforts in that regard may initiate action to help the Indian people. I hope the same will be true in respect of housing.

I do not have to recall the events in respect of the housing crisis. You will recall that during the election campaign in June of last year one of the platforms of the Liberal party was a massive housing program to meet housing needs in Canada. In September, because the crisis continued, this government set up a task force on housing. That task force reported in January of this year and we are anxiously awaiting action on the recommendations of that task force. There seemed to be conflict in the cabinet, the result of which was that the Minister of Transport in charge of housing resigned. Apparently this was because of differences that minister had with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). We now have the present minister in charge of housing.

The Prime Minister indicated there was no crisis in housing, and this precipitated a special debate on housing some two weeks ago. Members of this house have looked at Bill C-192 and have found that it is merely a housekeeping bill and a capitulation to financial institutions across the country. This resulted in a caucus and a request that the minister bring in amendments to this bill.

Hon. members realize that their efforts in the past were effective in respect of action on the part of the Postmaster General—we did receive amendments to the Post Office Act—and also in respect of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) regarding the Estate Tax bill. Hon. members saw shortcomings so far as Bill C-192 was concerned.

This bill does not have provisions in respect of low income families, a decrease in the price of land or a decrease in interest rates. Hon. members have attempted to persuade the government to seriously consider these three matters.

It is my understanding that the minister has just completed an emergency course in housing and is now ready to go ahead with Bill C-192. I am sure he is anxious to rise in his place and support members of the house and the people of this country by presenting some of the amendments he intends to bring forward in respect of Bill C-192. I am sure he will not repeat that performance we witnessed today in respect of the languages bill. Surely, he will not wait until this bill goes to the committee to rise in his place and tell us his ideas about the shortcomings of the bill and the amendments he proposes. The minister said he would approach this matter with an open mind, and as a result of his past performance I am sure he is anxious to answer these important problems.

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I tender my apologies for being late and not hearing the opening of the hon. member's remarks. I got caught in a traffic jam as a result of the construction going on along Wellington street. I hope the hon. member will forgive me. I should like to thank him very much for his kind remarks regarding my new assignment and my involvement in another department for the past ten months—an assignment I very much regret leaving.

The hon. member has used the word "crisis". Under the present circumstances I think this is a word which needs defining. Quite frankly, I prefer to state that in the area of housing this government is very deeply concerned. I hope I can do something to alleviate the situation.

Amendments to the National Housing Act will be brought before the house as soon as

the official languages bill debate is completed, I hope sometime next week. We will then be ready to file the bill, move for second reading and refer it to the committee. The hon. member has expressed hope that some additional information may be forthcoming at this time. Without being evasive I should like to say I am not in a position to advise him about these amendments at this time. I will be in a position to advise all hon. members of this possibility, and will do so as soon as I possibly can.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. Pursuant to standing order 2(3), this house stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 20, 1969, at 2 p.m.

At 4.39 p.m., the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Tuesday, May 20, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Second report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development—Mr. Watson.

[*Translation*]

Nineteenth report of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, in French and in English—Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau).

[*Editor's Note: Text of foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

### CONSUMER AFFAIRS

ANNOUNCEMENT SETTING UP PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE CAUSES, PROCESSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF INFLATION

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short statement with regard to the Prices and Incomes Commission. Following publication of the white paper on policies for price stability I arranged extensive consultations with a wide variety of representatives of economic interest groups, including the organized spokesmen for business and labour, and with the provincial governments. I also received letters from a great many people commenting on the proposals in the white paper, and I take this occasion to express my gratitude to all those who took the trouble to let me have the benefit of their views. I am glad to report to the house that there was a very broad measure of support for the kind of approach suggested in the white paper.

In the light of these consultations we have adopted the following terms of reference for the Prices and Incomes Commission which I wish to announce today:

The commission will be asked to inquire into and report upon the causes, processes and consequences of inflation and to inform those making current price and income decisions, the general public and the government on how price stability may best be achieved. The Commission will be authorized to prepare and publish from time to time under its own authority specific reports on:

(a) the results of their studies and investigations of the matters outlined above;

(b) current developments in costs, prices, productivity and incomes in particular sectors and industries within the economy and for the Canadian economy as a whole. The commissioners will be authorized to receive any requests for the conduct of studies on problems, issues and situations made to them by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or by any provincial government, but will be free to reject or defer any such request if they consider that the study is not relevant to their main functions or that, having regard to the resources available to them, the study is of lower priority than other studies or inquiries they consider they should conduct.

I am confident that this commission, as it proceeds with its tasks of investigating the inflationary process in Canada and of giving public advice on how we may achieve better price stability, will be able to bring about a greater degree of restraint on the part of those in the private and public sector who are charged with the responsibility of making current decisions about prices and incomes.

I want to emphasize, as we did in the white paper, that this is only one element in the government's policies for price stability. Monetary and fiscal policy are the major instruments the government is relying on. I am however convinced that this commission can make a valuable contribution towards price stability if it gets the co-operation it will need from all interested parties. In regard to fiscal policy, I would remind the house that there will be a budget statement early in June and that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) has emphasized our determination to keep the budget in balance. We have been exercising severe restraint on government expenditures ever since the present administration took office last summer, and as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau)

indicated a week ago, we will continue to do so and further announcements will be made in this regard.

• (2:10 p.m.)

I am very pleased to announce that Dr. John H. Young has agreed to become Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission now being established. Dr. Young is an economist of international stature. He has both the personal qualities and the practical experience that are needed for this kind of task. He has for some years been a member of the faculty of the University of British Columbia and is at present Dean of Arts at the university. I am grateful to Dr. Young for interrupting his career to take on this assignment which is of such importance to the Canadian people.

The names of the other members of the commission will be announced very shortly. In the meantime Dr. Young has already begun to seek qualified members for the staff of the commission so that work can begin without delay.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, there is only one word to describe the conduct of the government in regard to inflation, and that word is negligent. Inflation has been increasing relentlessly since 1966, at least. The rate of increase in prices has been twice as high, some years, as the Economic Council of Canada has suggested is tolerable. Last year, 1968, the consumer price index increased by 4.1 per cent, the highest in 17 years.

Our genial Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) in his budget of October forecast an inflationary factor this calendar year of about 3.5 per cent. In the first four months of the year the consumer price index has increased by nearly 2 per cent. At this rate the minister's forecast, unfortunately like many of his forecasts, will be wildly inaccurate.

In the face of the continuing increase in inflation the only response that the government made was in its white paper of last December announcing its intention to set up a Prices and Incomes Commission as a study group. The white paper did recognize the failure of established government policies to achieve the general aim upon which we all agree, and that is reasonably full employment associated with a reasonable degree of price stability. The white paper did say in no uncertain terms that the existing policies of the government were inadequate in that respect, but it went no further than to recommend the appointment of such a commission as this.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the government has not done one of the things that the Economic Council has consistently urged should be done to help in this fight,—perhaps in a minor way but yet in a helpful way,—and that is to establish a more accurate forecasting group in the country. Now we have in the country uncontrolled inflation associated with excessive unemployment, particularly in those parts of the country where inflationary pressures are not heavy.

Let me make it very clear that, although I wish Dr. Young well, in the light of the seriousness of the inflation problem, setting up this new group in itself is a ridiculously inadequate response; I have been urging for some time that the government act in cooperation with other segments of the economy to establish voluntary wage and price guidelines, not as a permanent solution but as a way of breaking loose from the inflationary psychology in which the government is caught, because not only have we inflation but we have very excessive unemployment in some parts of the country, and we must recognize that anti-inflationary programs the government is pursuing add to these difficulties, as was recognized by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) over the weekend upon the occasion of his visit to the Atlantic provinces.

Inadequate though it is to meet the immediate crisis, this commission might hopefully be of some usefulness in considering longer term solutions. Yet it has taken the government since last December to find the chairman; we still do now know who the other members of the commission will be. These will be future exciting instalments to which we can look forward.

The minister today announced the so-called terms of reference for the commission. They really add nothing of any consequence at all to what we already know. In short, today's announcement is proof that the government has a phony war against inflation, just as it has a phony war against poverty; and the enemy inflation is a strong ally of the enemy poverty—the strongest ally poverty has.

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, in spite of the minister's pride in his newly born brainchild I fear that the long labour has provided but a puny

infant. Apparently the commission is to provide a sort of rarefied study seminar empowered to call for information to aid its deliberations and empowered to publish information as to how price stability can be achieved. It is expected to produce reports which will be referred to a second stage seminar in the form of a joint Senate-Commons standing committee.

As an instrument for achieving price stability this commission appears singularly handicapped. It should be noted that the sessions of the commission are to be held in private, giving consumers no opportunity to watch what is going on, thus eliminating any possibility that the proceedings might have some immediate effect on price patterns in Canada.

The achievement of price stability is not the private concern of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It is a public matter of the most urgent importance and should be so treated. If this Prices and Incomes Commission is to be kept in the private cabinet of the minister along with the complaints of Box 99 and the deliberations of the Consumer Advisory Council, we have no hope of achieving price stability. We can hope to achieve price stability only when the white light of public scrutiny is let into the secret places of government and the marketplace.

A second thing to be noted is that the function of the commission is to be purely educative. It has no power to act as a policeman in defence of the consumer. It has no power to intervene in individual price and income decisions. It has no power to launch inquiries into rising living costs. In short it has no power except to use moral suasion, a weapon which was already proved a broken reed in the carnivorous jungle of the marketplace.

What the consumer needs is not a study seminar: The consumer needs teeth. This commission should provide a prices review board held in the white light of publicity, empowered to bring before it those who intend to raise prices and empowered to make them justify by full disclosure the need for such price increases. With such a commission the achievement of price stability would take on meaning and reality.

With such a commisssion, participatory democracy for the consumer would become more than an empty phrase. With such a commission a strong anti-trust, anti-combines and anti-conglomerate policy would become mandatory on the minister and would lead to a Combines Investigation Act with real teeth, instead of the dental falsies that face us now. With such a commission, what provincial government would dare display reluctance in concurrent legislation to help achieve price stability? With such a Commission what provincial government would refuse concurrent legislation to deal with the wildcat costs of services such as the salaries and wages of doctors, lawyers, executives, directors of corporations and other groups not now subject to the collective bargaining process.

Finally, a genuine and effective search for price stability must find ways and means of making Canada less dependent on the United States than it is now. When the United States sneezes Canada catches pneumonia. In tackling rising prices in Canada the government has rejected any formal incomes policy or guidelines for price and income increases. However it has instituted guidelines on salary and wage increases for the Public Service of Canada. This is completely unjustifiable discrimination.

If guidelines are to be applied—which in the white paper the government has rejected—then they should be applied to all forms of income, including profits, rents, interest and professional fees. This is the kind of program which must be undertaken if price stability is to be achieved. Big Brother is undoubtedly watching; but so is the consumer. And for the consumer the time for action is long overdue.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate Mr. John H. Young on his appointment as chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission.

Mr. Speaker, whether it be Mr. Young or someone else who is chairman of the Commission, it will remain a commission like all the others already existing in Canada.

The purpose of the new Commission is to determine whether prices have increased or not. That is a question that everybody can answer and there is no need for a Commission to tell us so or to determine that this is so. As a matter of fact, prices have risen and continue to rise because governments at all levels, federal, provincial and municipal, and school boards are forever raising taxes, and that contributes directly to price increases. And so, the Canadian people must pay higher prices for the commodities they need.

We think we are fighting inflation, or at least, we say we want to fight inflation by establishing new commissions. However, the hundreds of commissions created in Canada

have never solved any problems, because the government did not have the courage to take its responsibilities.

In his statement to the house, the minister said and I quote:

I am confident that this Commission, as it proceeds with its tasks of investigating the inflationary process in Canada and of giving public advice on how we may achieve better price stability, will be able to bring about a greater degree of restraint on the part of those in the private sector who are charged with the responsibility of making current decisions about prices and incomes.

Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing the same old story for some fifteen years, and things are getting worse all the time.

The minister said in conclusion:

I want to emphasize, as we did in the White Paper, that this is only one element in the government's policies—

The setting up of the commission is only one element of the government's policies.

—for price stability. Monetary and fiscal policy are the major instruments the government is relying on.

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what prompts us of the Ralliement créditiste to tell the government, that instead of setting up commissions which will realize that prices increase and that the poor get poorer all the time, it should assume its responsibilities as far as monetary reform is concerned, as suggested by the Ralliement créditiste, and wage an efficient battle against inflation which remains the "baby" of the present monetary system.

[*English*]

## THE PATENT ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE AUTHORITY TO MAKE RULES RESPECTING FEES

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)** moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-194, to amend the Patent Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

## FISHERIES IMPROVEMENT LOANS ACT

AMENDMENT TO INCREASE MAXIMUM ON GUARANTEED LOANS

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance)** moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-195, to amend the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

[Mr. Caouette.]

# ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ATLANTIC REGION—REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister arising from statements attributed to him when he was on his high-flying weekend to New Brunswick, to the effect that "to counterbalance the effects of our anti-inflation measures we will have to spend more for regional development". Will the right hon. gentleman say whether the government has any new programs in mind to assist the Atlantic region, and if so, when an announcement may be expected?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for regional economic expansion will make an announcement in due course.

**Mr. McCleave:** Was he along with you?

**Mr. Macquarrie:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion was not in New Brunswick this weekend. Is the Prime Minister or the government having any studies made of the impact of the lacuna in development funds which will take place because of the phasing out of the existing programs and the delay in passing and implementing the new incentive programs?

**Mr. Trudeau:** We are very much aware of these problems. Any lacuna, if they do exist, are a concern of the government.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** One further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it correct to assume that despite the Prime Minister's position as outlined during the weekend, the government has no new policies to offer?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question is argumentative.

## HOUSING

INQUIRY AS TO AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister, likewise based upon his weekend visit to New Brunswick. In view of some of the housing conditions the Prime Minister saw in certain parts of New Brunswick, is it now the government's intention to

introduce amendments to its housing legislation so that it will really provide houses for people who need them?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, in a very few days the house will have occasion to listen to the housing policy as proposed by the Minister without Portfolio from Ontario.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of what the Prime Minister saw over the weekend, will he not agree that the government's housing legislation is hopelessly inadequate?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest to the Prime Minister that the question as asked cannot be answered because it is clearly out of order.

MUNICIPAL PROJECTS UNDER NEW GUIDELINES

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, before I ask my question may I be permitted to compliment you, Sir, on behalf of the house, on the signal honour bestowed upon you by a university from which I also obtained a degree or two.

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

**Mr. McCleave:** I think you worked harder for yours, Sir, than I did for mine.

My question is directed to the minister responsible for housing, but before I start may I at this first opportunity compliment him upon assuming a very important portfolio. The question arises out of the trip made by the right hon. Prime Minister to New Brunswick over the weekend. Can the minister say when the municipalities will be in a position to start public housing projects under the new guidelines to be announced by the minister in a few days time?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister Without Portfolio):** In a few days time, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

MONTREAL—LAY-OFF OF CANADIAN VICKERS EMPLOYEES

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I had a question to ask the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Since he is not here, I shall direct it to the Prime Minister.

In view of the regrettable situation in which employees of the Canadian Vickers, in Montreal, find themselves, as a great many of them are being laid off, is the Prime Minister personally dealing with this situation and could he tell us whether the government has a solution to propose in order to help those employees or to find a solution to the serious problem existing in Montreal?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I am not dealing personally with that problem; that is why we have appointed ministers.

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

The Prime Minister remains just the same, I believe, the Prime Minister of the country. Now, according to the list I have in hand, the responsible minister should be in the house today.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Today is Tuesday.

**Mr. Caouette:** Then, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister should be in a position to tell us if the cabinet is considering any solution to the problems facing Canadian Vickers employees.

**Mr. Speaker:** It seems to me the hon. member is only repeating the question he asked at the very beginning.

[*English*]

## THE CORPORATIONS ACT

REQUEST FOR DISCLOSURE OF AMENDMENTS

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Would the minister disclose now the general nature of the amendments to The Corporations Act which he intends to propose to the house, and which he was so careful to disclose to the press prior to the weekend?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I expect the legislation to receive first reading in a few days time, and that is wren any announcement will be made. I have no idea to what the hon. member is referring.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister's reading is not up to date. Would he deign to disclose to the house whether the minister and the government are going to insist on the passage of these amendments by both houses prior to the end of June?

**Mr. Basford:** The bill will be read the first time this week, I hope; but the progress of business of the house is really not in my hands.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

### CLAIM BY U.S. TO INTER-ISLAND WATERS OF ARCTIC ARCHIPELAGO

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** I wish to address a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Would the right hon. gentleman inform the house whether the United States has laid claim to the waters between the islands in the northern archipelago, and whether discussions are going on between officials of the United States and Canadian governments with respect to the sovereignty of these waters?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of a claim to those waters by the United States government, nor indeed of any other claim apart from that of the Canadian government. I made a statement last week about the whole position of Canada in the Arctic and I indicated of course that claims established by previous Canadian governments over certain aspects of the waters were not recognized by all states. It is this aspect of the policy which we wish to study further in preparation for negotiations. However, we are certainly not neglecting to consider the practical question of whether it will eventually be in Canada's interest to have these waters declared Canadian internal waters, rather than to encourage their use for commercial purposes.

**Mr. Lewis:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the Prime Minister said in his statement that Canada's sovereignty over the waters in question was not admitted by all states, did he refer specifically to the United States or were governments of any other countries laying claim to them; and if no country has laid claim to these waters would the Prime Minister inform the house how he is able to say that all countries do not accept Canada's declaration of sovereignty?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It seems to me that the third question is a little too far out. I think the first and second questions might be in order. Perhaps the Prime Minister might want to answer them.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I do not wish in any way to give publicity to our claims which may be contrary to Canada's long term interest. I think it is of general knowledge that not all seafaring nations are anxious to have such vast areas of ocean claimed by any one state. This is obvious in the case of the two other large archipelagos of the world, and we have been given notice that this would be the position of certain countries with regard to the Canadian archipelago in the north. However I repeat that I do not think it would be in the best interests of Canada to give any publicity to our claims until we ourselves are in a position either to substantiate them with even greater force, or alternatively to withdraw them if it is in Canada's interest to do so.

**Mr. Lewis:** I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Without indicating what other governments are involved, can the Prime Minister inform the house whether there are currently discussions on this issue among governments of nations, including the government of Canada, and have they been going on for some time?

**Mr. Trudeau:** My answer is yes, discussions are going on with regard to the general proposition of closing such archipelagos. Some nations have laid claim to them and other nations, which claim that these waters are part of international trading lanes, are contesting them. This is the type of general exchange that is going on. However may I repeat that I do not think it would be useful to be more precise in the case of Canadian claims. I can tell hon. members that there has been a lack of recognition of Canadian claims by important nations, either stated verbally or in writing.

*[Translation]*

## NATIONAL PARKS

### GASPÉ—AGREEMENT BETWEEN PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL AUTHORITIES

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Can he tell the house whether an agreement has been reached between the Ottawa and Quebec governments on the development of a federal park at Pointe-Forillon, in Gaspé and, if so, what are the terms and conditions of the agreement?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I hope that such a question will not be asked every day. I have the feeling that the hon. members put the same question forward almost daily. Anyway, the minister seems ready to answer the question of the hon. member for Lotbinière today, and I shall allow it.

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr.

Speaker, I am not ready to answer. I was supposed to have the visit of the Quebec Minister of Tourism today, but he has informed me that he cannot come to Ottawa before tomorrow morning.

[*English*]

## COMBINES

POSSIBILITY OF PROSECUTION FOLLOWING AFFILIATION OF CANADIAN AND U.S. INVESTMENT CORPORATIONS

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Finance whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith Incorporated, the largest investment house in the United States, and the Royal Securities Corporation of Canada have agreed to affiliate. I ask him whether this will not place or tend to place the outflow of Canadian funds under the domination of the United States, and what action the Canadian government is taking in this connection. He will recall some of the statements made by Mr. Walter Gordon, formerly minister of finance.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** May I say in answer to the first part of the question, yes, I am aware; in answer to the second part of the question, no; in answer to the third part of the question, the matter is indeed being considered.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, in that case I should like to communicate with another minister, namely the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Will the alleged combine that will result be made the subject of any investigation by the department to ensure that Canada's interest will be protected, rather than left to the mercies of a powerful United States corporation?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the right hon. gentleman knows, having been prime minister, that it is traditional policy not to announce matters which the combines investigation branch is investigating.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That is just not so, if I may say so. I ask the minister: Is it being investigated or are we not to be protected?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I rise on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Before the right hon. gentleman does so, may I suggest that there should not be a debate between the minister and the right hon. gentleman as to what is the government policy in such circumstances.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** My point is that the regard for truth in the statement made by the minister is as small as the benefit which the measure that he discussed today in the house will bring to the Canadian people.

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is of course neither a point of order nor a question of privilege.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Just a fact, Mr. Speaker.

## WATER RESOURCES

LONG HARBOUR, NFLD.—INVESTIGATION OF WATER POLLUTION

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister, or have his officials, had an opportunity to study the cause of so many fish dying in Long Harbour and, if so, is there any evidence to indicate that the phosphorous wash from the British-owned Electric Reduction Company (Canada) Limited is the cause?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries):** Certainly departmental officials and members of the Fisheries Research Board have been studying this situation intensively. There is an extensive fish kill in the general vicinity of the plant, and the red herring problem is indicative of pollution by phosphorous. However the cause of this fish kill has yet to be determined with finality.

**Mr. Crouse:** In view of the statement in *Time* magazine of May 16 that the inshore fishery has been decimated—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member has to ask a question directly and cannot use statements in newspapers or magazines as the basis for his question.

**Mr. Crouse:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister issue a statement immediately giving the true facts about the pollution which has caused the death of these fish, and explain what efforts his department is making to clean up this situation?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Davis:** We intend to make a statement shortly, perhaps within the next ten days, summarizing all the facts which have been collected by our staff on the spot.

POLLUTION OF CANADA-U.S. BOUNDARY WATERS

**Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex):** My question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Mr. Speaker. Is the government following its customary policy of consultation and consideration, or is some Canadian initiative being shown in dealing with alleged d.d.t. pollution of the Great Lakes to such an extent as to cause American states bordering these waters to take legislative action?

**Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** There is continuing negotiation with our United States counterparts at the level of the International Joint Commission and also through my department. Any legislation which is contemplated in this regard would, of course, be announced in the house in the normal manner.

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** In view of the fact that special concern has been caused over the weekend by this d.d.t. problem, have there been any further negotiations with the United States authorities?

**Mr. Greene:** I am not aware of any specific special negotiations in this regard which have occurred since the weekend, but I shall take the question as notice and if there has been any special association or negotiations with our United States counterparts in this connection I shall be pleased to inform the hon. member.

POLLUTION BY D.D.T. OF INLAND FISHERY

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** In view of the seriousness of this problem can the minister tell us whether the government has considered testing fish in all inland waters to ascertain whether the effect of d.d.t. is dangerous in terms of accepted public levels?

**Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Specific testing of this kind would likely fall within the jurisdiction of the Department of Fisheries, but I shall be pleased to take note of the question and advise the hon. member whether any special testing is being done.

[Mr. Crouse.]

## HARBOURS

IMPLEMENTATION OF REPORT ON ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

**Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** I have a question for the Minister of Transport concerning administration of small boat harbours on the Pacific coast. Will the minister make a statement to the house on motions at his earliest convenience indicating what steps, if any, have been taken since the summary of the report on harbour administration was issued on May 1, 1968, to implement the recommendations put forward by Dr. T. G. How with regard to this important and urgent matter?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

## AIR TRANSPORT

DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY AFFECTING REGIONAL CARRIERS

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** My question is for the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. Now that the regional air carriers have demonstrated during the recent air transportation crisis their competence in serving the people of Canada, will the government be formally implementing the regional air policy as it was enunciated in 1965?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** I am sure we are all pleased that the regional carriers performed so well. I think we all owe them a great debt of gratitude.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Jamieson:** However this particular incident has not made any difference to our planning in connection with regional air policy, and such plans will be announced in due course.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Will the regional carriers continue to operate on routes for which they had applied prior to the Air Canada strike, and which were approved to meet the exigencies of the moment?

**Mr. Jamieson:** I would not be able to answer that question without knowing the precise routes involved. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to indicate the routes in which he is interested I will be glad to give an answer.

## FISHERIES

### RESTRICTIONS IN SAINT JOHN HARBOUR AND BAY OF FUNDY

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** A question to the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the salmon fishing restriction in Saint John harbour about which eloquent objections were raised last week. Has the minister received a telegram from the fisheries minister of New Brunswick expressing dissatisfaction with the decision taken on the grounds that it was made without proper consultation and consideration? And did the minister say in this connection that he would be looking into the matter again?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries):** I have not received the telegram which the hon. member mentioned.

**Mr. Bell:** When the minister does receive it through the courtesy of the Postmaster General or whoever is answerable, will he make a reply to the house on this important matter?

## GRAIN

### WHEAT—QUOTA FOR WESTERN FARMERS

**Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley):** A question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Mr. Speaker. What quota does the Canadian Wheat Board hope to provide western farmers by the end of July?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** The best possible one, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Thomson:** I was hoping for a more direct answer. Is it the intention of the board to equalize its quotas as between delivery points by the end of July?

**Mr. Pepin:** That is generally the policy of the Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker. I was not trying to be funny when I replied a moment ago. It is simply that it is impossible, now, to know what will happen in July.

### REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION TO ASSIST PRAIRIE FARMERS

**Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** On Thursday last, Mr. Speaker, I directed a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In his absence, the acting minister took note of it. I should like to repeat the question, now.

In view of the fact that the committee mechanics seem to preclude the bringing in of an early report and related policy recommendations following the recent tour of western Canada by the Standing Committee on Agriculture, will the minister consider making an interim statement of government policy designed to alleviate immediately the critical economic situation facing western farmers today?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I think it would be improper for a minister to comment on the mechanics or procedure of one of the standing committees of this house. I think that answers the first part of the question. So far as the latter part of the question is concerned, I have answered that a number of times in the house.

### WHEAT—REQUEST FOR LARGER QUOTA IN MANITOBA

**Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Since a number of delivery points in Manitoba are still on a one bushel quota or just on a one unit quota for dry wheat, will the minister advise the house when these points can expect larger quotas?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, instructions are to give a preferential basis to those points that are still on unit quotas.

**Mr. Stewart (Marquette):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the house why most points on low quotas are Canadian Pacific delivery points?

**Mr. Pepin:** No, Mr. Speaker. If there is a specific reason I will try to discover it and report to the house.

[*Translation*]

## INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

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

He is probably aware that the Quebec government has recently signed a very important contract with the Brinco Company regarding the development of the Churchill falls and I should like to ask the Prime Minister if Mr. Jean-Noël Tremblay, the Quebec Minister of Cultural Affairs, has been in touch with the federal government or with him in order to complain because the said contract was drafted only in English?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Speaker:** I doubt that such a question is urgent. The hon. member will perhaps want to put it on the order paper.

[*English*]

## TRADE

WHEAT—FURTHER SHIPMENT IN SETTLEMENT FOR INFERIOR QUALITY DELIVERED

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Mr. Speaker. Canada has agreed to pay Japan $160,000 to settle a dispute over damp wheat shipped during last November. Will the minister tell us whether Canada has attempted to make arrangements for compensation similar to those made by the United States under which wheat was shipped in place of money by way of compensation? This would of course permit us to ship more grain, of which we now have a surplus in western Canada.

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** This was an ex gratia payment by the Wheat Board in compensation for delays in shipping and in compensation, also, for some milling problems from the point of view of Japanese milling requirements in respect of Canadian lower grade wheat, namely No. 4 Northern. The grade of the wheat was not in question. As to the question whether wheat was offered instead of money, I will undertake to find out.

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** A supplementary question. Was this situation investigated to determine responsibility and in order to ensure that it will not be repeated? If so, can the minister report on the results of the investigation?

**Mr. Pepin:** One part of my previous answer covered that point, Mr. Speaker. I said the grading of the wheat was not in question.

**Mr. Horner:** Is the $160,000 coming out of the Wheat Board pools or will it come out of the federal treasury?

**Mr. Pepin:** From the Wheat Board pools.

## COMPANY OF YOUNG CANADIANS

KAPUSKASING, ONT.—ALLEGED COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES OF GRAHAM DELINE

**Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Secretary of State. Since he is not here and since it is of considerable urgency may I direct it to his representative in the house. Since infiltration into the Company of Young Canadians by revolutionaries has been alleged at various times and answered in general terms, may I ask whether the minister intends to take action. If so, what action does he intend to take regarding the latest and most specific instance of communist indoctrination of our young people at Kapuskasing high school by one Graham Deline, a member of the Company of Young Canadians?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please. I think this is the type of question that could easily be debated at the time of adjournment.

## NATIONAL PARKS

JASPER—INQUIRY AS TO EASING OF RESTRICTIONS

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Since the minister advised this house last week that he had had a very cordial meeting with the citizens of Jasper, may I ask why he limited his contact with the businessmen of the town to the thirty seconds in which to receive a petition to the government? Was he advised at the time that they were to continue on as they had intended, and was the town to be on rotational one day strikes throughout the summer?

[*Translation*]

**Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I do want to make a correction—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Chrétien:** I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. member check his facts. I spent two hours listening to Jasper businessmen making representations. I received a petition from one minority business group and I told them, as I stated in the house, that I would put the interest of all Canadians before the interests of a few businessmen from Jasper.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Before getting excited, he should have listened to my question. I asked him if all he did was receive a petition from Jasper businessmen, and if the whole thing took only 30 seconds, as reported by their spokesman.

[*English*]

## EDUCATION

EMPLOYMENT OF CANADIAN SCHOLARS IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to my fellow egghead, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. It follows up a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the very serious problem apparently facing Canadian scholars seeking appointments in the universities of this country. Can the minister advise if the government is taking steps to ensure that a high proportion of the staffs of Canadian universities will be composed of persons educated in Canadian graduate schools, or of Canadian nationals trained abroad?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please. I venture to suggest that this question is of very wide scope and ought to be placed on the order paper.

## TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO RAILWAY SAFETY

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. In view of the minister's answer on May 13 with regard to railway safety and in view of still another derailment of a Canadian National freight train in Brampton on Monday, attributable to a broken axle, will the minister now tell the house whether he is to initiate a public inquiry into railway safety?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** No, Mr. Speaker. No such decision has been made.

**Mr. Skoberg:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister make representations to the Canadian National and ask them to curtail further reductions in car and roadbed maintenance personnel until such a decision is made.

**Mr. Jamieson:** Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to see that the request is passed on to the Canadian National.

## CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

CORNER BROOK, NFLD., BUS ACCIDENT

**Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Realizing how eager our new minister is to become involved at the earliest opportunity in matters of trains, buses and transport in Newfoundland, will he undertake to fulfil the commitment of his temporary predecessor—I am referring to the hon. member sitting to his immediate right and not to the one sitting on the far left—on April 30 and report on the result of the investigation into the recent, serious Canadian National bus accident in Newfoundland?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to look into this.

## AIR TRANSPORT

ADDITIONAL COAST TO COAST CARRIERS

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Now that the Air Canada matter seems settled may I ask the minister when we can expect the government's answer to the question of opening the door to further coast to coast air carriers in Canada?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please. That question is of very wide scope and involves questions of general policy. I do not think it can be asked at this time.

**Mr. McCleave:** Mr. Speaker, the minister seemed to want to answer.

[*Translation*]

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MAINLAND CHINA—INQUIRY RESPECTING CANADIAN RECOGNITION

**Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, I will direct my question to the Prime Minister.

After the start of the negotiations between Communist China and the representatives of Canada, did the Prime Minister receive any indications that an agreement could be worked out soon between Communist China and Canada in connection with the diplomatic recognition of that country by Canada?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** If the agreement can be arrived at soon—?

**Mr. Asselin:** —if the talks will soon lead to negotiations on the matter of the recognition of Communist China by Canada?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot foresee how long it will take, but the talks are going on pretty well.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

[*English*]

## NATIONAL SECURITY

### SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES BY COMMUNIST CHINESE

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I direct it to the Minister of Justice. In light of suggestions by Cardinal Yu-pin of Formosa, made yesterday in Washington to the effect that "there are centres of communist Chinese subversive activity in Canada" and that this activity will intensify if Canada should succeed in recognizing Red China, will the minister assure the house that he will look into these allegations, advise the house if they have any foundation, and thus relieve fears and anxieties which have resulted from the remarks I have just alluded to?

### INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. On a number of occasions he informed the house that an expurgated edition—and I use the term without being in any way offensive—of the report of the Royal Commission on security would be tabled in the house. On a number of occasions he told us that the report was to be tabled soon, and that it was to be translated. Is such an expurgated edition of the report now being printed and if so, how soon may we have it?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I assume the house will have guessed that the task of expurgating a work of such dimensions is difficult and gives rise to many discussions, because the expurgators have to proceed in such a way that the authors may still lay claims to their work. The only problem involved here is one of national security, and the expurgating is being carried out with that in mind. I must report to the house that after several months of labour we have not yet arrived at any conclusive or, shall we say, definitive expurgated edition. I realize that the house is entitled to an explanation sooner or later, and I undertake to report to the house in due course.

I do not mind these constant questions because we are very much aware of the need to proceed with this matter. The difficulties are those which I have indicated and have nothing to do with governmental interest. They have to do with the problem of national security; and this is the only aspect causing delay.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

**Mr. Lewis:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Do I gather from the Prime Minister's explanation that there is disagreement between officials of the government and members of the royal commission as to what should or should not be expurgated? If that is the situation, should not the opinion of the members of the committee be listened to by the government?

**Mr. Trudeau:** No, Mr. Speaker. I believe the hon. member is referring to the members of the royal commission itself?

**Mr. Lewis:** Yes.

**Mr. Trudeau:** If that is the question, then the disagreement has not reached that stage. It is still officials and ministers themselves who are trying to arrive at a version which they have reason to think will be accepted by the commission. Following that, as I say, we will have to come to the house either with a refusal of the commissioners to approve it, or with an explanation that we do not even want to proceed. There has been no conflict, if that is the member's question, between the government and the commission members.

**Mr. Lewis:** A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact one assumes the report will deal with all sorts of matters that are now current, such as eavesdropping, wire-tapping, the use of electronic devices, the extent to which public servants should have certain rights so as not to be—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Would the hon. member ask his question?

**Mr. Lewis:** I will, Mr. Speaker. In view of that fact, is it not possible to expedite the preparation of a report which would not infringe on national security, instead of taking all this time?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. If the government wanted to deal only with the questions mentioned by the hon. member, perhaps we could proceed more expeditiously; but that is not the name of the operation. We are trying to adhere as much as possible to the report of the commissioners themselves, and very large parts of the report do not deal with these matters but with ways used by the government to protect its security both in the national and international areas. The difficulty is in making sure we do not publish information which would permit the enemies of Canada for $1.50 to buy information about our own security services.

## TRADE

CHURCHILL, MAN.—ANTICIPATED TONNAGE OF GRAIN THROUGH PORT

**Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Is the minister in a position to advise the house of the tonnage or numbers of bushels of grain it is expected will be shipped through the port of Churchill this year in relation to shipping orders already on hand?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is asking for statistical information which is not normally given during the question period.

**Mr. Simpson:** Mr. Speaker, it has been customary at this time of the year for the government to divulge to the house the number of bushels they expect will be shipped through various ports in Canada, especially the port of Churchill.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think this information should normally be given by way of a statement on motions.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

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

The house resumed, from Friday, May 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen (for Mr. Trudeau) that Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Mr. Speaker, because there does seem to be considerable doubt whether or not this bill, if passed, will be constitutional, I question the motive of the government in placing this piece of legislation before the house at this time. A former judge, who once held the second highest legal position in our country, as well as many others, have stated that Bill C-120 is unconstitutional. I am also aware that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) stated that his legal advisers have informed him that the bill is not unconstitutional.

All members of this house, including the ministers of the crown, are aware of the conflict of opinion on this constitutional issue between many people in this country, including members of the legal profession. A final decision will only be achieved when a judgment is handed down by the Supreme Court. I suggest that such a decision be obtained before we proceed further with this bill. If the decision of the Supreme Court is favourable to the government's contention, nothing will be lost. Many needless words in this debate could be prevented. On the other hand, if a decision is sought after the bill has been passed and it is found to be unconstitutional, it will be most embarrassing to those who strongly support the bill. We will also have wasted a great number of days in debate which could have been used to greater advantage dealing with the economic problems that plague our country.

In the limited time I had on Friday I dealt mainly with the suggestion that this bill attempts to amend section 133 of the British North America Act and is therefore beyond the power of this parliament. Section 133 of the B.N.A. Act deals with the use of the English and French languages in the courts and parliament of Canada. Nowhere in the British North America Act is there a reference that French and English are established as the official languages of the government of Canada. I refer to "government" as contrasted to "parliament", the two being obviously quite different entities. The declaratory clause of Bill C-120 now under debates states:

> The English and French languages shall be the official languages of Canada for all purposes of the parliament and government of Canada—

The use of the word "government" throughout the bill adds another sector to our democratic structure where the two languages shall be used. It is obvious that the bill as now worded effectively changes section 133 of the B.N.A. Act and by the addition of the word "government" attempts to amend the constitution by going beyond the terms to which the Fathers of Confederation agreed.

Another section of the B.N.A. Act explicitly prohibits the federal government from acting unilaterally in certain spheres. Section 91(1) forbids the government to tamper with language questions. In part the amended section now reads:

> It is hereby declared . . . the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say—
>
> 1. The amendment from time to time of the constitution of Canada except as regards . . . the use of the English or the French language.

I draw the attention of the house to the word "except". I do not see how there could

possibly be much clearer constitutional guidance. The minister contradicted himself in his speech on Friday. He knows full well that to change sections 133 and 91(1) is not within the powers of the present government. I would like to put on record what the minister said in his speech on Friday, as found at the bottom of page 8 of his speech:

• (3:10 p.m.)

It is true that our constitution already provides for the use of both languages. At present, however, section 133 of the British North America Act applies only to the Legislative Assembly and courts of Quebec and to the federal parliament and courts.

He goes on to say:

Though in no way amending the constitution, the bill which is being submitted to you does concern language usage in connection with the federal government and parliament and the institutions thereof.

I would say that that last sentence is a direct contradiction of what he said in the first part of the paragraph. In the same paragraph he goes on to say:

Seen in this light, the present bill represents the culmination of an extensive evolution.

Evolution means change. In other words, what the minister is saying is that in the British North America Act it is forbidden to deal with it in this way but the government is going to do it anyway. I wonder why, Mr. Speaker? I am sure the minister knows that it is unconstitutional to tamper with the language in the way he has suggested, or the way this bill suggests. However, I covered most of that on Friday, so I will continue.

There is one other aspect of the constitutional question that is of interest and that I believe has not yet been sufficiently stressed. It has to do with the erroneous idea that has grown up in some areas, and was even expounded upon by some commentators of the mass media during the recent constitutional conference, that all that is necessary to secure passage of this bill as a constitutional measure is to get unanimous agreement on its worth between the federal and the provincial governments. Such agreement, however desirable, in itself means nothing. The next and inescapable step is to secure an amendment of the constitution to make this bill legal. Either the constitution of our country means something to us or it does not. I suggest that the government intends to ignore the constitution.

By way of an aside, Mr. Speaker, it was quite revealing, I thought, to hear the reaction of the Premier of Quebec to this bill at the recent conference. Its avowed purpose is to satisfy the demands or expectations of French Canadians, largely resident in the Premier's own province. One might expect joyous and wholehearted support for it from that quarter. But what was his reaction? What was Quebec's reaction? It was cool and reserved. I believe the Premier said something along these lines: "It's nice, we can probably accept it without arguing too much, but what we really want is something quite different and much more." If Quebec does not want this bill, who does?

I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, that my second objection to this legislation was that I thought it was undesirable. I believe it is undesirable because I believe it will not achieve what it seeks to achieve. I believe further that it is the wrong method of pursuing the aims that the bill's backers claim to be seeking. I do not believe you can legislate to change people's emotions, mind or spirit. You cannot mould or regulate emotions, thoughts or spirit by legislation. I do not believe that understanding, tolerance or courtesy can be legislated into being. On the contrary, I think that legal compulsion too often has the opposite affect. It breeds the very difficulties it seeks to alleviate. It inflames the sores it seeks to sooth.

This bill envisages a tremendous, cumbersome and vastly expensive federal apparatus, set up to establish a complex system of language areas and to police what has already been established. Problems of human beings living together in reasonable accord are matters of the heart and mind, of mutual regard and respect, of understanding and brotherhood. In my estimation nothing will warp and pervert human relationships faster than government compulsion and the witches' brew uncovered by free, individual access to legal proceedings. I do not think the machinery to be set up under this bill will work. I do not think it is economically practical. I think it is self-defeating. I think it will damage national unity beyond repair. As I said on Friday, it will create disunity in areas where disunity never existed before.

This bill spells the end of the simple and honourable designations, "Canada" and "Canadian." It will forever entrench the hyphen in our national life. It will set one group against the other and damage rather than help the cause of that group it seeks to assist. It will end by creating what the people of French tongue in Canada profess to want the least—a compartmented French-English

country. The areas to be designated as bilingual areas will be nothing but language reservations, ghettos, refuges for specially designated Canadians. It means the end of the dream of one nation, with one citizenship and one nationality.

I believe the French speaking people of Canada are beginning to appreciate that this bill will kill for all time their bright dream of a Canada within which they can move freely, speak freely and live freely in their own language and in their own culture. In a country that already suffers from too many boundaries this bill will create a whole new set of frontiers.

I have mentioned several clauses of the bill already. In passing I would direct the attention of hon. members to the provisions of two other clauses, 9 and 10. One creates, without any constitutional or even popular authority, a bilingual national capital region. Aside from everything else, what will this do to the people in the public service?

In introducing this bill on October 17, 1968, the Prime Minister, among other things, said that it should not:

> —involve any prejudice to the careers of civil servants who are not bilingual and who have devoted many years of their lives to the public service.

That is a noble sentiment, Mr. Speaker, but whom is he kidding? Careers have already been prejudiced, and many more will be in the wake of legislation such as this if it is passed. Prime Ministerial promises are no great protection. Even regulations and statutes are no great protection if the intent of those applying them runs contrary to their provisions. We have already seen what can happen in the incident of the commissionaires at the National Museum, and it is no isolated incident. We now have unilingual ships in our navy, if we are permitted to refer to a navy any more, and we are to have unilingual army units. No doubt this fashion for unilingualism that seems so popular in the province of Quebec will spread throughout the federal services and departments.

Government spokesmen other than the Prime Minister have given assurances that civil servants will not be prejudiced by this rush toward bilingualism. But, official or not, it is now a strong influence in the hiring and promotion of public servants. I dare say that tomorrow it will be a condition of employment.

As I read clause 10 of the bill regarding bilingualism and the travelling public, it will mean that airports across the country will be compelled to make bilingualism a condition of employment for everyone working there, from taxi drivers and waitresses to char staff and porters. The absurdity of such a blanket provision will be more obvious in other parts of the country where, if the bill is enacted, jobs will go begging because there will not be enough bilingualists to fill a tenth of them. It may solve the unemployment problem in the province of Quebec but it will do nothing for other regions except breed resentment and trouble.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I said I objected to this bill as being frivolous. I believe it is frivolous because it has absolutely no business being given priority in this chamber over real national problems such as unemployment, inflation, the cost of living and agriculture. I am convinced that we would be doing a far greater and more significant thing for Canadians of French ancestry if we were to take measures to assure them of stable employment, stable prices and stable wages. Whatever the merits of bilingualism and biculturalism may be, they surely cannot hold the urgency that equality of opportunity and equality of economic benefit do for all Canadians in all regions. It is my convinction that this is a bad and inappropriate piece of legislation and that the government should now withdraw it.

• (3:20 p.m.)

The way would then be clear for us to deal with the continuing business of providing the most rewarding and abundant living possible for all Canadians of all tongues and all ethnic backgrounds. I want it made crystal clear that I oppose the principle of this bill and intend to vote against it at all stages. The implementation of this bill will restrict progress in Canada as much or more than occupation by a foreign power.

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak at this juncture in the debate for two very specific purposes. My colleague the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) has already dealt with the basic principles underlying this legislation. He has described the purpose of the bill, the ends we seek to achieve by it and the methods proposed in the bill to attain them. I shall not cover that ground in detail again. However, I do wish to deal with the constitutional questions that have been raised in connection with the bill following its introduction by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) last October

and, second, I wish to deal in general terms with the amendments the government intends to propose to the special committee which has been set up to deal with the bill.

Both the question of the constitutionality of the legislation and of the amendments that the government will be proposing to the committee are bound up in some of the criticism that has been levelled at the bill. It has been felt by some—and the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) who has just taken his seat reflects this attitude—that the bill impinges on provincial jurisdiction in very practical ways, and a number of provinces have raised constitutional issues in relation to it.

As I have already reported to the house, I have had consultations on this subject with the western Attorneys General, with the Attorney General of Nova Scotia and with the Prime Minister of Quebec who also happens to be Attorney General of his province. Both prior to the federal-provincial conference in February and subsequent to that conference I travelled across the country and a good deal of the conversations I had both with the Premiers and then subsequent to the conference with the Attorneys General bore on the question of language, particularly as it is reflected in this bill.

Hon. members will recall that the bill received first reading on October 17, 1968. As a consequence there has been ample opportunity for full public airing and, indeed, the most minute consideration by provincial governments both before, during and subsequent to the consultations in which I have participated. Let me therefore make clear at the outset of what I am saying that the amendments which the government intends to move in committee have been prepared with a view to the practical problems involved in implementing legislation of this sort and after serious and detailed discussions with the provinces. We hope the changes which will be brought forward will meet the practical objections and that by so doing a constitutional confrontation can be avoided, that is to say, that the provinces will not test the validity of this legislation either before a court of appeal in their own jurisdiction or before the Supreme Court of Canada.

It is my view as a Canadian—and the government shares this view—that a discussion of language, which is a sensitive subject historically and today, should remain in the political arena, that language should be discussed in the public forum and that language should be discussed in the provincial legislatures and particularly here in the forum, the theatre, of the nation, the House of Commons of Canada. It is a political and not a judicial matter. I would hope the discussion of this bill, the implementation of it and the debate on it will remain in the political arena and will not be subject to the scrutiny of the courts because I believe the dangers inherent in that procedure are very real indeed. I hope the provinces most concerned about the bill will come to the conclusion that the consultations we have had with them have been meaningful.

I have taken it upon myself to present the amendments to the House of Commons first. I am writing letters which will be sent this afternoon after I conclude to all the Attorneys General of the provinces. After these amendments become public I hope the provinces will give this bill as now proposed to be amended their best, fair and reasoned judgment and that they will allow the matter to remain in the political arena.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The bill is entirely within the legislative jurisdiction of Parliament. It is in no way concerned with the rights and privileges granted by clause 133 of the British North America Act. Everyone will continue to enjoy the same rights as regards the official languages, as defined in section 133. The constitution of Canada, as to the use of English and French, will remain unchanged.

I do not think either that it is fair to interpret the constitution in such a way as to freeze the use of French outside the rights granted by section 133. If such is not the case, the same limitations would apply to the use of the English language. According to the constitution, the two languages are in the very same position, and my conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is that parliament and the provincial legislatures are authorized to legislate in language matters insofar as their legislation does not conflict with the principles contained in section 133.

It seems to me that the position is clear. Those who maintain the contrary are motivated more especially, I think, by the conflict they see between the federal jurisdiction with regard to criminal law and procedures and the provincial jurisdiction with regard to the administration of justice in the provinces. Even if I do not think it is a legislation relat-

ing to the administration of justice in the provinces, I understand the apprehension of the provinces with regard to the secondary effects of this bill on such administration.

[*English*]

I recognize that in some of the provinces there is a feeling that the official languages bill affects directly the duties and responsibilities of the provincial governments to an unwarranted extent. I have in mind the provisions of the bill dealing with the question of official languages in court proceedings and more particularly that section of the bill which permits proceedings in criminal matters heard by provincial courts to be conducted in either language in certain circumstances. A number of provinces have expressed the fear that these provisions of the bill entrench upon their jurisdiction relating to the administration of justice in that they affect the administration of justice relating to the courts in their provinces. As I said, as a matter of constitutional law and having been advised by the law officers of the Crown and others, I have not felt that this objection was well founded. Indeed, the appeal division of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, in the case of Jacques Belisle and Jacques Moreau which was decided in June, 1968, unanimously held that parliament has exclusive jurisdiction to enact legislation respecting the use of language in criminal proceedings, but in practice it is obvious that these provisions might make it very difficult for the administration of justice in the provinces to be carried out if we attempt to achieve too much too quickly.

• (3:30 p.m.)

With this in mind the government has decided to amend the bill so as to recognize more clearly this obvious impact on a field of provincial interest and responsibility. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, despite parliament's undoubted legal authority to legislate in respect of criminal law and criminal procedure, in my view the bill should avoid the effect of placing the provinces in a difficult posture by creating new burdens on the administration of justice that cannot be discharged immediately.

It is our hope that the provinces will wish as quickly as possible to take steps to achieve the goals that all governments set for themselves at the constitutional conference of 1968. Indeed, we should not forget that the Confederation for Tomorrow Conference, convened in Toronto by the Prime Minister of Ontario in 1967, accepted the principle of linguistic equality in Canada for Canadians.

So, Your Honour, it would be my hope that with this and other changes which we propose, no province will find it necessary to challenge the constitutional validity of the enactment. I wish to stress again as I have said already in this house, Sir, that we are prepared to meet that challenge if it is made, but it is our judgment that a constitutional challenge relating as it would to the fundamental aspect of national unity would be unfortunate, indeed, a tragic circumstance for Canada, particularly in this period of constitutional reform. By bearing in mind the practical concerns of the provinces, and in particular by following the process of consultation that was initiated by this government, I hope that the federal government will have demonstrated a flexibility of approach necessary to the implementation of this very important legislation which we regard as fundamental to our confederation without in any way, Sir, sacrificing the principles of the bill.

Let me say that the discussions I had with the provincial Attorneys General of the western provinces, the correspondence I have had with the Attorney General of Nova Scotia and the meeting I had with Prime Minister Bertrand were all very frank and helpful. They led to a number of suggested changes in this bill other than those I have just referred to in order to meet problems in respect of the administration of justice in the provinces. I hope and I believe that the provincial governments will follow that process of consultation which has been meaningful.

**Mr. Lewis:** Would the minister permit a question? Can he indicate a little more precisely what amendments he is referring to in respect of language in the courts? Is he only dealing with clause 11 of the bill or will there be wider amendments?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I think the hon. member will find that they deal particularly with clause 11 of the bill. I intend to go into as much detail as the procedure in this house on second reading will allow, and to table the amendments which we intend to propose at the committee stage.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** There will be no restriction on the minister at all so far as I know. We will be very glad to hear them. This will give body to a bill which at the moment is very hollow.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I accept the right hon. member's courtesy without accepting the full import of his remarks.

I might say by way of background that I recognize the difficulty in respect of the acceptance of this bill in certain parts of Canada. I recognize the objections that were expressed about it in parts of western Canada, in the rest of English speaking Canada and in Quebec, and I recognize particularly the objections to the bill, not in principle but in what Premier Bertrand referred to as "les modalités", in that the concept of bilingual districts would in his opinion and in the opinion of the government of Quebec, as envisaged in the bill, serve to ghetto the minorities of French Canadians in other parts of Canada. This concept would serve to encircle those minorities in rural parts of our country outside Quebec and would fail to recognize the mobility of Canadians and the possibility of French speaking Canadians living in the great cities of our country. When I deal in some detail with the amendments I now propose I think hon. members will recognize that we have gone a long way to create more flexibility and opportunity for service in either language, beyond the concept of bilingual districts.

On February 17 I discussed this bill clause by clause with the four western Attorneys General at a meeting in Victoria. The position I took on behalf of the federal government was one of flexibility in detail, commitment in principle. Many of the suggestions made by the western Attorneys General were constructive and revealed an understanding of the essence of the bill. I go on the assumption, in dealing with provincial governments, that they are as strongly convinced in their Canadianism as I and other members of this government are, and I listen to them and deal with them as Canadians.

The purpose of these amendments is to avoid the confrontation by some provinces in the courts and make practical accommodations where we felt it was necessary and reasonable to do so. What were the principal criticisms of this bill that I heard in western Canada? I think it would be useful to put this on record here in the House of Commons.

The first criticism I heard was in the form of the question, why force us into bilingualism by legislation when by gradual consent it can be achieved in due course? I would concede that there has been great progress made in the last two, three or four years by provincial governments toward recognizing a wider use of both languages, and by widening the opportunities of education for young Canadians to learn both languages at an earlier age when it is easier.



The answer to this objection, to my mind, is that this legislation is a matter of converting symbols into reality. If we mean what we say we will put it into writing. I believe this will be concrete evidence of good faith on the part of the English speaking majority of Canadians and the French speaking majority in Quebec, that is, to enshrine these principles recognized in this bill in the legislation of Canada. Rights can only be protected by law. No amount of good will, and I believe there is growing good will in Canada, can substitute for that.

The second objection I met was a feeling that some people had in respect of the problems of implementing this legislation in that it would involve the Canadian people in additional cost. In answering this comment one must bear in mind that educational facilities have to be improved across Canada to equip the next generation of Canadians with greater facility in either language than most of us have been able to obtain. I believe our children must be given an opportunity to learn a second language.

In my opinion the cost of bilingualism is part of the price of being Canadian. If bilingualism is a national policy, then the federal government will have to make a contribution toward implementing it.

**Mr. Caouette:** Welcome to this side.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Let me say to the hon. member that it is a comfort that he is on my side for a change.

The third objection I met, and I am sure hon. members have also had occasion to hear this objection, relating to the bill is that there will be a great many technical difficulties involved in implementing it.

• (3:40 p.m.)

There is, for example, in this country a lack of qualified interpreters, stenographers and translators. The number at present is definitely too small to handle all the immediate requirements. The answer to this is that the obvious flexibility in the bill itself gives time for a gradual process in its implementation.

A fourth objection—this was an objection which I found very serious indeed—was that some people, particularly in western Canada,

indicated to me a great concern about the creation of what they thought was a second-class citizenship in that they felt those Canadians who were neither of British nor French descent would be excluded by the bill from full citizenship. That is the argument that is made.

I cannot stress strongly enough—the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) was very eloquent last Friday on this point, and his personal experience justifies his sincerity—that there is only one class of citizen in Canada. In this respect I echo what the hon. member for York South said. Most of those who have come to this country have learned to express themselves in one or other of the French or English languages. They have not given up their own culture but they have enriched their lives by opting for one of the two languages and cultures which they have found in Canada. This bill does not deprive them of any of those rights or any of those historic, traditional, family advantages. I believe it would be useful to put on record the fact that clause 38 of the bill sets this out amply and clearly when it provides:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as derogating from or diminishing in any way any legal or customary right or privilege acquired or enjoyed either before or after the coming into force of this act with respect to any language that is not an official language.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, would the minister allow a question? Would he give an example of this? I endeavoured to think of an example and could not, but no doubt he will be able to do so.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I would say that in certain parts of western Canada where a language other than French has been traditionally used in the schools of some municipal areas or even, to a limited extent, in the courts by way of interpreters, those rights are guaranteed by this bill and are in no way excluded by it.

**Mr. Lewis:** And parochial schools.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** And parochial schools, as the hon. member for York South reminds me. Another objection emanating from western Canada and shared in some measure in the Atlantic provinces relates to the fear that our policy represented in this bill will bar English speaking Canadians from the federal public service.

**Mr. McIntosh:** It already has.



**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I agree with the hon. member that this is a question of prime importance, but I do not agree with the assertion he has just made. Of all the issues raised in connection with this bill, I believe the question of recruitment for the public service deserves the most serious consideration. Some people have expressed the opinion that if this bill were to be enacted it would limit recruitment to certain areas of our country or, if we want to be really blunt about it, the public service would become the preserve of French speaking Canadians. I do not accept that for one moment. I believe it is encouraging to note that the government's policy on bilingualism has had no deterrent effect on recruitment in the English speaking parts of this country. Quite the contrary, because—

**Mr. McIntosh:** That is not correct.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** —since the announcement of the government's policy by the former prime minister of this country, the right hon. Lester B. Pearson, in 1966 the total number of university graduates applying for positions has more than doubled from about 4,000 in the 1965-66 recruitment program to almost 9,000 this year.

**Mr. Horner:** Would the minister have a look at the Department of External Affairs?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The breakdown by universities clearly indicates that the bilingualism policy has not scared away the younger people from any part of our country. I would like to read, and am prepared to table with the consent of the house, the figures comparing the year 1966 with 1969. Let me refer to a few universities chosen at random. McGill—

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate the source of the figures he is going to use?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The source of these figures is the Public Service Commission of Canada. In 1966 there were 204 applications from McGill University; in 1969 there have been 309. For the University of Montreal, in 1966 there were 85 applications; in 1969 there have been 256. With regard to the University of New Brunswick, there were 76 applications in 1966 and 221 this year. For Dalhousie there were 77 in 1966 and 156 this year; Memorial University, 37 three years ago and 114 this year; Victoria University, 26 three years

ago and 152 this year; the University of British Columbia, to which I have a particular loyalty and in which I have a particular pride, 358 three years ago and 717 this year; the University of Manitoba, 248 three years ago and 560 this year; the University of Toronto, 236 three years ago and 538 this year; the University of Western Ontario, 100 three years ago and 428 this year; Queen's University, 80 three years ago and 236 this year; the University of Ottawa, 81 three years ago and 295 this year. Since I have mentioned one university in my riding, I might mention the other, Carleton and St. Patrick, 198 three years ago and 566 this year.

**Mr. Horner:** How many of the applicants were bilingual?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, those are the figures which with the consent of the house I should like to table in full in order that they way become a part of the proceedings of the house.

**Mr. Alexander:** Did I hear the minister mention McMaster University among those figures?

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Speaker, it is true that those figures indicate that considerably more university graduates are now applying for civil service jobs. However, if they are to have any relation to the debate they would obviously have to indicate in the case of each university how many applicants have been able to meet the bilingual requirements of the civil service.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, these figures indicate quite conclusively to my mind that the policy of bilingualism of the government, which has been public policy since 1966, has in no way discouraged young Canadians from any part of Canada applying for positions in the public service of this country. That is what these figures represent.

**Mr. Danforth:** They are applying, but what have been the results of their applications?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I have the consent of the house to have this table printed as part of my speech.

**Mr. Horner:** We can have the figures, but they mean nothing.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, would the minister also give the number of applications accepted and the number of applicants who were bilingual?

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** As we are on second reading of the bill the minister will need the unanimous consent of the house to have these figures printed as part of his speech. Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank hon. members for their courtesy in allowing this to be done.

**Mr. Horner:** They mean nothing. They will just fill up *Hansard.*

**Mr. Flemming:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he will give us the number of applications made and the number of people whose applications were accepted.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I think this is a subject that is quite properly a matter for the committee. The policy of bilingualism as enunciated by this government has in no way diminished the interest of Canadians from all parts of Canada in joining the public service. Do I understand that I have unanimous consent to table these figures in *Hansard* as part of my speech?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's note: The table referred to above is as follows:*]

Total Number of University Candidates Who Applied For Positions With the Public Service Commission of Canada

1966 — 3482 1969 — 8994

INCREASE 1969 VERSUS 1966, 158.1%

| UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE | 1966 | 1969 |
|---|---|---|
| Victoria | 26 | 152 |
| Notre Dame | | 12 |
| Simon-Fraser | | 168 |
| British Columbia | 358 | 717 |
| Alberta | 223 | 448 |
| Calgary | 64 | 134 |
| Lethbridge | | 11 |
| Saskatchewan | 211 | 505 |
| Winnipeg | | 169 |
| Manitoba | 248 | 560 |
| Brandon | 32 | 52 |
| Lakehead | | 94 |
| United College | 100 | |
| Windsor | 49 | 207 |
| Brock | | 55 |
| Guelph | 77 | 133 |
| McMaster | 70 | 292 |
| Toronto | 236 | 538 |
| Waterloo | 45 | 155 |
| Waterloo Lutheran | 68 | 72 |
| Western Ontario | 100 | 428 |

| UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE | 1966 | 1969 |
|---|---|---|
| York | 35 | 98 |
| Trent | | 44 |
| Queen's | 80 | 236 |
| Ottawa | 81 | 295 |
| Laurentian | 12 | 73 |
| Carleton & St. Patrick | 198 | 566 |
| Sir George Williams | 36 | 151 |
| Sherbrooke | 51 | 106 |
| McGill | 204 | 309 |
| Montreal | 85 | 256 |
| École Polytechnique | | 74 |
| Marianapolis | | 53 |
| Macdonald | 111 | 111 |
| Loyola | 37 | 156 |
| Hautes Études Commerciales | 37 | 82 |
| Bishop's | 11 | 35 |
| Laval | 184 | 472 |
| New Brunswick | 76 | 221 |
| Mount St. Vincent | | 33 |
| Mount Allison | 38 | 87 |
| Moncton | 30 | 62 |
| Acadia | 50 | 68 |
| St. Francis Xavier | 47 | 60 |
| St. Mary's | 19 | 76 |
| Nova Scotia Technical | 27 | 50 |
| Dalhousie | 77 | 156 |
| Prince of Wales | | 1 |
| St. Dunstan's | 12 | 47 |
| Memorial | 37 | 114 |
| TOTAL NO. OF CANDIDATES | 3,482 | 8,994 |

• (3:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I am saying therefore that the present policy is in no way an erosion of the merit principle on which our public service is founded. Bilingualism was established as an element of merit for certain positions and in certain places in the 1961 Civil Service Act and was re-enshrined by parliament in the passage of the 1967 Public Service Employment Act. Since that time the commission has been progressively recognizing bilingualism and/or the willingness to become bilingual as an element of merit wherever the need exists and to the degree that the need exists. But in effect bilingual capability is merely one element of merit along with education experience and personal suitability, the standard required being tailored to each position in each locality. The introduction of a new clause 40 in the official languages bill reaffirms this position and extends it to all appointing authorities affected by the legislation.

**Mr. Horner:** What does the new clause 40 say?

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** As I said, within the terms I expressed it recognizes the merit principle as the principle required for the recruitment, hiring and promotion of people within the public service.

I think that at this stage it is not possible for me, within the framework of the rules governing debate in this house, to consider in detail or even individually the amendments that will be proposed at the committee stage. I should like to table these in accordance with Standing Order 41(2), and if the house so desires they can be made an appendix to *Hansard*.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is there leave to table this document?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** I would like to ask the minister a question. Are what he has just tabled his amendments?

**Mr. Turner:** Yes.

**Mr. Caouette:** It would seem there are more amendments than there are sections now in the bill. I wonder if it would not be better to draft a new bill.

**Mr. Turner:** No. This is only to be consistent in the visual aspect of the matter. There is but one amendment on each page.

**Mr. Caouette:** Has the minister sent a copy of this to *Le Soleil*, so they can publish it on their front page tomorrow?

**Mr. Turner:** I think the correspondent for *Le Soleil* has eyes as good as the hon. member's.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I should like to remind the hon. members that on second reading, an hon. member who wishes to speak must have the unanimous consent of the house.

[*English*]

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask whether it has been made an order of the house that this document be an appendix to *Hansard*?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** No such order has been made as yet.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I asked that that be made an order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is that the wish of the house?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

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

[*Editor's Note: For text of amendments see appendix.*]

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Asselin:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Charlevoix on a point of order.

**Mr. Asselin:** I should like to know whether the minister can provide the opposition with a copy of the amendments he has just tabled, for we shall have to study them. After the minister has finished his speech, some hon. members from other parties might wish to speak and give their views on the amendments. Has the minister got some copies for the opposition parties?

**Mr. Turner:** Mr. Speaker, there is a good number of copies available for those who wish to examine the amendments.

[*English*]

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The press has copies, so I suppose they can also be made available to us.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The purpose of tabling this document is so that members will have a copy.

I think that the package of amendments will demonstrate just what is involved here in terms of change and will show, I hope, the government's flexibility in relation to the problem of the implementation of the bill. I want to reiterate that the bill has not been diluted in principle, that the amendments proposed affect both English speaking and French speaking Canadians, and that there is a balance in the amendments proposed which represents and reflects that delicate equilibrium which is part of Canadian national unity.

Essentially, sir, these changes break down into three categories. The first category is composed of technical amendments which we felt would clarify the bill. I do not think I need dwell on these. The second category includes those amendments directed to improving the bill from the point of view of implementation. They have been designed largely with reference to comments received from the Attorneys General of the provinces, in particular the western provinces, Nova Scotia and Quebec. Finally, there is a category of amendments that has some policy dimensions which we felt would clarify the objectives sought to be achieved in the bill and would add something to the fundamentals of the bill. Amendments that are designed to improve the implementation of the bill involve a clarification of the situation in which court judgments must be rendered in both languages. I refer to clause 5 (1). They refer also to a situation where legislative instruments may be impugned for want of a second language version—clause 6—and in what circumstances regard must be had for both versions of an enactment.



It is felt that these changes, without touching in any way the principles of the bill, will make its implementation easier in some cases and clearer in others. It has not been the government's intention that public offices outside the national capital region or outside bilingual districts need, as a general rule, provide services to the public in both official languages. We therefore intend to modify the legislation to make this clear, and this is the reason for the amendment to clause 9(1). At the same time, however, we felt it important to stress that bilingualism in terms of the provision of services is not to be restricted to bilingual districts where there is a demonstrated need for it. Hon. members should refer to the new clause 9(2). This was perhaps the major issue that I discussed with Prime Minister Bertrand in Quebec city. We are therefore going to propose—and this amendment will touch on a question of policy not fully set out in the bill previously—that government departments and crown corporations be obliged, in the case of a significant demand for second language services, to provide such services notwithstanding the fact that the location in question may not be within a bilingual district.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we do not want to create linguistic ghettos. We are aware of the opposition expressed against the bilingual district concept, though this would represent in our opinion the best way to protect minorities wherever they may be.

But in order to widen the scope of bilingualism within the federal institutions, we think that it is important to emphasize that the duties and responsibilities of departments and other federal bodies are not limited exclusively to bilingual districts.

The government has therefore decided to bring in an amendment to the bill with

regard to bilingial services outside the federal bilingual districts and the bilingual services given to travellers. It is intended to ensure bilingual services to growing minorities in Canadian communities.

I hope that this supplementary concept will have the effect of allowing the quickest possible expansion of bilingual services as our resources will permit it.

[*English*]

I think hon. members will agree that it would be folly to ignore the numerically very significant minorities in various parts of the country where those minorities, in relation to the majority population, are not now, and perhaps never will be, sufficient to justify the establishment of a bilingual district under the 10 per cent principle. It is to the urban areas that Canadians are moving in ever increasing numbers. Where possible their cultural heritage should be respected in those urban centres, and this should be done even though the minority, although large in number, is not, in percentage terms or relatively, as significant as one in, say, a rural area.

It will also be moved on the part of the government that the provision relating to the services provided abroad by crown corporations be slightly amended in order that there be more flexibility concerning the application of these provisions. I refer to the amendment to clause 10 (2). There are circumstances in locations outside Canada where it may not be necessary or indeed appropriate to extend the bilingual qualification. An amendment will be proposed to provide for exemptions in appropriate cases.

As I mentioned a short while ago, there are also amendments relating to the use of both languages in court proceedings. As it stands now, the bill brings a new element into proceedings in that a witness will be able, as a matter of choice and of right and not merely when he is unable to speak the language of the court, to determine the official language in which he wishes to give his evidence. It should be made clear that this provision is to apply only to witnesses or the accused. As there has been some misunderstanding as to its extent, it is proposed to revise slightly the language used. I refer to the amendment to clause 11 (1).

The bill also provides now that criminal proceedings may be conducted in one or the other of the official languages, subject to the right of a witness to testify in the official language of his choice, at the discretion of the court. This provision is of fundamental importance. It also poses a real problem of implementation in many parts of Canada. The government realizes the real and practical provincial interest in this area. Obviously, a judge will not be able to accede to proceedings in the other official language if facilities are not available. As a consequence, we shall propose that this discretion be exercised in circumstances in which the second language is authorized by the law of the province to be used in civil causes or matters. This is the new section 11(4) of the bill. Thus, we shall not be forcing upon the provinces any régime which they cannot adequately implement. When administrative and other arrangements are such as to permit the province to authorize the use of the other official language in civil cases, the discretion of the court in criminal proceedings will operate. This is the case at the present time in New Brunswick and will be in the future under the proposed official languages legislation of that province. Hence, the change will result in the federal legislation serving as a complement to provincial law, something which I think should be acceptable to all the provinces.

• (4:00 p.m.)

We think this is a reasonable view and that it will enable provinces to move ahead, within their own jurisdiction, without any feeling of unreasonable compulsion such as they felt was present when the federal government legislated to authorize choice of language with relation to criminal proceedings. We are confident this will lead to a rapid extension of the important rights accorded by the bill.

In addition, we felt that as a practical matter the provision respecting language in the courts might best be regulated, where necessary, for each of those courts by the Governor in Council or by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I refer to the amendment to 11(5). This will enable a more rational approach to be taken in circumstances where rules may be needed either at the federal or the provincial level. It should also avoid problems which would arise from a multiplicity of rules on the same subject applicable to various courts in a province, and at the federal level. Hon. members of the house who practice law will realize that each magistrate constitutes his own court; we are seeking to provide a standard procedure throughout the province and not to allow each magistrate to interpret the procedure in accordance with his own view.

**Mr. Lewis:** Would the minister permit a question? Does this mean that the federal government will be able to make procedural rules with respect to the work of such courts? That is how it seems to me to read.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Where the federal courts are involved it would be a federal rule; where provincial courts are involved it would be a provincial rule.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the minister, but his time has expired.

**An hon. Member:** Let him continue.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Does the house give unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I thank the house for its indulgence.

Amendments will also be proposed for the purpose of clarifying a number of other provisions. Included is a provision dealing with the alteration of bilingual districts once established. We wish to make it clear that no alteration can be made unless the altered district would fulfil the criteria established in the legislation for the creation of a bilingual district. I am referring to 13(4). It is also proposed to clarify the powers of investigation of the Commissioner of Official Languages—this is to be found in 26 (1)—and the ambit of the expression "institutions of the Parliament and Government of Canada" so that there may be no doubt that these include the Canadian Forces and the R.C.M.P. I refer now to 36(3).

Finally, an amendment will be proposed which would impose a duty on the Public Service Commission to see that the purposes and provisions of the act are carried out. This is important in the framework of realizing the goals of the bill in terms of the federal public service. I am referring to the new section 40(4). However, this duty will be qualified by the obligation to maintain the principle of the selection of personnel according to merit as required by the Public Service Employment Act.

I have attempted to give hon. members a thumbnail sketch of the package of amendments to be put forward at the committee stage. It will be possible to discuss the details of the government amendments as they are moved in committee. I believe this bill recognizes that one of the fundamental questions we have to face as Canadians is the question of equality of access to the federal institutions of government. I do not minimize what the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) said in his speech on Friday nor what the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) or the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) said in the course of their speeches to the effect that economic matters are of great importance. Nevertheless, no one can gainsay the fact that one of the fundamental problems we have to face is whether the French language will continue to exist in Canada or outside of Canada—whether it will be spoken only in Quebec, or in a separate Quebec. This is at the root of our current constitutional debate and it is at the basis of the official languages bill.

This may be difficult for people in some parts of the country to digest. It may be difficult, particularly, in western Canada where there has long been a mosaic of many cultures. To many in Western Canada this bill may appear to be a reversal of history. But to those of us who support it it reflects a fundamental premise that this country as we know it can survive only if we broaden our recognition of the two founding cultures and the two founding languages.

I believe the provisions of this bill have been generally misunderstood, particularly in western Canada. Some people seem to feel that this legislation, if enacted, would oblige or compel the average citizen of Canada, or the average citizen in western Canada, to speak French—that it represents compulsory bilingualism. This is just not the case. I believe that no matter the source from which the criticism may come—and I respect the views held by hon. members—we must deal with the bill in terms of what it really says. The principle of this bill is that there should be equality of access to the federal institutions of government, that every citizen should be able to communicate with the federal government in either of the two languages.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** It is not compulsory individual bilingualism; it is institutional bilingualism—equality of access to the federal institutions of government rather than compulsory bilingualism for individuals. People will continue to use the language that they speak now, but within the terms of the bill they will be able to approach the federal government in the language of their choice.

Why is there a need for two official languages? I believe we have to deal with the political fact that the territorial and geographical unity of the country demands it. It happens to be a fact that 80 per cent of those in the province of Quebec are French speaking and that 80 per cent of those speaking French in this country live in Quebec. The younger generation in that province is deciding today and tomorrow whether to opt for Canada or to opt for Quebec. We believe the young people of Quebec will opt for Canada given the principle of equal access in the French language to the federal institutions, in Quebec, yes, and across Canada. I believe this step will represent a clear indication to French speaking Canadians in this country that they are welcome not only in Quebec or in parts adjacent to Quebec but everywhere in this country. I believe this is fundamental to national unity in Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

• (4:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The 1967 Confederation For Tomorrow Conference accepted this principle of linguistic equality and in doing so the premiers were reflecting, I believe, public opinion to a great extent. The need for an official languages act was one of the main conclusions of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. We endorsed it in our election campaign, and I say that to make it clear that the Prime Minister of the country and members of this party were absolutely clear and as specific as they could be in either language across Canada that there was a need for this bill. We spoke of the need for this bill and we said this bill would have to be implemented to assure us national unity. This bill is a reflection of the mandate we believe we have from the people of Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** As I said before, I believe the principle of linguistic equality is accepted by the majority of Canadians. Even more, I believe this principle is accepted by an overwhelming majority of young, English speaking Canadians in this country.

**Mr. Lewis:** That is what I said.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** If there is any evidence of a generation gap in Canada that evidence will be found, as one travels across this land from east to west or from north to south, in the different attitudes of the generations and in the willingness with which the young will accept change for the benefit of national unity in this country. If there is any evidence of that gap it will be found in the fact that the young people of this country are willing and anxious to accept this change because they believe that having two languages gives us an identity that separates us on the northern half of the North American continent from our great neighbour to the south.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Our young people believe that having these two languages in this country makes us more civilized human beings and opens up new vistas to knowledge and new avenues of personal fulfilment. They feel that if we can arrange within the fabric of this country for both languages and linguistic groups to get along together we shall set an example to the world of how two different peoples can get along.

I believe that, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the languages bill is the core of our guarantee of equal rights and privileges for the two main linguistic groups in Canada. I do not believe it will immediately resolve all our problems—no. I do not believe it will dissipate all misunderstandings. I believe we shall have to introduce a new dynamic note into our lives. I should like to quote the words of Justice Learned Hand of the United States Supreme Court. He once remarked:

> Liberty must reside in the hearts of men. Where it so lies it needs no government, no law and no court to save it, and where it is found wanting, no government, no law and no court can preserve it.

I believe that Canadians must incorporate in their lives this essential concept of our national unity. That concept is that citizens who speak either of our languages shall be free to live and grow and work in the language of their choice. That, sir, must be our national and emotional commitment.

I wish now to refer to what one of the greatest Canadians and certainly one of the greatest Prime Ministers had to say in parliament in 1890. Of course I speak of Laurier. He said:

[*Translation*]

Any policy which does not appeal to the soundest instincts of every class, of every creed, of every race, is branded with the stigma of mediocrity. The French Canadian who encourages his fellow-countrymen to

hold aloof from other nationalities, the Anglo-Canadian who prompts his countrymen to keep their minds set exclusively on their own interests may well be cheered by his hearers, but impartial history will deem his action as faulty in conception as it was pernicious and evil in purpose.

We are—or we want to be—a nation made of the most heterogeneous components; Protestants and Catholics, English, French, Germans, Irish, Scotch etc., each one, let us not forget it, with its own traditions and prejudices. In each one of these opposed components, however, there is a common link of patriotism and the only true policy is that which transcends this common patriotism and carries all those components towards a common aim and common aspirations. Where is the remedy? Certainly not in ostracism nor in hard or cruel means. The true remedy is to be found in tolerance and mutual respect.

[*English*]

The concept of bilingualism, Mr. Speaker, is that of a bilingual society and state rather than of a state and society in which every individual is bilingual. We do not require that every citizen shall be obliged to speak or write a second language; rather, we say that each citizen should be able to communicate or deal with the federal government or any of its agents in either of the two official languages, the principle being equal access to the services and institutions of the federal government.

I believe this policy will need the nation's commitment. I believe that the bill will have to be explained to the people of Canada. I believe that whether we are English speaking or French speaking we shall have to make a reasonable accommodation, exercise patience and tolerance, wrestle with our own prejudices and understand this question with positive good will and an open mind. I believe this is a commitment which our French speaking and English speaking Canadians must make, because unity is a two-way street. I believe we can solve our difficulties and reconcile our views. As Canadians, we have too much to gain and too much to lose. We have inherited the bounty of one of the richest lands on earth and together we can turn it to our benefit and to the enhancement of other peoples in our world.

Let us quicken the fashioning of a new nation of two languages so that we can move on to the harvesting of the promise that brought us all to these shores, no matter whether we came yesterday, the day before yesterday, a generation ago or five generations ago. That promise brought us to these shores where we are and shall remain one of the most fortunate clusters of people to be favoured on the face of the globe.



**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Before I recognize the hon. member for Charlevoix may I ask whether the hon. member for Témiscamingue has a question?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to ask the hon. minister a question.

He said a while ago he was convinced that the great majority of young English-speaking Canadians accept the principle of this bill. I would very much like the hon. minister to tell us whether he can also sincerely believe that the great majority of young French-speaking Canadians also accept it.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I also believe that and I think one of our duties is to explain the magnificent option open to young French Canadians to become good Canadians.

**Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the statement made by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner).

[*English*]

**Mr. Skoberg:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, since backbenchers will wish to participate in this debate may I ask whether copies of the amendments some hon. members have will be circulated among all hon. members generally?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am advised that copies of the amendments have been prepared and will be circulated to all hon. members as soon as possible.

• (4:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Asselin:** Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, we have just heard the Minister of Justice make a very good speech. I want to congratulate him for his introduction of the bill which, in some respects, I do consider difficult to explain to the Canadian people as a whole.

Of course, we have not had time to study in detail the amendments which the minister introduced this afternoon, since he only tabled the list a few minutes ago, and I must say that I am not in a position to discuss them. However, I take comfort in the fact

that these amendments are the result of consultations which he had with the attorneys general of the various provinces, mainly the western provinces, who were opposed to some provisions contained in the bill, as introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on first reading.

We remember how, at the last federal-provincial conference, several premiers or provincial attorneys general raised objections, especially with regard to the setting up of bilingual districts across Canada under Bill C-120.

I trust the amendments the Minister of Justice brought in this afternoon with regard to those bilingual districts will dispel the misgivings of the attorneys general or premiers of some provinces who had raised objections concerning the setting up of those bilingual districts.

I must add that I too, had certain fears for, if we were to consider what districts could be set up in the province of Quebec, that province alone, according to the spirit or the letter of the law, could constitute one single bilingual district.

I feel that the Quebec premier was right in some of his remarks about bilingual districts. I trust the amendments proposed by the Minister of Justice this afternoon will meet with the approval of the provincial attorneys general and premiers who raised objections in this regard.

We, members of the official opposition, have studied in depth the bill now before the house. From time to time, as parliamentary procedure allows, we shall introduce amendments or try to complete those introduced by the Minister of Justice, to clarify the provisions of the act and try to avoid the major objections that might be raised not only by the members of our party but also by the members of the party in power, with regard to certain provisions of bill C-120.

Mr. Speaker, as a French-Canadian from Quebec, I am in favour of the principle of the bill now before us. In my opinion, the bill confirms a reality. It is the confirmation of the Canadian duality. It confirms the fact that we must aim at making every effort in order to work together to establish here of a bilingual and bicultural country.

In my opinion the legislation introduced by the Prime Minister, namely Bill C-120, is not a legislation the philosophy of which is alien to that of the Conservative party, because during our convention in Toronto, we had included in our political platform a provision relating to the recognition of the linguistic rights of all Canadians. Obviously, Bill C-120 puts in concrete form this section of our political program.

I for one, as a Quebecer, am in favour of the principle of the bill before us, as I just said. I am for it, Mr. Speaker, because we are obviously witnessing a new development not only in Quebec but in the other provinces as well, especially among the young people of the other provinces. In my opinion, young English-speaking Canadians find that to build a new Canada it will be necessary to know at least one second language. I do not mean to know it perfectly, but try to learn the second language, a language which was the basis on which the Canadian Confederation was established.

We meet this enthusiasm again among young English Canadians, and God knows that it is a great comfort to us, since we can hope that the old prejudices of some English-speaking people are starting to disappear. We can make the best wishes for the Canada of tomorrow and hope that it will be a Canada where the two main groups can live side by side, exchange ideas and discuss the problems now facing Canadian unity.

The principle of Bill C-120 is acceptable to the members from Quebec, because at the last federal-provincial conference, in its opening statement, the government of Quebec, speaking on behalf of all French Canadians, expressed its faith in the establishment of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote an excerpt from the brief submitted by the government of Quebec at the Confederation of To-morrow Conference. On page 23, one reads and I quote:

> Whatever their immediate functions, it appears essential to us that in the Canada of to-morrow, federal institutions take clearly into consideration, in their structure and direction, the binational character of the country.

• (4:30 p.m.)

We believe also that the federal capital of Canada should reflect the linguistic duality of the people.

> First of all, it would be desirable that the proper means be taken to insure a real, efficient and equitable participation of the French-speaking Canadians in the federal public service. Improvements have recently taken place in that respect, but it would be advisable to speed up the process and, above all, to provide accurate machinery through which the reform could be quickly translated into facts.

Now, that excerpt from the opening statement by the Quebec government, referred as it happened to Bill C-120 now before us.

And in the same statement by the Quebec government, on the question of bilingualism of course, here is what I find:

> But that cannot solve the whole problem. Essentially, French Canadians want to be themselves and develop normally as any other race, in the province of Quebec and in the other areas of Canada.

I quote this statement in answer to some hon. members, some English-speaking Canadians who suggest that the Quebec premier, when he attended the federal-provincial conference here, has some reservations concerning Bill C-120. The Quebec premier recognized the principle of the bill, but the reservations which he stated dealt with the establishment of bilingual districts in the province and throughout Canada.

I repeat what I said at the beginning. If the Minister of Justice has met with the Quebec premier and has reached an agreement as to the form of the proposed amendments, I think that the latter, if he is satisfied, will have no other reason to object if Bill C-120 becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, French Canadians, as we know, have never been inclined to apply for positions in the Public Service, because for too long no account was taken of that principle on which Confederation was founded, namely that English and French were the two official languages and were to be considered equal, so much so that the Fathers of Confederation thought of including a special provision—section 133—to ensure the respect of French and English in federal parliamentary institutions and in Quebec's parliamentary system.

We hear objections that I find very insignificant, to the effect that the bill is not constitutional. I say that if we take the time to consider all such objections, we will never build a bilingual and bicultural Canada, because the bill before us is a political instrument Canadians will need to develop bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker that for too long French Canadians were not inclined to apply for jobs in the federal civil service on account of its prevailing unilingualism.

The French Canadians who came here had to learn English before they could secure any employment. For too long, the federal civil service has been unilingual and that is what has kept French Canadians away from the executive positions they otherwise could have held.



It may be useful to add that Canada is actually at a turning point of its history. The tides of contestation are mounting against the federal government because there is unrest in the French-Canadian community; it is frustrated in its efforts to be understood and admitted as a full partner within confederation. If, unfortunately, there are extremists and separatists in Quebec, some are also to be found in the English provinces. To hear some English-speaking people in other provinces bring up constantly the victory of the plains of Abraham, one wonders if they are really working for Canadian unity.

If we condemn Quebec extremists who wish to set up an independent state, we should condemn just as vigorously the people from English provinces who are still harping on the same string who are still putting forward the principle that French Canadians have lost the battle of the plains of Abraham and that might is still right in Canada.

If it is intended to build the Canada of tomorrow with such obsolete principles, we shall never succeed.

Mr. Speaker, the extremists of other provinces are jeopardizing the achievement of Canadian unity just as much as the Quebec separatists.

Naturally, if the English provinces are told that the purpose of this bill is to compel all English Canadians to speak French, or all French Canadians to speak English, serious objections will be raised, not only in western Canada, but in Ontario and in the Maritimes, to the passage of Bill C-120.

But such is not the purpose of the legislation, which is merely to give Canadians, both French and English, the opportunity of joining the public service and of being attended to in their own language by civil servants. I do not see any other purpose in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, if the bill is explained in this way to those English Canadians who have raised major objections, I think the objects of the bill will be well understood and accepted.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if one considers this legislation as a means of enabling a third of the Canadian people to communicate in their own language with government services, a major step forward will have been taken to show that in actual fact Canada is a bicultural country where the two major linguistic groups may live in harmony and may work together towards the solution of the problems that the country is now facing.

The protest movement and the separatist movement that have come into being in Quebec are a direct result of the fact that although much was being said at the federal level about bilingualism and biculturalism, for purposes of appeasement apparently, the talk remained concerned with policy—and never reached the legislation stage.

Today, Bill C-120 brings us something tangible. This bill will considerably undermine the validity of arguments put forward by those people in Quebec who argue that it is impossible at the federal level to derive advantages from their culture and their language.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill is to become an instrument of national unity, it will have to be explained clearly to the population, especially where it looks like an indirect means of taking away from the English-speaking majority its established rights.

This legislation does not mean that both English and French will have to be spoken all over Canada. Those who have explained in this way this legislation to their constituents have obviously been doing this in bad faith, and they belong to that group of extremists I mentioned at the beginning. The sole purpose of this legislation is to recognize in practice what existed already in theory by virtue of the constitution.

• (4:40 p.m.)

At this stage, I would like to put a question to some of my colleagues who raise basic objections to this bill. I would like to know if Bill C-120 deprives the English-speaking majority in this country of any right? I would like to know if Bill C-120 is contrary to the claims or historic rights of English-speaking Canadians in this country?

I examined the text of the bill from every angle, but I never reached the conclusion that this measure deprived of any right the English-speaking majority in this country. The sole purpose of this legislation is to correct an injustice which had existed for a long time, while we neglected to give French Canadians the same opportunity as the English Canadians.

If this is not the meaning of the bill and if one absolutely wants to block it Mr. Speaker—because obviously it would insure for French Canadians the respect not of some privileges but of their rights—we can wonder what the devil are French Canadians doing in parliament? If we cannot agree on the objectives of Bill C-120, and if we are not capable of obtaining from the English-speaking majority, not concessions, but quite simply the recognition of fundamental rights which the French-Canadian nation has always enjoyed since Confederation, we can wonder what we are doing here.

Mr. Speaker, we often like to say, when we travel abroad, that we come from a bilingual and bicultural country.

When I went to the United Nations from 1960 to 1962, I was extremely surprised to find that some delegates of member nations did not even know there were six million French Canadians in our country. Why? Because our representatives at the United Nations, most of the time, only spoke one language. In fact, when I arrived at the United Nations in 1960, representatives of eighteen French-speaking African nations were quite surprised to meet French-speaking Canadians. Sometimes I was humiliated to have these people meet our Canadian senior officials in the United Nations who could not speak French.

Often we like to say that Canada's prestige lies in the fact that we are a bilingual country. But, faced with concrete facts such as is the case today when considering Bill C-120, some people raise all kinds of objections saying that this will create difficulties.

The administration of this legislation will obviously create difficulties. How shall we succeed in changing our constitution, in building a new Canada, in changing certain customs, without being faced with difficulties? Obviously, we shall meet with them and efforts will be necessary. But we French-Canadians, those of good will at least—there are still a good number of them—we are ready to face the challenge, to study the problems with our English-speaking colleagues, in an effort to build for future generations, a country which will be a good place to live.

Whenever we travelled abroad—as many of my colleagues have done, and spoke French in an embassy, we were unable to find anyone to understand us. We have sometimes visited French-speaking countries where the ambassador spoke only English. He could not even say "Bonjour" in French. It was humiliating for a French Canadian to have to address his own ambassador, who could not even speak his language.

We hope—obviously this will take some time—that this bill will cope with the situation, as a matter of justice and not as a favour. I want to make myself very clear, because whenever French Canadians express

a grievance, some people always think they are asking for favours. We French Canadians never ask for favours. We are merely asking for the recognition of our legitimate rights. And here is a bill which recognizes legitimate rights as regards French Canadians.

I ask the English-speaking majority members, whatever their political affiliation, to be very open-minded in dealing with the bill before us.

It is obvious, as concerns the western provinces, that some members are in a fairly difficult position for, as the Minister of Justice pointed out today, perhaps the bill was not well explained to their constituents. I say to the Minister of Justice as well as to the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), who are piloting this bill together, that they will have to provide full information after the passage of this bill, in order to overcome the difficulties as to the interpretation of the bill in certain parts of this country.

Of course, it is the duty of the government to advise the people of what the bill entails so that Canadians, knowing all its details, can accept it objectively.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that although the bill is being studied in a tense atmosphere, although there will be major objections to it—there are fundamental objections to it, which some members have already started bringing up, and others, I am sure, will follow suit—we must still prove to the country that the representatives of the people, English-speaking as well as French-speaking, are capable of assuming their responsibilities, of studying a bill with serenity which, to my mind, is of capital importance to the future of the Canadian confederation.

What happens to this bill will tell us whether there is still hope for Canada as we now know it. If there is filibustering, if objections are raised irresponsibly to play up the misgivings expressed by some sectors of our population, under the pretext that there is no need for bilingualism or biculturalism in Canada, if life is to go on as it does now when the rights of a third of the Canadian people are being overlooked, we French-Canadians of the province of Quebec sitting in this house will have to ask ourselves certain questions with regard to our presence here in this House of Commons.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask our English-speaking colleagues to show some understanding during this debate. May I also ask for their co-operation.

[Mr. Asselin.]

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, there is unrest in Quebec. English-speaking members often tell us: "You speak of separatism, but that is to blackmail us, to obtain concessions." I say, Mr. Speaker, that the percentage of separatists in Quebec is higher than one would think.

Recently, an important Montreal paper carried out a survey and, according to its findings, Mr. René Lévesque's party could obtain 25 per cent of the votes in the next election. Well, I hope that those findings are inaccurate.

The fact remains that if one travels through the province, one finds out that there are important groups of separatists with leaders in every corner of the province.

Is it because the members from Quebec who sit in this house did not do their duty adequately or did not discharge their responsibilities? Better late than never. We must now take our responsibilities, we must show not only to the French Canadians of Quebec, but also to those living in other provinces, and to the English Canadians as well, that at least in the House of Commons it is possible to achieve unanimity on a piece of legislation as important as that which is now under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks, I say that all Canadians have a duty to make every possible effort to build the Canada of tomorrow, which cannot be anything but a bilingual or bicultural country. Otherwise, there will no longer be a Canada, and it will be useless to offer band-aid solutions to problems of French Canadians of Quebec or other provinces because they would be rejected straight off. In my opinion, Canada will be bilingual and bicultural or it will be no more. It would fall apart.

In spite of its defects, Bill C-120 is a step forward in making the country where we want to live bilingual and bicultural. If the country is not bilingual and bicultural, it will fall apart, because a major portion of our people can no longer live otherwise than as equal partners, in every respect.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted this afternoon to speak calmly and state the problem now existing throughout Canada. I represent a rural constituency of the province of Quebec. We know that there are problems. Let us build together this new Canada. I wanted to appeal to the goodwill and open-mindedness of my English-speaking colleagues and tell them: "Better late than never." We should at least agree about the bill now before us if we

want Canada to be still in the future this bicultural and bilingual Canada which most Canadians wish to have.

I agree with the Minister of Justice when he says that the young, either in the province of Quebec or in English-speaking provinces, are eager for a renewal in Canada and it is obviously by relying on them that we will build the Canada of tomorrow. That is why I repeat my request to my English-speaking colleagues, in order that together we may at least show all Canada that we are capable, with some goodwill, to build a Canada where it will be good to live in the future.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[*English*]

**Mr. Colin D. Gibson (Hamilton-Wentworth):** Mr. Speaker, it is not only a pleasure but an honour to speak in this house on this bill after such a thrilling, inspiring and eloquent speech as the one we have just heard by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin). In my opinion the hon. member's words will do more to fuse national unity than many of the speeches we have heard from either side of the house since this session commenced. The talented and eloquent words of the hon. member for Charlevoix inspire me to take a stab at ma deuxième langue. If he will stay with me I have something to say in French.

[*Translation*]

May I quote here an excerpt from the opening statement made by the right hon. Lester B. Pearson in February 1968 at the first meeting of the constitutional conference.

> There are two facts which could not be denied by whoever considers the situation with impartiality. The first is that Canadians of French language and culture do not have the same possibilities as the English-speaking people to live their lives, to raise their children or to make in their own language their full contribution anywhere in Canada.

It is to such a question that I will attempt to give an answer. It would be necessary also to recall the evolution of bilingualism in Canada since 1967. Let us recall the stands taken by our party since the achievement of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the actual Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), not forgetting the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent and Lester B. Pearson, and ending with the urgency to legislate on the matter if Canada is to survive.

Mr. Speaker, what is our ultimate goal as Canadians of either language? The greatness, development and progress of our country, at all levels. To reach that goal, we must combine our efforts and not divide them in futile struggles which in no way improve our lot or that of our country. We want a better life for all our citizens. Why should we quarrel constantly? Both the English and the French elements in Canada are there to stay and both are determined not to abdicate their language or their traditions.

Their increasing numbers will certainly not weaken their respective position. Why should we refuse to allow either of them to communicate officially in their own language with the government of the country or the various judicial or administrative agencies under its jurisdiction? Let us be more serious and more realistic.

[*English*]

It will be a great day for Canada when Bill C-120 is placed on our statute books. It has great effects for individual Canadians in all parts of the country, from one coast to the other and from one region to another. It will have great benefits in respect of one province and its relations with the others. The only result of this bill can be a fusing of this federation with a better spirit among the provinces and a better relationship between the provinces and the federal government. The composite result will be a vibrant and young nation growing in bilingualism and biculturalism.

I do not use the word "biculturalism" in the sense of a by-product. I have in mind the facts of French life—French levity, lightness and camaraderie—about which we are all aware. This is what French Canadians have brought to us, particularly many of us here in Ottawa where we have formed many friendships. These things are real and this is the message that we can spread.

This is the kind of thing we can teach our young Canadians so that when they grow up they will be stronger and better Canadians living richer lives that we ever had the opportunity to live. We will be the forerunners because we will have had the initial advantage of meeting our confreres from the province of Quebec on both sides of the house. We have learned from them and we pass on what we have learned without fear or reluctance. We move forward joyfully in this crusade for Canada.

We will take a huge step forward by adopting this bill. Perhaps we will not completely

achieve our goal, but I believe the amendments proposed today by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), particularly the new subclause 4 of clause 40, which refers to the Public Service Commission, will represent tremendous progress. In the words of the minister, this amendment will make it clearly obvious that promotion is to be made on merit and that this is the principal consideration in respect of any promotion in the civil service. Certainly what the minister said today has gone a long way toward dispelling any doubt in this regard.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The hon. member for Charlevoix touched on the presence of Canada at the United Nations. I was there only very briefly as an observer last November, but one of the things that impressed me deeply about the Canadian delegation was that our young diplomats were bilingual and were establishing friendships with the Francophone nations. It was a wonderful experience to see representatives of a country such as ours making new friends throughout the Francophone world concurrently with our use of the English language. In this we are spreading our bilingualism and biculturalism in a constructive manner. We are fusing a greater Canada and proving that we are a great country, a country that will play a greater role in world affairs as time goes by. We know that the future of our country is great, but it will be greater because of the tremendous spirit and drive behind this bill.

As an English speaking Canadian I am shocked and ashamed to think that in the past French Canadians have not had the opportunity we have had. This is a terrible injustice. We have gone a long way toward curing that injustice, but we do not believe that simply passing this bill will be an end of the matter. We will proceed to build a society equalled by none other elsewhere in the world.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate the government for introducing this bill recognizing the status of the official languages of Canada.

It should be noted, however, that the British North America Act already awarded us these rights and it is truly regrettable that during one hundred years, that is before 1962, we did not have in this parliament of Canada any members capable of demanding equal rights for us.

[Mr. Gibson.]

This afternoon, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) gave us some explanations concerning the amendments he is proposing. I hope they will not cause any harm to the Quebec people, especially if we were to judge them by the one he moved to clause 11 (3), and I quote:

> That the French version of Bill C-120 be amended by striking out the words "tribunal du Canada" on line 16, page 7, and substituting therefore the words "tribunal au Canada".

So by simply replacing "du" by "au", it is implied that in Canada, as a result of both official languages being recognized, English and French will not have to be used in all courts in Canada.

Therefore, we advise the minister and the house that we will scrutinize all the amendments.

We have examined carefully Bill C-120 as submitted. We agree with it, but we will scrutinize all the amendments, because, as the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin) said earlier, people are wondering whether Canada will remain united or whether separatism will develop.

Separatism is not all bunkum; it is not window-dressing meant to impress other Canadians. People want action, and if justice is done to our people, Canada will continue on the right direction. In any event, I made that remark because, too often, we are faced with superficial bilingualism.

Earlier, we received notice of questions to be debated tonight at ten o'clock; this notice is perfectly bilingual. But as regards those to be discussed in the days to come, everything is in English. Then, I understand that we want in this parliament to give justice to our own members, and I hope that such small hitches which we want and hope to eliminate will be taken care of, so that we can feel at home, really at home, everywhere in Canada.

When I personally visited western Canada in 1959 and went up to Vancouver and recently, during a trip in April which took me into western Canada, as far as Victoria this time, I realized that in the West, especially beyond Winnipeg, French speaking people are few and far between except in the French minority groups who have made a tremendous effort to remain bilingual. Western Canadians have probably realized that to preserve their mother tongue they had to be unilingual. President Nixon and General de Gaulle understand this, because when they get together they talk in their mother tongue and use interpreters to be understood.

We, French Canadians from Quebec, contrary to some people in Western Canada, have adopted this bilingual posture. And as the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) pointed out last week, when an English-speaking Canadian wants to be served in his own language while visiting "La belle Province", Quebecers go out of their way to please him.

However, that makes me ask myself the following question, because we have tried to show such good will in endeavouring to become bilingual, holding that in the remainder of this country, other Canadians were imitating the stand we had taken, but unfortunately we have found out that such was not the case everywhere. That is why today I wonder whether it would not have been better to preserve our French, even if we had had to hire interpreters to make ourselves understood by the remainder of Canada, for every day, I realize that we have still a lot to learn of our own language and of our French culture, and that it may be dangerous to become a people of translators rather than Canadians with a French culture and Canadians with an English culture, communicating through translators, in order to become fully aware that basically we have two cultures.

• (5:10 p.m.)

At any rate, I want to analyse the problem from an entirely new point of view, that is considering bilingualism throughout the world, and I think the best way to understand a problem is to consider it under a new angle.

When we, Canadians, have to face some national problems, we tend to withdraw into ourselves. If we look around us, we merely note what is happening in England, in France or in the United States.

These traditional sources of inspiration can hardly inform us on bilingualism. Besides, professor Mackey suggests to take the whole world as the frame-work for our analysis. If we follow this wise piece of advice, very soon we will realize that most of the people of the world, at some time or another in their history, had to face the same problems which now concern Canada and several other countries.

Bilingualism has almost always been considered as a marginal phenomenon. It has never been the prime purpose of specialized sciences such as sociology, psychology and linguistics. In the mind of the general public, bilingualism has always been rather an exceptional, if not abnormal, phenomenon concerning only a few bilingual countries in the world or a few individuals in a community.

Therefore, I shall attempt to prove that bilingualism, far from being an exceptional problem, reserved to bilingual countries, is in fact common to most of the people of the world. Indeed, there are fewer bilingual people in bilingual countries than in so-called unilingual countries. In fact, we do not always realize that bilingualism is recognized in some nations, not so much to promote it than to provide for the maintenance and the use of two languages or more, in one nation.

A bilingual statute, for instance, ensures the integrity of the Swedish community in Finland and protects that of the Lapps in Norway.

In a federal state, such as Switzerland or Yugoslavia, official bilingualism maintains the linguistic status quo.

In the new African states, it allows the contribution of international knowledge and thus becomes a means of communication at world level.

Bilingualism is maintained by two unilingual blocks. If one of the two becomes bilingual the other one enjoys a linguistic superiority and can then absorb the bilingual community. Such has been, in the past, the fate of several bilingual communities. That is why bilingual nations consider regional unilingualism as a means of preserving their national bilingualism.

Four factors contribute to make bilingualism a universal fact. These four factors are the following: first the number and distribution of languages in the world, secondly, the comparative utility of national idioms; third, the scope of the international languages; and fourth, the migration of populations.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker we have the question of the number and distribution of languages. If we look at the situation in the right perspective, we find that there are about 30 times as many languages as countries to house them. This means that a number of countries have more than one language and if we observe the distribution of those languages we can see that this is practically the case for most countries.

There are, for instance, about 200 languages spoken in the U.S.S.R. though only 70 of them are official languages.

Whether the world is enriched by having a smaller or a greater number of languages is a matter open to discussion.

According to some people, it would be of the greatest advantage if we had only one language. It is a fact that when a larger number of people understand a language, the quality of national and international communications can be improved. On the other hand, from the cultural point of view, the disappearance of a language is an irretrievable loss. One's position in this debate depends on one's point of view, but the fact remains that the languages already widely spoken are already gaining at the expense of the minority languages.

What is the reason for this phenomena? In the past, it was said that one of the reasons laid in the increasing number of political alliances. At the present time, however, that factor is of less importance compared to the vast improvement in education together with the recent revolution in the communication media.

According to King Stephen The First of Hungary, a kingdom, where only one language is spoken, is weak and powerless. For most nations, the necessity for a certain measure of bilingualism is not always justified for educational purposes.

In fact, a person leaving his country cannot expect in most cases that his language will be spoken elsewhere.

People from Norway, Yugoslavia and Rumania, for example, who for some reason or other must cross the frontier and their number is increasing due to better means of transport cannot expect to be understood in foreign countries and, conversely, they cannot be expected to speak the national idiom of everyone they meet. They must therefore learn one or more of the most widely used languages, which permits them to communicate with a greater number of people, not only with those who speak their own language, but also those who like themselves had, for the same reasons, to learn those languages.

Mr. Speaker, we can imagine at the present time that the political and industrial power of the nations for which those languages are official vouches for their authority and their prestige. Those languages are English, French, German and Russian, and to a lesser extent, Japanese, Chinese, Spanish, Italian and some others. As compared with the latter and what they represent, the great majority of languages of the world have little to offer



to the millions of people who everyday achieve a greater degree of knowledge and who will try to learn everything that the modern world can offer in the field of knowledge and information.

In the case of an independent multilingual country, the adoption of a language as the national language, to the exclusion of others, can even bring about a civil war. In order to be convinced, one has only to meditate on the recent failure of the Indian government when it tried to impose a national language to India, and the uprising generated by the new language policy.

Thus certain countries must face the following problems: give official status to local languages, or keep the language of the colonizing nation as the official language. To solve both problems, there is but one imperative solution: to adopt some degree of bilingualism at the national level, and this requirement, in most countries going off on such a venture, will affect a sensible percentage of the population and help those countries to be recognized all over the world.

That necessity does not automatically hinder the intellectual life of those nations. Today, an author or a scientist who belongs to a linguistic minority must often write in a priority language to make his ideas or findings known to a wider public. Such a trend gives the priority languages in an even stronger position. A large proportion of scientific papers released in the Netherlands or in highly civilized countries, in the technical field for example, are published in English, French or German.

• (5:20 p.m.)

One can therefore wonder whether those whose mother tongue is a priority language have any need for bilingualism, since theirs is the language of the country where they live and work. Besides, it enables them to acquire the knowledge they need and since, finally, it is spoken and understood in many countries, they would like to visit, why should they need another language?

Such considerations lead people to give too much importance to their mother tongue. Such linguistic chauvinism often disturbs those who took the trouble of learning a second language, perhaps less important than their own.

If Dutchmen learn English, why do not Englishmen learn Dutch? Is it because English is better than Dutch? It is true that we can consider English as a great language,

just as French, and that for many reasons but none of them dealing with linguistics.

For a linguist, English and French are not more important than any of the 3,000 other languages spoken in various parts of the world. Moreover, no language has the monopoly of universal knowledge.

This is why Milton urged the English people to learn Italian, which was the most widely used language then, and in which Queen Elisabeth and Mary Stuart published edicts.

The postwar era saw thousands of people going to foreign countries in order to find temporary jobs. The countries they found more attractive, such as Switzerland and Germany, welcomed a great number of foreign workers because of their lack of manpower.

It is estimated that in Switzerland, right now, more than 10 per cent of the population is made up of workers and people from abroad. It follows that because of their work requirements thousands of Italians, Spaniards and other foreign labourers have become bilingual.

It is reckoned that the United States alone had more than 20 million bilingual people before the postwar influx.

How long does a community stay bilingual? The duration of bilingualism varies greatly. But what is important is not the political border but the linguistic one, and they are seldom the same, except when they correspond to certain natural elements such as oceans, mountains or deserts which can prevent the spreading of language. A quite important difference in the linguistic border and the political one can bring about the existence of a bilingual country such as Switzerland and Belgium.

Historic events can also upset the geographic distribution of bilingualism. Historic events alter national borders and political groups.

On the political level, federalism has promoted bilingualism in Malaysia, Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. The number of unilingual people in each of those linguistic communities is a determining factor for the importance of bilingualism.

If Ireland, in spite of strenuous efforts is still one of the least bilingual countries, it is largely because unilingual Englishmen exceed bilingual Irishmen in a ratio of 50 to 1.

If on the contrary, South Africa, where 73 per cent of the population can pride themselves of speaking both languages, is the most bilingual country in the world, it is largely because the unilingual people for both official languages is almost equivalent, 15 per cent for English and 11 per cent for Afrikaans.

The larger the difference in number between two linguistic communities, the higher the percentage of bilingual people in the minority community, provided however, that other factors do not intervene to change the order of things.

In Wales, 82 per cent of Welshmen are bilingual at 12 years of age, as against 4 per cent of Englishmen.

Around 740 A.D., the slaves of the Arabic army had to learn Arabic. In Britain, after the Norman conquest, the Normans occupying nearly all the key positions contributed largely to the establishment of bilingualism among a good number of Anglo-Saxons and kept French alive until the Hundred Years' War. We all know what influence these generations of bilingual people had on the English language, which is still replete with French terms.

On the other hand, the Romans never tried to impose their language, nor did the Greek, although both their imperialisms were founded mainly on language and not on race or nationality. The language was not imposed on the population; rather it was offered as a privilege. As the language became more uniform and standardized, it gained more converts. The standardization and the diffusion of the language were due to a network of schools.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in Canada also, through teaching, which can, it is true, help the ascendance of a language, we could increase the influence of a tongue by including it in the curriculum. For instance, the use of English was forbidden in the British schools in the thirteenth century.

If prosperity can destroy a language, poverty can bring the same result. A period of economic recession in the area where the minority language is spoken can bring about disastrous effects.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, almost all the Irish Gaeltacht was affected by a famine led to massive emigration. In the course of one generation, the language, which was that of half the country's population, became that of a small minority.

The predominating language in Luxemburg, where a Teutonic dialect is spoken, is alive perhaps only because the national economy requires the existence of a trade treaty.

Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that French Canadians are concerned about the turn of events, and that, in turn, they plead with English-speaking Canadians to understand them, in order that Canada may be maintained as the country we want it to be.

The case of the Aramaic language shows, as I have explained a moment ago, that effective means of communication can develop the influence of a language. Aramaean nomads went to Mesopotamia, adopted a similar writing to that of the Phoenician,—a running and efficient handwriting,—which resulted in the establishment of Aramaic as the international language throughout the East, beyond the sphere of influence of those who spoke the language. Since business papers were written in that language, it spread very rapidly through the great commercial channels and, in some countries, it became the court language.

Another factor, Mr. Speaker, is isolation which may preserve the existence of a language. That was the case for Frisian, Lappish, Romansch, Welsh, Irish and Scotch.

Besides, that is the reason why some separatists say: Even if we are isolated, we shall continue to protect our French language. Isolation is a way for minority languages to avoid being absorbed by majority languages.

Some languages survive longer than others. How long does it take for a language to disappear when survival conditions no longer exist? It took a thousand years for Coptic to disappear from Egypt, while in one generation Norse had disappeared in France.

The language that survives the longest is the one that generally boasts the most literary works. Latin and Greek are excellent examples. They are taught even now as second language in our schools.

All the causes I have just enumerated, Mr. Speaker, give some variations of the main dimensions of bilingualism: distribution, stability and function that affect the individual, the language and the group. The effects on the individual may be emotional, intellectual and cultural. Some of them have been considered as hindrances, other as advantages. Let us first consider the so-called hindrances.

• (5:30 p.m.)

As far as the emotional effects of bilingualism are concerned, it has been maintained that bilingual children lack self-confidence or have a low level of maturity, that they show symptoms of introversion and that they have the feeling that sometimes their thinking is not clear.



It is maintained also that, in South Africa, since bilingual pupils are instructed in the tongue which is less familiar to them, emotional troubles develop.

The so-called intellectual inconveniences of bilingualism are connected to the part played by the language in the way the child learns to think. The younger the child, the more important is the part played by the language in his intellectual development. According to some, bilingual children cannot express themselves with precision; they have difficulty in handling abstract concepts and the rational faculties of the child, discouraged by bilingualism, interfere with his development of ideas or concepts.

That is why, faced with the incoming tide of that English uniligualism, we, in the province of Quebec, have seen bills such as the one passed in the legislature that in Quebec the working language be the French language.

However the fact remains that there are cultural impediments. Some maintain that a bilingual person is deprived of cultural roots or has an hybrid culture and cannot reach deeply in neither one nor the other cultures and thus remains a marginal person.

Undoubtedly bilingualism has an effect at least on one of the languages and in the end changes it or suppresses it. Generally speaking, it is the dominant language which influences the other, as can be assessed by the number of words borrowed from the other tongue.

When in a given country, a language other than the original one prevails for some time, the latter is never the same again.

To wit, the state of English after the Norman conquest, and that of the Persian language after Arab control.

In some cases, a hybrid or a creole tongue is born, as in the case of Haiti and New Guinea.

When a language is submitted to the influence of another, people often react to save it by setting up various organizations, by launching out campagns to rid it of the words borrowed from the prevailing language. But few of these movements ever meet with success, Mr. Speaker, unless they are fostered by outside conditions.

Generally, the State does not do away with the tongue of a minority; it merely ignores it and apathy does the rest. In this way, bilingualism leads ultimately to the complete

elimination of one of the languages. Such was the case, generally speaking, of the languages of Britanny.

Take Egypt, for instance: over a period of 1000 years, it went through five stages of transitory bilingualism. First of all, under the domination of Persia in 323 B.C.; then, under that of the Greeks until roughly about 146 B.C.; later under the Romans until about 640 A.D. And finally under Arab domination. Still, the Egyptian language remained a living language until the 18th century.

Finally, what is the effect of bilingualism on the group, that is the community or the nation? From bilingualism, spread intelligently within a multilingual nation can grow the feeling of belonging to one and the same nation.

In Czechoslovakia, for example, bilingualism managed to overcome the extreme exclusivism of national groups which had been a destructive force within the family and at school.

In the Soviet Union, it would seem that bilingualism was the main factor of equality amongst the various national groups.

The debates concerning the effects of bilingualism result to a great extent from the multiple-dimension character of this phenomenon and to the high degree of variability of every dimension. For instance, an immigrant child will benefit from bilingualism because it is easy for him to comply with it, while another one will not profit by it, because he cannot become easily adjusted to it.

The importance and value of every factor vary from one person to another and from one area to another. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is so difficult to establish a causality between bilingualism and other aspects of human behaviour.

In a country where bilingualism is inevitable, the policy should strive to take advantage of all the benefits derived from bilingualism and to minimize its disadvantages. But if a country ignores bilingualism, disadvantages will most likely outweight advantages.

That is why an officially bilingual country, as Canada might be, should encourage the study of the phenomenon of bilingualism as such. It is that phenomenon I tried to explain. It is gaining ground and I believe the English-speaking people also wish to promote French culture, as I found out during my trip to western Canada and personally, it appears to me as something really complex and of multiple dimensions, unsteady by nature but nevertheless liable to be studied in a scientific way.

The basic solution to our Canadian problem does not lie in documents, however useful they may be. Complete unity will be achieved when the Canadian people will understand its meaning and will truly want it. It will be the outcome of what you and I and 18 million—21 million people now—think and do. If we show tolerance, imagination and foresight, then the light will shine on our future. The two great communities which make up Canada have fostered prejudices and made mistakes. But, I think that today, as a Canadian, I am quite aware of our past and present errors, and I think that by giving a few examples, the vague and erroneous view which we often witness among our people will be completely cast off some day.

A few years ago, before the royal commission which bears a long name, in Winnipeg, the manager of a local radio station was telling about the linguistic problems he was up against in establishing his broadcasting timetable. To the question as to the number of foreign languages in which he was broadcasting his programs, he answered more or less the following:

There is German, Ukrainian and French.

He should have been reminded that in Canada, French was not a foreign language since it was spoken before English. His remark was nevertheless quite candid, but as long as such answers will be given in Canada, we will certainly not be able to approach some vital questions in a climate of justice and truth.

The Right Hon. Vincent Massey said one day that the French culture came first to Canada. It has been said, and rightly so, that Quebec is indeed a motherland in itself, that is, homogeneous community which defends and perpetuates the great traditions it has inherited. It is a stronghold of French culture whose links with French-speaking Canadians from coast to coast are very powerful. And it is good that it should be so.

A very learned man stated once, in Quebec City, that language is a key which opens the door of your neighbour. If all Canadians could speak our two national languages, one can assume that the basic problem of lack of unity would still exist. But even if bilingualism never completely solved this problem, it will contribute a great deal to increase the real dialogue between our two cultures, a

dialogue that Canadians of good will, whether of English or French expression, have kept going but which is in danger of being interrupted today.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Of course, we cannot expect that every Canadian will eventually speak both languages. However, we can focus on a high though attainable objective, and bend all our energies to it.

The Right Hon. Vincent Massey added:

I feel that we should insist that all our young people be able, as early as the second year of high school, to read an easy text in French and express without hesitation at least a few correct and understandable sentences in that language.

He was then speaking to English-speaking Canadians.

In Scandinavian countries and in the Netherlands, classical students, in high school, study three modern language to which they can add two ancient languages. Are we lazier, less intelligent or less aware of our duty and of our true interests than they are? I do not think so.

Let us consider the situation of the French Canadian who has learned English, speaks it and understands it well, or if not well, at least enough to get along. He is called upon to sit on a national commission with other Canadians from various parts of the country. Matters will almost certainly be dealt with in English. This man is handicapped in two respects. First, though he may express his ideas properly, he probably does it more slowly and with less accuracy than his colleagues who speak their maternal tongue. He has the feeling of not being perfectly understood, or both at the same time. If the debate waxes hot, he feels his handicap more keenly.

We all know that in such meetings, it is sometimes difficult to precise clearly one's thoughts, even in one's own language. We have all at some time had the feeling that we had not done ourselves justice. Well, French Canadians have that feeling nearly all the time. If only they could in their own language, get this subtle shade of meaning across. But nobody would understand them anyway. They are fighting but on someone else's ground. It is not surprising therefore that the discussion, which normally should have been friendly, leaves them with a feeling of uneasiness, when it is not of downright frustration.

Few people know that extreme weariness, when it does not affect the very faculty of thinking, leaves one with a very poor vocabulory. This paralyzing weariness can quickly appear when one is using a language which, though mastered, is not one's own.



I think the differences and even the tensions existing between Canadians could become the source of a new vitality. This surplus of energy could be harnessed for the benefit of all Canadians, to improve economic and social conditions, to increase the opportunities for every citizen, regardless of his or her language, and to enable Canada to increase its contribution to the well-being of humanity at large. Then the enormous resources of the two cultural groups, French and English, would be tapped, with the addition of the enriching contribution made by Canadians of other cultural backgrounds, everybody working in his own way to the achievement of common objectives.

It is interesting to note that in Switzerland, as in Belgium, the French-speaking people have a reputation to be the less eager to use the language of their fellow-countrymen. This is particularly true in Belgium. It has often been said that if a group of Swiss, Italians or Germans speak French among themselves, it is because there is at least one French-speaking Swiss in their midst.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, to conclude my remarks, I say that we Canadians of Quebec will support this Bill C-120, because it will encourage dialogue between the two great races of Canada and thus put an end to this monologue which has existed in parliament for one hundred years. I congratulate the government on having introduced this bill, and I will vote for it, conscious that I will be helping all Canadians.

[*English*]

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40 to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Income tax—request for exemption of old age pensioners; the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—Communication—Bell Canada—alleged disregard of investment return regulations; the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau)—Regional Economic Expansion—Atlantic Development Board—government policy.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

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

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen, (for Mr. Trudeau) that Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières):** Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to open a short parenthesis and thank the hon. leader of the Ralliement Créditiste (Mr. Caouette) for the advertising he did twice last week for a choir from my community; this choir is made up of some 110 young people between 18 and 19 years of age, who can perform in both languages. I would like to support his recommendation to the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) that the government finance trips across Canada for these young people so that they can serve as an example of national unity for the whole of the country.

[*English*]

When rising to speak on Bill-C120, one is prone to remember we have been talking about bilingualism for at least 200 years. It is probable we will discuss it for another century or two, but we must admit that in the last few years there has been a great deal more discussion, mainly as a result of the progress made in this country.

[*Translation*]

I am among those who try to be authentic Canadians and who want unity in diversity for Canada, and I believe, like Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, that the greatest vocation in the world is to try and unite men.

But to unite them they surely must be persuaded to speak both languages, or at least to understand them, because I believe that the only way to be united is to understand each other.

That is why I shall, as briefly as possible underline a few important facts, for instance that the use of French is an historical right for French Canadians, that the use of French is a natural right throughout Canada, that bilingualism is an everyday fact in several countries, that bilingualism is a cultural factor, an enrichment for everyone, and finally that bilingualism is a factor of national unity recognized and practiced for many years by French Canadians.

I think it should be emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that we ask of our English speaking fellow Canadians to do what we have been practicing for over one hundred years in Quebec, where we accept even unilingual people in our midst and we get along fine with them and as we provide as best we can English-speaking Canadians with services in their own language.

It seems to me that in the field of bilingualism, there are some misunderstandings. It is a fact. It was mentioned here this afternoon. There are misunderstandings. At the outset, the bill should define what is meant by bilingualism. I believe that what is wanted is official bilingualism, and nothing more.

English-speaking people imagine that French Canadians want to force all English-speaking Canadians to speak French all the time. That is not the idea, not in the least.

On the French side, there are some people, above all Separatists, who think that the French language is in jeopardy and that some Great Wall of China should be built around the province of Quebec so as to protect our mother tongue.

Other people claim that unilingual officials could be dismissed. I think it will not be the case. But even if it were the case, some of our French-speaking colleagues should be reminded that for a hundred years, in the province of Quebec we have been dealing with English-speaking federal officials. We have put up with it, as Christians should, for all these years. Now our young people are angry, they refuse to stand it any more. They will call for bilingualism, and for an equal statute in the whole of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, what we want, I will say it again, is that the French-Canadians who are one of the two main ethnic groups in this country, who of course enjoy a kind of seniority right, since they came first to come to this country, who have for two centuries given the proof that they are faithful subjects of the Canadian nation, and even of the British Empire, want to be now considered and treated as full-fledged Canadians. They accept no longer to be treated as second-class Canadians, outside their province.

What we want is that they have a right in provincial Assemblies, in the courts of justice, within the Crown corporations in Federal departments, to use their mother tongue if they want to.

It goes without saying, that I shall not dwell on all the objections of the fanatics, of the "jingoes" that we talked about this afternoon. Those people can be found on either side. I believe we should try and discuss this problem of bilingualism as serenely as possible. Today I would like merely to speak to Canadians of goodwill, and avoid partisanship as much as possible, as I notice with a great deal of satisfaction that members of different parties seem to have come to some sort of agreement in this respect. It is fortunate indeed that there is no partisanship and that nobody takes advantage of such a difficult issue to resort to demagoguery. There are a few exceptions, unfortunately, but perhaps it would be better not to grant them undue attention.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Historically, England and the government of Her Majesty have probably better understood French Canadians than some fanatics at home, who would like to see the battle of the Plains of Abraham still be fought and to remind us, Quebecers, that we are conquered, colonized, in short!

As for those who fear the domination of French Canadians in the federal public life, we can reassure them; there is no question of that for many reasons. The first, is that we are too few in number and all we are asking is to be masters at home, first in Quebec; then, to be on an equal footing with the rest of the people in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize a little what the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin) and a few other members said a while ago.

The people who are really responsible for separatism in the province of Quebec are precisely the English-speaking Canadians who have not understood the fundamental fact that there are two founding races who speak different languages. It is the uncompromising attitude of these people which has imposed upon us, French speaking Canadians, laws of exception, of discrimination, as it happened in Ontario, in Manitoba, in the Northwest Territories and in some other provinces, when the question of the teaching languages in the schools was being discussed.

That is what brought about the separatist trend that we are witnessing in the province of Quebec and which we, supporters of federalism and Canadianism, want to fight unreservedly, through practical measures. That is why we ask all hon. members of goodwill to co-operate with us to prevent the fabric of the Canadian federation from being torn apart.



Our young people in Quebec are angry; they will not accept for another century the glaring inequities they had to bear in the past.

From a historical point of view, practical bilingualism has always been recognized in our province, at least in principle.

[*English*]

Around 1774 Lord Edward Thurlow, who was Attorney General of Great Britain, expressed this way the intentions of the British government towards the French Canadians:

> You ought to change those laws which relate to French sovereignty . . . but with respect to all other laws, all other customs and institutions whatever, which are indifferent to the state of subject and sovereign, humanity, justice and wisdom equally conspire to advise you to leave the people just as they were—

The language laws related of course to all of Canada at the time.

The great Edmund Burke did not think differently when he said:

> I consider the right of conquest so little, and the right of human nature so much, that the former has little consideration with me. I look upon the people of Canada as coming, by the dispensation of God, under the British government. I would have us govern it in the same manner as the all-wise disposition of Providence would govern us.

[*Translation*]

And Lord Grenville, setting forth in the House of Lords in 1792 the principle of the Canadian constitution, said and I quote:

> The province of Canada differs by reason of its situation from the other British colonies in America. It was not founded or originally conquered by this country and the British laws could not be applied there unchanged. It is a province conquered over another country, a colony having already its system of laws, its agricultural industry and its trade.

I continue with the quotation:

> The French Canadians' love for their customs, their language and their manners which they prefer to those of England has been called prejudice. Such a love deserves a better name than prejudice.
>
> Such love is based on reason, on something better than reason, on the best feelings of the human heart.

And it is not a French Canadian who says that.

At about the same time, a French-Canadian parliamentarian, Mr. de Lotbinière, stated in

connection with the same problem and I quote:

The statute of the 14th year of His Majesty's reign proves the truth of what I am saying. Our religion is preserved, our property rights are assured and we should enjoy all our civil rights as amply, as extensively and as profitably as if there had been no proclamation, ordinance, order nor other public act. After the issuance of such a solemn legislation which has not been repealed, can we believe that Parliament wanted to withdraw what it has so generously granted us;

He is speaking of the British Parliament of course.

—can we believe that by assuring us our rights as citizens, by maintaining our property rights,

—Therefore, the French language—

—they would refuse to listen whenever we use that language, that they would refuse to read the notes we present to them on a text they have granted us. That cannot be. We see a continuation of the benevolence of this august Parliament in the act of the thirty-first year of the reign of His Majesty.

On July 3, 1793, the right hon. Henry Dundas, the Home Secretary of the British Parliament wrote to lord Dorchester, governor of Canada:

About the orders of the house that bills relating to laws, traditions, customs and rights of the province will be introduced in French ... At the same time, I have no objection to a standing rule providing that any bill of the nature mentioned above be introduced in the house with a French translation.

It will be agreed that this was a great deal if one bears in mind that those words were spoken after the conquest, almost 200 years before the enlightened century we live in, when kings had power of life and death over the conquered peoples. All that had been prepared by British authorities, whose broadness of mind is all to their credit.

On October 27, 1764, Murray wrote to Lord Eglinton, and I quote:

French Canadians are perhaps the most noblest and bravest races of the world. If they are granted certain rights, they will be the most loyal and most useful group of men in this American empire.

All that was ratified about 1769, when another British governor won his case before the London parliament. I mentioned Lord Carleton who then objected to the theory of attorney-general Masères, as those who have studied history will recall, who preached on behalf of assimilation. One can see that fanatics existed long before today. As for Carleton, who recommended reconciliation, against Masères' extolling of assimilation, he declared, and I quote:

—we must not forget that the Canadian people is not made up of British emigrants, who brought with them the laws of England, but of inhabitants who are part of a long-established colony, which her Majesty's arms forced to submit to its power, under certain conditions.

We must also consider that their laws and traditions are very different from the laws and traditions of England, but that like the latter they are based on unwritten law and equity, that their honor, their properties, and their income as well as the king's taxes depend largely on those laws and traditions.

And in 1770, attorney general Marriott, who to this day is known as a fanatic, wrote the following to the British parliament. He said:

From the point of view of international law, I consider capitulation not only as a national agreement, but as an agreement made with the inhabitants in consideration of their will to cease all resistance. The honour and the interests of this kingdom are at stake, and the agreement must be fully complied with.

However, we were promised that all our rights would be preserved, our language included, and we never understood this to be only for the Quebec "reservation".

Mr. Speaker, is it necessary to make further quotations in order to show our hon. friends that from the beginning of British regime, here in Canada, the most brilliant minds were advising the British crown which had already accepted that view, to consider French Canadians as first class citizens who would retain the right to speak their mother tongue throughout Canada.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being six o'clock, the sitting stands suspended until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. J. A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières):** Mr. Speaker, before dinner, I tried to explain, with quotations and facts, that politicians who presided over the early relationships between Canada and Great Britain, from 1760 to 1800, were rather well disposed towards the French Canadian group, in particular in

connection with that question of languages, and I believe their statements fully prove it.

[*English*]

I shall continue for a little while in English. I realize that it might be annoying to my listeners if I speak for a while in French and then in English, but I believe it is still the best way to set an example for the rest of Canada if we really believe in bilingualism. I have a special quotation I should like to read. I chose it on purpose to refute what I heard on television last Friday night when the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) opposed the bill for a lot of specious reasons. He blamed the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) for having introduced the bill. He thought it should have been introduced by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). The hon. member should realize this is such an important bill that the cabinet decided two ministers should introduce it. I am surprised that the hon. member for Prince Albert, a very devoted follower and admirer of Sir John A. Macdonald, holds this opinion. I repeat that I dedicate this quotation from Sir John A. Macdonald to the hon. member for Prince Albert. The Father of Confederation once said:

> I have no accord with the desire expressed in some quarters that by any mode whatever there should be an attempt made to oppress the one language or to render it inferior to the other; I believe that would be impossible if it were tried and it would be foolish and wicked if it were possible. The statement that has been made so often that this is a conquered country is à propos de rien.
>
> Whether it was conquered or ceded, we have a constitution under which all British subjects are in a position of absolute equality, having rights of every kind, of language, of religion, of property and of person. There is no paramount race in this country, there is no conquered race in this country, we are all British subjects, and those who are not English are nonetheless British subjects on that account.

Let me go further, Mr, Speaker, and say that in or about the year 1818 the British government appointed a committee to inquire into the position of modern languages and the educational system of Great Britain. Here is one of their conclusions:

> French is by far the most important language in the history of modern civilizations—

We are better than all other people.

> —for England was in the fourth century the pupil—notwithstanding the enemy, the rival—but always in some degree under the influence of France. From every point of view French is for us above all the most important living tongue.

[Mr. Mongrain.]

Also I am sure everybody realizes that the Queen is perfectly bilingual. I do not doubt that the hon. member for Prince Albert will be willing to follow her example. After all those citations, let me bring forth the argument that the Queen is fluently bilingual; she has practically no accent. I think most of her predecessors whom I have known or heard about on the throne of England spoke French with a tremendously judicious choice of words. Should not this serve as an example to those who still hesitate to master two languages and thus deprive themselves of something that could enrich their lives?

We speak French but we are bilingual in Quebec. We did not wait for this bill to become bilingual. I hail from the second French speaking city established in North America, which was founded in 1634, a century before the ancestors of the member for Prince Albert came to this country. I was born in a small country village where I do not think anyone could speak English or had any need to learn it except for the sake of culture and mutual understanding with our fellow Canadians of English descent. We have learned it.

In our courts of justice, our municipal councils, our legislatures and our associations our English speaking fellow Canadians are treated as members of the family. Most of them are bilingual. There are still a few who are not. We, I think, have set an example. That is the example we wish the people all over the country to follow. I think this is one thing that should convince those who hesitate to accept this official bilingualism. We are only asking them to make the effort to do what we have been doing for decades, if not for centuries. I know there have been incidents, and I will talk about them later.

• (8:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that bilingualism is impossible, that it is utopian but I am going to try to prove the contrary. Once again, it should be clearly understood that we are not speaking of integral bilingualism; what we want is official bilingualism for those who need it.

A few years ago, a society was formed in France which was named the *Bilingual World*; it put out a magazine entitled *A World Where People Get Along With One Another*. Here are a few excerpts from its manifesto:

> To get to know one another,
> To get along with each other,

To live in peace

The peoples of the whole world will have to learn, in addition to their mother tongue, a second language. We must build.

A bilingual world or, in other words, a world with two languages.

What languages shall they be?

For the English and North Americans, French.

For the French and French-speaking peoples, English.

For the other peoples, French or English, as the nationals choose.

As you can see, Canada is not the only country where bilingualism is important.

At the Atlantic Community Studies' International Conference held at Oxford from September 7 to 13, 1952, the representatives of the 14 Atlantic nations adopted unanimously a motion approving the principle of that bilingualism, and providing for its implementation in primary schools and in the armed forces.

Mr. Michel Debré, a well-known French statesman, said about the same time:

French-speaking nations should learn English, English-speaking nations should learn French. The other nations could choose between one or the other for their external relations. Language is one of the keys to solidarity. The promotion of the two most common languages is certainly the only means at our disposal to give the western world an instrument for understanding and to build, according to the rules peculiar to the free world, a power that is essential to the safeguard of a civilization.

I said a while ago that the Queen is bilingual. I have here a text written by the Queen mother when she sent a note to a magazine on behalf of Princess Margaret. This is what she said:

[*English*]

Her Royal Highness has read with interest of your purpose to encourage the cultivation of a bilingual facility in English and French. This has so many advantages that I need not assure you of Her Royal Highness' sympathy in such an effort.

[*Translation*]

I also dedicate that to the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), Mr. Speaker.

I have here also other evidence a brief reading of which might prove interesting. For instance, professor Martini Hartman, from Leipzig, chairman of the neo-philological association of Germany, said the following, and I quote:

As a German citizen, I wish my mother tongue were granted the honour... however, from an objective point of view, I have to admit that the opportunities for French in combination with English are infinitely greater than those of German combined with French, or of German combined with English.

Daniel Rops, a French philosopher, known internationally, read even by English-speaking philosophers, a master with followers in the whole world, has stated his opinion as follows, and I quote:

On the whole, to do away with this tower of Babel—

—the misunderstanding between people—

—it would suffice that one language be declared compulsory, from primary schools, in all countries, or else to admit the use, as a second language, of two languages of universal significance, English and French, for example.

And he added:

Would not a pool of languages be as important as coal-steel pool?

The late lamented President Eisenhower, whose memory is regretted, also expressed on this subject an opinion published in newspapers. He declared himself fully in favour of the bilingual movement which extends throughout the world and pledged his personal support to it.

Mr. Anthony Eden, an English statesman, also expressed his opinion on this subject. I quote his words for the edification of hon. members who refuse to get out of this habit of fanaticism and who do not want to recognize that there are really two founding nations which have legal rights. Before leaving the field of politics, let us come back to what the former Prime Minister of England, Mr. Anthony Eden, said and I quote:

I sincerely wish to do all I can in order to promote the study of our two languages on the widest possible scale, and I shall not fail to consider the proposals for bilingualism which have been made to us—

He was then addressing the Association of the bilingual world, we were referring to earlier—

—as a means to reach this highly desirable goal.

He made that statement in 1952.

The late Adlai Stevenson, who was a candidate to the presidency of the United States, also made a statement in this respect. I quote:

I am in favour of French-English bilingualism and I shall do my utmost in order to promote its concept and its application in the United States.

It is said that bilingualism may be a utopia or a fad. However, Mr. Speaker, there have been bilingual countries in the world for many centuries. In the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, everyone who had pretensions to culture spoke Latin and Greek besides his mother tongue.

In every Chancery of every newly-formed country, people had a knowledge of both those languages, and sometimes of three or four other dialects.

The Italian, Saint Thomas Aquinas, the English, Duns Scot, the German, Saint Albertus Magnus, and many other great philosophers and scientists understood one another very well because they were bilingual, and that enabled them to bequeath to the world philosophical masterpieces which are still read by today's philosophers and scientists.

Everyone knows that the use of Latin and Greek is decreasing while French and English are making progress. That is why enlightened and broad-minded people advise those who take pride in being cultured or competent, to those who wish to communicate with their fellow men, their brothers, of all races, to learn a second language.

And this afternoon, a member of the Ralliement créditiste mentioned a large number of countries where bilingualism is in favour.

More than 2,000 years before the Christian era, Mr. Speaker, we find in Mesopotamia—as a member of the Ralliement créditiste said—an example of a bilingual state—

**An hon. Member:** The honourable member for Frontenac (Mr. Dumont).

**Mr. Mongrain:** —the hon. member for Frontenac, thank you—the example of a bilingual state where two official languages co-existed, Acadian, the language of the Semite conquerors, used in everyday life, and Sumerian, the ancient pre-Semite tongue of the conquered people, which became the sacred language.

Today, Switzerland is a bilingual country, as well as Belgium and Luxemburg; there are African and South American nations where the people speak fluently their mother tongue and French or English, and sometimes three languages.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Again, several countries are a proof that bilingualism can exist even if it sometimes gives rise to certain inevitable wrangles. As quarrels sometimes arise between members of the same family, so can they happen sometimes, as to details, between members of a bilingual nation. But as concerns the essential, people understand themselves better when they can speak in languages they usually understand, and when they do not need interpreters to be understood.



After all, Mr. Speaker, what is it we want in this country? If an English-speaking Canadian can speak French, apart from the personal prestige this will give him, the pleasure of being more easily on friendly terms with his fellow-citizens, of being more efficient, he will be able to count on his government's gratitude if he works in the public service. As for the French Canadian who has made the effort of learning English, he will benefit from the same advantages.

The purpose is also to make French Canadians feel at home throughout the country, as English Canadians feel at home when they come to Quebec, because their language is spoken there, first as a gesture of courtesy and also for the sake of brotherhood between fellow-citizens of a same country.

Again, nobody will be forced to know both languages at once. It is merely a matter of prompting all those who can do it to do so and also of asking that public service officials deal with all Canadians in one or another of the official languages.

The fact will obviously remain that apart from professional efficiency, people able to speak two, three or even four languages will always be more qualified and superior, all things being equal, to others. To those who understand that, I would suggest that they learn three or four.

Still, this is a field, Mr. Speaker, which can lead to anger, sentimentality, stirring of popular passions, demagoguery, fanaticism or jingoism—it could easily be done—because one's mother tongue is something fundamental to the human being. It enables him to express his innermost feelings. I have seen several cases such as that. I have seen many cases of it back home. I still see some occasionally but I do believe I see more cases of it elsewhere in Canada when persuing its history in the last few years.

I am appealing to our English-speaking brothers elsewhere in Canada who are sensible, that an end be put to the exaggerations of recent years of our angry young men in Quebec, because they are fed up with injustices, with promises that never come to anything.

Once again, I appeal to the conscience of all the members. I urge them not to listen to the complaints of those who in fact indulge in this type of discrimination and who will not, or cannot, understand that there really can be two peoples who are both entitled to their own mother tongue.

I feel it behooves each and every member to go back home and explain that principle to those of their constituents who find it difficult to understand, and to show them that Quebec is not asking for favours but, as the hon. member for Charlevoix said this afternoon, merely to be treated as all the other citizens are across Canada, as we were treated with fairness. ...so far, when it was a question of paying taxes or of serving in the army to save the fatherland.

Mr. Chairman, corporations realize these things today; and they offer courses to their employees.

A constitutional argument is put forward. They are trying to be legalistic in order to oppose this decision of parliament which will entrench once and for all what we have been waiting for over a century. However, it is not a question that will be solved simply by raising constitutional objections because there are six millions Canadians who feel in their hearts and souls that time has come for them to be put on an equal footing with everybody else.

Out of this number, more than five millions in my province will no longer accept, tomorrow, to be treated as inferior beings. They were requested, in order to be allowed to work in the public service, to speak English. They learned it, even when they did not need it. We ask our English-speaking fellow-citizens to do the same thing towards the French-Canadians.

It is possible to add fuel to the fire, but I think that in conclusion I could do no better than to thank and to congratulate all the members who have acknowledged this principle.

In particular, I congratulate the leader of my party, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who had the courage to bring in the bill.

I thank and I commend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) as well, for approving the guiding principle of the bill. I also thank the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste (Mr. Caouette) for defending that cause.

We may have different opinions on how to implement the bill, but I think that if, as a matter of principle, we favour demogoguent and discrimination, if we are divided instead of being united and trying to persuade all Canadians that this an important and urgent matter, we shall have done a disservice to this country.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is too important to allow such an attitude. That is why I am happy to see that many of my colleagues of all parties approve the principle of this bill, which will make the next century a more prosperous one, because Canadians will understand each other better. Instead of creating confusion in their relations, they will speak languages they will understand.

I conclude by recalling a few words from Saint-Exupéry, and I quote:

The greatest vocation for men is to unite men—

—and the best way to unite them is to help them speak languages they all understand.

[*English*]

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** Mr. Speaker, under the new rules of procedure in the house, at this stage we are making suggestions preliminary to the submission of the legislation to the special committee that will be set up to deal further with this matter. Ordinarily, there would not be an extended debate at this period. However, I shall take this opportunity afforded by second reading to make recommendations which I trust will be taken into consideration by the committee when it begins to focus on this bill. I do so at this stage because, from rather bitter experience, I am discovering that the new procedures have a tendency to make it extremely difficult for a private member of the House of Commons to have direct participation in discussion at the committee stage.

We have only a few members of the house represented on the committee. I recall the recent debate on Bill C-150. It was impossible, following the consideration of the matter at the committee stage, for a private member to have amendments to the bill taken seriously into consideration. Again this afternoon we ran into a further complication arising from the committee system. The Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, which is concerned with matters pertaining to the department of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), was called together to sit while the house was sitting. Some of us raised a protest in the committee this afternoon and pointed out that there was another extremely important matter under consideration in the House of Commons. I think all hon. members will agree that the House of Commons has first call upon the services of members of parliament, including the members of the executive. It was doubly important that members of this committee should be in the house, because the

Secretary of State is piloting this legislation through the house.

As a result of attendance at the committee I was, unfortunately, unable to hear the statement of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) whom we thought would be responsible for dealing with this important issue in the house. Therefore, the comments I shall make this evening will be without the benefit of having heard his speech. The attention of several hon. members of the house was divided due to what I thought was the unnecessary calling together of the Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts to deal with another matter, that of putting Telesat into orbit. Telesat has never been mentioned by the government house leader as having great priority. It is very difficult to understand why at this stage the government is putting pressure on hon. members to deal with other matters, particularly when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Secretary of State and other hon. members have pointed out that Bill C-120 is considered of most urgent importance, inasmuch as it is concerned with the preservation of national unity in this country.

• (8:30 p.m.)

The previous speaker, the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) has just said that when the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) criticizes the fact that the torch has been thrown to the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), this is not the case at all. He says this bill is so important there are two ministers piloting it through the House of Commons, and this indicates the government is giving top priority to the measure. Why then are we diverting the emphasis?

**Mr. Osler:** May I ask the hon. member a question?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Will the hon. member allow the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) to ask a question?

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Yes, if the hon. member wishes to do so.

**Mr. Osler:** I want to ask a double-barrelled question.

**Mr. Monteith:** Of course, it would be.

**Mr. Osler:** When I was attending the meeting of the broadcasting committee this morning, the hon. member was not present. He could have attended it had he been interested in broadcasting, and I wondered why he did not do so. My other question is this: If the hon. member for Prince Albert can give all his opinions *ex gratia*, without having attended the committee, I do not know why this hon. member cannot do so.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please.

**An hon. Member:** Where was the hon. member last month?

**Mr. Muir (Lisgar):** Winnipeg would be glad to hear what you said.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** The hon. member said he had a double-barrelled question. I think he had a question with a double meaning because, as I explained in the committee before the hon. gentleman arrived this afternoon—he had not arrived there by the afternoon, let alone the morning—

**Mr. Forrestall:** Everybody sleeps in once in a while.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** As I explained in the committee, and this is one of the problems with our committee system which is destroying the effectiveness of this House of Commons, I was busily engaged in the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. It is impossible to be in two places at once. But the point I am making here, which seems to be irritating the hon. gentleman opposite, is that the government is downgrading the role of parliament, and this has been the case in respect of this bill. It was introduced before we actually knew its final form. Some amendments have been placed before us, but they have no significance at all until they are put before the committee and a decision is made on whether or not the committee approves them. Opposition members have not even had the opportunity to propose amendments, so it is in a sort of never-never atmosphere that we are debating this important subject at the moment. I think it was Mr. Charles Lynch, in an article following the debate on Friday, who said that it was an act of lunacy on the part of the government to irritate parliament on a controversial matter of this nature by failing to put the amendments before the house.

I enjoyed the statement made by the Secretary of State when he introduced the bill. He speaks English with an accent that would have charmed the heart of my old Irish mother, and he speaks it in a way that indicates he has already assumed the mantle of the

minister of culture. Of course, the ministry of culture, when and if it is established in Canada, would require all the arts of the propagandist. I thought that the Secretary of State on Friday afternoon handled his assignment very effectively from that standpoint. But the truth of the matter is—and this is proof of the fact that the government is schizophrenic and of two minds on these matters—the government was emphasizing in the committee the fact that Telestat and other developmental programs that are concerned with the economy of Canada are the real stuff and substance of national progress and development. I am speaking tonight as one who has strongly supported the notion that the government priorities at this stage in the parliamentary session should be in the direction of economic matters rather than symbolic or cultural matters. This opinion is supported by some very sound leaders from the province of Quebec as well as from other provinces of Canada.

I speak tonight as a representative of a western constituency, a part of Canada that is faced with a problem of extreme economic consequence if it is not dealt with very quickly by this dilatory government. I am referring of course to the problem of the grain situation on the prairies. Ever since parliament came together last fall, western members have been asking the government for emergency action to deal with the crisis among the grain growers of the prairies which is becoming more acute with each passing day. All we get in response is the lethargic attitude of the government that in due course they will do something about this matter. Obviously, they do not understand the economy of the prairies because the farmer is into another crop year. He is faced with indebtedness from the past year because he cannot pay his debts until he sells his crop. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Stewart) this afternoon, a good many shipping points in the west are still on the unit basis. They do not even have their initial quotas.

I want to protest in the strongest terms against this failure of the government of the just society to come to grips with the real issues that are gnawing at the vitals of national unity and of the Canadian confederation. I have good support for this stand from within the cabinet ranks and I hope the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Richardson) will deal with this matter in the House of Commons because, in a strongly worded speech to the provincial Liberal leadership convention a week ago Saturday in the city of Winnipeg, he put his attitude on the record in the following words:—

**Mr. Orlikow:** He will regret it.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** The article reads:

James Richardson, newly appointed federal supply minister, says it is time to end western alienation by eastern Canada.

The Winnipeg South M.P. told the Saturday Liberal leadership convention the West should be allowed to set up its own trade tariff agreements and that big business should let the West retain earnings now "funnelled" east through head offices there.

He said westerners do not want to pull out of Confederation but are anxious to renegotiate the terms upon which they stay in.

It goes on in that vein.

"At the present time, a disproportionate amount of economic benefits accrue to eastern Canada as a consequence of both government and business structures," he said.

While the West is willing to offer its vast resources and economic strength to the whole of Canada "what westerners do not want, is to be made into a vassal state".

Those are the words of Canada's Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson), and they reflect the attitude that prevails to an alarming degree in an important region of Canada, namely, west of the head of the lakes. I would like to point out also that in the past the problems of confederation and national unity that have torn the body politic asunder have not been related to cultural, social or linguistic issues but rather economic discontent.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Let me go back to the period of the progressives. The progressives spawned the C.C.F. movement which gave birth to the New Democratic Party. In addition, the progressives, which was essentially an agrarian protest movement, also spawned the social credit movement. It is interesting that both these groups which have migrated to the east in strong numbers are now emphasizing the importance of symbolic and cultural matters in contrast to the basic economic issues which were stressed by the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson).

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I beg your indulgence but I should like to be informed what subject we are discussing in the house this evening.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I am pleased to advise the hon. member that we are studying Bill C-120.

*Official Languages*

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):** I presume, Mr. Speaker, you are making reference to the official languages bill. I have it here. I just thought I would like it made clear.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I think the hon. member is coming to the subject.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Speaking to the point of order for the moment, Mr. Speaker. I would have thought the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay) would have shared the opinion of his colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Richardson) that economic issues are just as important as these other questions, if not more so, when it comes to solving the problems of the Canadian body politic. I think that what I am saying has to be said by the western members. I trust the hon. member for St. Boniface will join with us and with his hon. friend the Minister of Supply and Services, in repeating here in the House of Commons what the latter had to say in Winnipeg last week.

Economic problems are always reflected in social and political issues. I have already intimated that the progressive movement was a reflection of economic conditions in agrarian Canada. It is trite to say that Canada is a difficult nation to govern. Our friends of the just society government are finding this out. Problems do not wither away in the aura of charisma; one has to deal with continuing economic reality.

In his speech the other day the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) said that unity does not demand uniformity. We all agree with that statement. Others have said you can only get unity out of diversity in Canada. It has required great quantities of goodwill and tolerance to achieve the splendid degree of national unity from sea to sea which has been realized in Canada out of such diverse ethnic groups. It always amazes me when I travel to different parts of Canada to see the way in which we have been able to continue as a nation, and to progress as a nation, while at the same time permitting the various ethnic groups which make up Canada to retain their language and certain aspects of their culture—in western Canada, even certain linguistic rights.

I do not think western Canada has to apologize to anybody, including the Secretary of State, with regard to the progress which has been made in recent years toward the acceptance of what is commonly known these days as the French fact. The province of Manitoba has offered leadership in this respect under the Hon. Duff Roblin when he was premier. There was no coercion; this was based on a spirit of goodwill and tolerance which is the essence of the mosaic concept so widely held in Manitoba.

In recent years, unfortunately, Canada, which used to be a shining example to the world of the virtues of tolerance, goodwill and mutual respect for ethnic, cultural and linguistic differences has begun to sound somewhat like a banana republic rather than the true north, strong and free. This relates to what is sometimes called the quiet revolution—actually, it has not been very quiet. It has created an atmosphere of uncertainty and disequilibrium which has made it difficult for many parts of Canada to continue along the pathway to nationhood which had become established as a way of life.

I have some relevant quotations here but time will not permit me to read them. Serious commentators have pointed out that what is really disturbing the balance of national unity in Canada is the export of the quiet revolution. As that quiet revolution is exported it tends to become more noisy, with the consequent debates which have been rocking the Canadian body politic in recent years.

Canada is a nation of minorities. We talk about the English speaking majority but in terms of population this majority is made up of many minorities most of which, in western Canada, still retain their ethnic ways of life. I do not need to belabour this point. In my own province, as in each of the prairie provinces, there are islands of cultural identification which are quite distinct. These people conduct their church services in their own languages, even broadcast in their own languages; this is something which is difficult, perhaps, for other hon. members who come from other parts of Canada to appreciate, but it does belie statements made by some people to the effect that the west is intolerant, that it wants to go back to the Plains of Abraham, and all that other nonsense. We are trying to get away from all that narrow nationalistic nonsense which tore up Europe and which was, in fact, the reason so many of those who belong to these ethnic groups came to Canada in the first place. They had suffered too much in the wars and quarrels of the 19th century and they came to Canada because it was a shining example of goodwill and tolerance toward ethnic and cultural differences.

It is not hard to stir up trouble in Canada because of the variety of ethnic minorities which exist. We like to say we are all equal, although I suppose it is possible to add that

some are more equal than others. We talk of founding races. For myself, I do not like this phrase; it sounds too much like the racism of Germany before the second world war, the kind of propaganda which Dr. Goebbels, minister of culture of nazi Germany, used to try to get across to the people having to do with pan-Germanism and all that nonsense which tore Europe asunder in the most bloody holocaust the world has ever seen.

• (8:50 p.m.)

I often wonder what our Indian friends who, after all, were here long before any of us, think of this. As one of them said humorously, if the Indians had had more restrictive immigration laws perhaps Canada would not be facing the trouble it faces at present.

Progress has been made through gradual development. It is always encouraging to see the children of immigrants, the second generation Canadians, proudly declare their unhyphenated Canadianism. Unfortunately, as I say, there is trouble in Canada at the present time and parliament will have to deal with it in the next few weeks. Why is there trouble, particularly in western Canada? I think the nub of the matter is that this legislation represents compulsion to many, and no one likes legislative compulsion. The hon. member for Temiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) had this to say to the Social Credit League of Manitoba recently, as reported in the Winnipeg *Tribune* of April 19:

> I'm against that kind of an act, because it implies compulsion and I'm strongly opposed to government compulsion.
>
> If passed, the act would guarantee French in the federal civil service, the courts, and schools in areas throughout Canada where there is a large French population.

Then he spoke about the point I was referring to a few minutes ago. The newspaper report reads as follows:

> The problem of the wheat farmer is worse, as far as Canada's economy is concerned—much more than the language question. Mr. Trudeau's fault was that he gave the impression everyone . . . would have to learn French, said Mr. Caouette.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is the compulsory aspect of legislative prescriptions that disturbs all the folk who have come to Canada to escape the sort of thing that has bedogged pre-war and post-war Europe and that has produced the worst global wars of history.

Some have said that the bill is unnecessary and all that is necessary is for us to carry out the spirit of the British North America Act. I agree. The spirit of the British North America Act has been moving forward with amazing speed in recent years, as seen by the application of broadcasting principles and the introduction of simultaneous translations in the House of Commons. When I was first a member of Parliament eighteen years ago, French was rarely heard here. Only those hon. members coming from Quebec, certain parts of northern Ontario and New Brunswick were truly bilingual. I studied French all through college and I am still not bilingual. It is not a living language for me because I have not been exposed to it and have not had to work with it. It has not become the language of my everyday life, and here lies the problem with legislative compulsion. The government realizes this, and that is why it has introduced amendments. The government has heard complaints from the prairies and from its own supporters. It is introducing these amendments to try to sweeten the semblance of legislative compulsion inherent in the bill, and thus make the bill more acceptable to its own supporters as well as to the people of Canada. Whether the amendments will do this we do not know. In any event, those amendments must be produced in the committee.

The constitutional question has been raised. I referred to it in passing. Many say this legislation is unnecessary; that it is a bit of window dressing and that it will give power to some. Perhaps this bill is the basis for the ministry of culture that the Secretary of State wishes to set up. As he has said many times across Canada, once this legislation has been passed he will have the tools in his hand with which to operate a ministry of culture and impose the views that he wishes to get across to us. As the Leader of the Opposition said, the committee will have to consider very carefully the constitutional question. The question of provincial rights is of great concern to the premiers of western Canada.

The Prime Minister blows hot and cold on this issue. Recently he had a quarrel with the former Minister of Transport on the interpretation of federalism. The former Minister of Transport says that he is a federalist, whereas the Prime Minister is a provincial rightist. That is an internal, family quarrel about which we have no exact information. I hope the Prime Minister will take part in this debate, because it is most important for him to do so. It seems that on this question the Prime Minister is espousing the other side of the coin. He seems to uphold the right of Ottawa to interfere in the cultural affairs of each of our provinces.

*Official Languages*

The bilingual district issue has been raised. Bilingual districts obviously will lead to ghettos which will engender problems similar to those of Indian reservations. Segregation of people always creates cultural ghettos. This issue has raised a strong reaction from the other western ethnic groups. "What about us" they say. When the Prime Minister campaigned in the west they asked him, "will we have the privilege of establishing linguistic districts or bilingual districts," and the Prime Minister said, "yes, if there is a request for that." Mr. Speaker, that answer only confused the situation. You cannot have cultural purity in the sort of world we live in and you cannot keep your linguistic purity. For instance, it is said that Americans, and particularly those of the United States, no longer speak English; that the language they speak has now become completely transformed. If a person from the southern United States speaks to someone from the northern half of the continent it is said an interpreter is needed to bridge the gulf between the two kinds of English spoken. Adulteration of a language takes place very rapidly, and we see that happening in western Canada where a new Canadianism, distinct from anything that has existed hitherto, is being created. It is rising rapidly and is based, as I have indicated, on the goodwill and tolerance generated by those who live in our western Canadian mosaic.

In its present form this measure is divisive. The Prime Minister understands this, and that is why he is trying to bring in amendments. The Minister of Justice also understands this. He travelled across the country trying to soften the divisive impact of the legislation. The Secretary of State has travelled across the country, too, but his statements have aggravated the situation. I do not think he realizes what the effect of some of his statements in western Canada has been. I will mention one or two of those statements, then perhaps he will understand why so much concern was expressed in western Canada following his pilgrimages there. In his speech before the founding meeting of the Societe Franco-Manitobaine in St. Boniface, he forecast the placement of federal inspectors or control officers across the country to promote bilingualism in the designated bilingual districts. They would be sort of "gauleiters" for bilingualism in the west.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) rising on a point of order?

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

**Mr. Stewart (Cochrane):** Mine is not exactly a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. member for Brandon-Souris permit a short question?

**Mr. Dinsdale:** At the end of my speech, if you please. I do not think these interruptions are fair.

**An hon. Member:** The speech may take all night.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** I see some hon. members are trying to restrict freedom of speech.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**An hon. Member:** Say something.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** If I am not saying anything why are hon. members so agitated? Why are hon. members asking so many questions if they are not interested—

• (9:00 p.m.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. The hon. member for Cochrane on a point of order.

**Mr. Stewart (Cochrane):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I merely wanted to remind the hon. member for Brandon-Souris to say whether he is in favour of the bill.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** If I were under the Liberal whip I would have to declare myself right now, as does the hon. member for Cochrane. Liberal members do not think for themselves. In this party, we have a chance to consider the issues and make up our own minds.

**Mr. Pelletier:** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I was quoted by the hon. member. He said, "unless this quotation is misleading"—I would like to tell him it is.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** From the same speech, Mr. Speaker—

**An hon. Member:** Are you quoting?

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Yes, I am quoting, Mr. Speaker.

"In order to do this public education," he said, "we shall rely heavily on the findings of the behavioral sciences. They will enable us to arrive smoothly at that degree of civilization where groups no longer try to impose their opinions by the strength of their number and size."

When the Secretary of State starts mentioning the behavioral sciences—

**Mr. Pelletier:** On a question of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. The text of this

speech exists. I can hand it over to the hon. member and he will not find the words he has just quoted. I do not know from what he is quoting. These were not improvised remarks.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** I am quoting from a newspaper report of the speech—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** That part is in quotation marks, and the article is under the byline of a very distinguished journalist.

**Some hon. Members:** Who?

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Mr. Charles Lynch of the Southam News Services.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Well, hon. members do not seem to have much confidence in Mr. Lynch. They, themselves, can deal with that issue. I am just pointing out to the Secretary of State that his presence in the west has become a matter for concern. I could go on and give further quotations. I have come to the conclusion the bill is divisive because it is discriminatory.

I will now deal with the main problem, one which has been presented to me on many occasions. If bilingualism is a prerequisite to civil service positions, obviously people in many parts of Canada who are otherwise qualified will be placed at a disadvantage. It is difficult to become bilingual in the Northwest Territories, the Yukon and western Canada, because we do not have the opportunities we would like.

If bilingualism is a pre-requisite, as it seems obviously to be, then discrimination exists, particularly with respect to the scientific personnel and the professional qualifications. Professionals and scientists speak a jargon of their own. You must be engaged in those fields to know their scientific jargon.

The areas of Canada which are bilingual are very restricted. English and French residents of the province of Quebec have an obvious advantage. They are bilingual by reasons of many, many years of bilingual tradition and heritage. The merit system must be emphasized in this legislation beyond any shadow of a doubt. We must consider the veterans' preference. We would not be here debating this issue if it were not for the sacrifice of Canadians in two world wars.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.



**Mr. Dinsdale:** I mention in passing the case of the commissionaires, who have no involvement in this whole business but who, even before the act is passed, are having the terms of Bill C-120 arbitrarily imposed upon them. These are the men who are least able to defend themselves.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made the facetious remark, if you are not bilingual you will run the elevators. Statements such as these are not designed to help national unity.

**An hon. Member:** Put up or shut up.

**Mr. Horner:** Do you deny he made the remark?

**An hon. Member:** When?

**Mr. Horner:** Read the papers.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** The spirit of unity always motivates westerners. In the west there is a saying that all wise men come from the east. Those who are popularly known as the three wise men are the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State and the Minister of Regional Economic Expension (Mr. Marchand). They are the moving spirits behind this legislation. We have another expression in the west to the effect that all wise men come from the east and the wiser they are the faster they come. The Prime Minister has been to western Canada. He made certain remarks about wheat and the wheat problem I think he has returned a wiser man. The Secretary of State has also been to western Canada. He obviously returned a wiser man because he no longer accepts the speeches made when he was in the west.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** This matter is not to go before a parliamentary committee. It is something which must be sorted out by the elected representatives of the people. The B. and B. Commission which moved across this country caused a great deal of anxiety. It consisted of people who were not elected representatives of the people. If we are going to preserve national unity we must get to the heart of the matter. We must avoid the technique of confrontation. That is not the kind of dialogue that Canada needs at this critical juncture of Confederation. We need more co-operation.

In conclusion I will refer to the Prime Minister's statements. He said that we are politicians and not philosophers; that second best solutions are often necessary and the spirit of compromise must prevail. That is a restatement of the old political saw, politics is the practice of the art of the possible. Let us not pursue the divisive course on which we have embarked on too many occasions during the current session of parliament.

• (9:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, no one in this party, and certainly no one who comes from a metropolitan area as I do will deny that there are immense and pressing economic problems that face this parliament. I am sure the same would be said by members who represent rural areas. Yet in my view it is wrong to say that this bill, the official languages bill, has come here too soon. To my mind, in principle, this bill is designed to remedy an ancient but serious injustice.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Brewin:** If anything, Mr. Speaker, it comes too late.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Brewin:** If in this parliament we are going to solve our economic problems within a federal system, then we must have the unity without which a federal system cannot flourish or even exist for very long.

I have had occasion recently to study the tragic case of a federation that failed and in failing has given way to a bloody war. If there is one lesson we can learn from the tragic failure of the Nigerian Federation it is that the very basis of a federation must be consent, consent to operate a system which does together some of the things which can best be done by a central government but which at the same time fully recognizes cultural diversity.

There is no more important aspect of culture than language. Canada could not have existed without respect for the differences of language between the two major elements that created Canada's existence as a nation. This is exemplified in the British North America Act itself, but it is my belief that the majority of the Anglophone population of Canada has shown, perhaps unconsciously and unintentionally, a lack of respect for the equality of the two official languages in many ways. I say we should hasten, in a spirit of generosity, to seek to remedy our neglect.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

This legislation in my view is an act of simple justice.

The bill itself is largely declaratory. The core of it is clause 2 which proclaims official languages of Canada for all purposes within federal competence, with the right to possess and enjoy equality of status, and equal rights and privileges as to their use. All the rest of the bill is machinery. I hope it will be possible for members of the committee to make sure that the machinery is fitted to its purpose, is not coercive and, does not, in the guise of protecting some people's rights, impinge on the rights of others.

How can anyone, I ask, oppose the principle of the bill? It is a simple statement based on historic fact.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Brewin:** It is something of which, if we wish Canada to continue as a nation, we should constantly remind ourselves.

This afternoon in an excellent and eloquent speech the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) spoke of objections to the bill which he had heard in different parts of Canada. I will deal only with the first of these objections, and I believe he put it in the form of a question. Why force us into bilingualism by legislation when we are progressing towards it by voluntary means?

I agree, Mr. Speaker, that we are progressing without legislation. I will say a word or two about that later. But legislation is not merely coercive and I do not think this legislation is coercive. The Commissioner set up by the bill—if that is the form the bill takes after final review in the house—and indeed the bilingual district advisory boards which may be set up by the bill, if it remains more or less in its present form, will investigate privately. If they are wise they will use persuasion and not coercion. But legislation of this nature expresses or can express the moral conviction of the people of Canada. It can be, and I believe it will be a solemn statement of the will of the people of Canada on a point essential to the compact of confederation.

As I said a moment ago there has been a tremendous growth of practical bilingualism in Canada. This is no doubt partly due to a new attitude. It no doubt owes something to modern communications, to more up to date methods of teaching languages. There is no reason that an increasing number of Canadians should not enjoy the great privilege of acquaintance with more than one language.

I am one of several members of this house, some of them French speaking, some of them English speaking, who from time to time are undergoing the benefits of immersion courses in the one or other of the official languages. I have not yet reached the point where I want to inflict my halting and imperfect French on the house, although I warn the house the day is not far distant when I shall make the attempt.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Brewin:** But, Mr. Speaker, I have made enough progress, and I think my other colleagues have done so too, to appreciate that knowledge of the beautiful French language is an enrichment of the spirit and understanding. No one is trying to force it on us, but the more we make the effort to understand then the better Canadians we shall be.

I come from a riding in the east end of Toronto which has very few French speaking residents. In the past some people could have said—I am not going to say I agree with them—that it was an area that was narrow minded if not actually bigotted. But all of that has changed. The Minister of Justice referred particularly to the younger people, and I want to pay tribute to the new tolerance of younger people. Perhaps there are still a few bigots left, but they are few and far between. I think I can speak not only for my constituency but for the area of Toronto from which I come. Today, the French fact is accepted not with reluctance but as something which enriches and distinguishes Canada and makes us happy to be Canadians.

We cannot, in this house, hope for unanimity, and we cannot expect there will not be honest, differing convictions. This bill is not the end. I think it is just the beginning. There is much more that needs to be done in the constitutional field before we have a modern, up-to-date constitution. There are, as I said at the beginning, challenging economic problems that we have to face. But this bill, improved and clarified as it well may be in committee, in my view is a step in the right direction; a token of tolerance, an important means to achieve justice based on equality. For those reasons I support it.

**Mr. Bruce Howard (Okanagan Boundary):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) for the very fine and enlightening speech he has given on this subject tonight. I wish that the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), and the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) whom I heard earlier this afternoon, had spoken along those lines because I was ashamed to listen as they purported to represent the thinking of western Canadians. Mr. Speaker, I am a western Canadian and I want to tell you what I think of the language bill.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary):** I want to tell you that Premier Bennett is one of my constituents, and although he did not exactly help to get me here, in a way I can speak for him too. There are some who say the west is alienated. There are some who even say Canada is falling apart. Some of them are in this house. Some of them have seen better days in politics, but they stand ready to give the country a shove in that direction if only to prove their point. These are the men who are using the language bill to warm up the prejudices. They would stew the bill in a miasma of ignorance and serve it garnished with old racial distrust. Is the west alienated? To the extent that the bill is misrepresented, to the extent that you can buy a pound of prejudice in the office of any western premier, it is alienated. To the extent that the west lacks strong federal authority it is alienated. There are two forces in western Canada opposing the language bill. The first is a small group of rock-ribbed western Tories, the same crowd that opposed the idea of Canada having its own flag. They opposed the unification of the armed forces and the modernization of the Criminal Code. Now, they oppose the language bill.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Have you ever driven through Drumheller, Alberta? In Drumheller scientists dig up the remains of dynosaurs and fossils. They send them to museums all over the world because they are a very interesting scientific phenomena.

**An hon. Member:** They missed a few.

**Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary):** Yes, they missed a few. A few years ago a number of these dynosaurs and old fossils joined the Tory party and were sent to parliament. There they sit, unware of the discovery of fire or the invention of the wheel.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary):** They are unaware that justice in the world must

begin with justice at home. They are unaware that the people of Canada gave the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) an overwhelming majority to bring about that justice.

Are westerners afraid of the language bill? Of course they are not. The west is a young country. People who think young understand the need to be fair to French speaking Canadians. Westerners are secure in their youthful strength and are not afraid to make room in the rest of Canada for French speaking Canadians. Westerners have known immigrants of many tongues. They know how these Canadians have added to the colour and richness of the west. We also know that the largest minority group in Canada by far is composed of French speaking Canadians. They were guaranteed special language rights in 1759 and at the time of Confederation in 1867. We have not always honoured the letter or the spirit of those agreements. This is a time in history when people of goodwill throughout the whole world are trying to redress past wrongs.

Some people ask, "Where is the just society"? I say to members on the Tory benches that here is the just society. The just society begins in the language bill. You will find it in the omnibus bill and pretty soon in the Indian claims bill and the new Indian Act. Only five short years ago the same rockribbed Tories who oppose the language bill were against Canada having its own flag. Five years from now they will look as incredibly ridiculous over the language issue as they do today over the flag issue.

Who else in the west is alienated? None other than the western premiers who, like many premiers in Canadian history, have used scraps with Ottawa to promote themselves. But Strom's huff and Thatcher's puff are no more than the skilful political conniving that we saw, used so many times by Ontario's Mitch Hepburn and Quebec's Duplessis. Westerners are not fooled by this kind of power play by strong provincial leaders. They rather like it. They respect strong provincial leaders, but that does not mean they want them meddling in federal jurisdiction.

Do western premiers speak for westerners in the federal field? The answer is a resounding no. They speak only for themselves. Westerners, like all Canadians, recognize the legitimate separation of provincial and federal authority. To each his own or as the French say, "chacun pour soi". If the west is alienated, it is only to the extent that the federal government has not grasped its power firmly enough. It has paid too much attention to provincial politicians who in reality have no special authority in federal matters, no more authority that is than any other voter who votes in a federal election. The people of Canada recognize the separate political jurisdictions. It is only the politicians who are confused.

If the federal government wants to earn the gratitude of westerners, and I suspect all Canadians, it will play the role of a stern father encouraging and helping the provinces but always ready to take them out to the woodshed if their personal ambitions endanger family life. If westerners are at all confused about the language bill it is because the truth has been distorted by some of those who oppose it. There will be only five or six bilingual districts in all of western Canada and none in British Columbia. That is a small price to pay to see justice done in all Canada.

This afternoon I heard the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) say that language rights need not be guaranteed by law and that they were better left to the conscience of men, or some such phrase.

**Mr. McIntosh:** You did not hear that at all.

**Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary):** It was very close. He suggested this kind of thing could be left to the control of men. How often have we heard reactionaries speak this way? Fair employment laws, anti-discrimination laws of all kinds, of colour, of race, of language and creed, have always been fought by people who have been so blind to injustice that their ultimate reason for opposition has been that all this can be left to men of goodwill and that such laws are not necessary. It must be obvious to even the most reactionary that we would have had no problem in the first place if such selfrighteous dreams were true.

We believe it is a noble purpose to support this bill for we seek to build a nation no longer weakened by the division of language but strengthened by the diversities of two great cultures. To that end we in western Canada will support this bill and mark it as a milestone in the progress of a unique Canadian nation.

**Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Cardigan):** Mr. Speaker, I suggest we are now embarked on what obviously is a very sensitive debate. As we pursue this matter, it is my sincere hope that we do not do anything which might tend in any way to hurt unity within this country. The purpose of the bill—and I stress that this

is only my own interpretation of it—is not to compel anybody to speak anything but the language of his own choice. To my mind it does not in any way require that every person in Canada speak or write a second language.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Remember, Mr. Speaker, I interpret this measure as an attempt to assure that each and every citizen can communicate or deal with the federal government in either of the two official languages. It does not, as I see it, compel English speaking Canadians to speak French. Nor, on the other hand, does it compel French speaking Canadians to speak English. I rely, and I certainly hope the rest of this country, can as well on the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he addressed the last federal-provincial conference. His statement on this matter is so very important I think perhaps it should be read into the record of this house, then if any misinterpretation arises at a later date we can refer to it. This is what he said when he spoke to the last federal-provincial conference:

> Our policy of bilingualism has been widely misunderstood. It does not mean that every English speaking Canadian must learn to speak French any more than it means that every French speaking Canadian must learn to speak English. It means that every Canadian will have access to public education in either official language and will be free to use either language in dealing with the federal government and other public bodies in all areas of the country where the size of the minority justifies it.

I hope I am not naive enough to believe that the Prime Minister of this country would make that statement at such an important meeting as a federal-provincial conference, to all the premiers of this country, unless he really believed that to be the purpose behind the bill. I suggest the bill itself does not impose bilingualism on the people of this country, but rather attempts to insure that all Canadians irrespective of where they live will feel equally at home.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) also made a very important observation during the same federal-provincial conference which I feel should be read into the record of this house for future reference. This is what the Minister of Justice said:

> This is not a bill to force compulsory bilingualism on the citizens of Canada. This is a bill enabling the citizens of Canada where they are found in sufficient numbers to approach the facilities of the federal government in either the French or the English language.

I suggest in all seriousness that there is nothing the matter with that objective. As a result of reading what the ministers said at that conference, I can tell you I have been assured that nothing in this bill will militate against the recruitment of young men and women from the western provinces, or from the central provinces in Canada, for the public service of Canada. This has been one of the serious fears expressed in reference to this bill. If I thought for one moment this bill would work against the recruitment of anybody of any linguistic origin into the public service of this country I would very definitely oppose it. I very definitely believe that is the wrong interpretation. We have the word of the Minister of Justice that this is not going to be the case.

This being my interpretation of the bill, fortified as it is by these statements by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, I personally am prepared to support its principle. The bill, as I see it, in no way renders the use of any language compulsory in Canada.

Although I am in accord with the principle of the bill as I understand it, I am also convinced of two things. First of all I am reasonably convinced, and I hope somebody corrects me if I am wrong, that the bill is not necessary. Secondly, I have the feeling that as it is presently drafted it has a great many defects which I hope the government will recognize when the bill goes to the committee.

Let me deal for a few minutes with my first contention, that the bill is not necessary. I submit very seriously that the character of this bill is totally administrative. Everything we find contained in this bill can be implemented administratively now by the federal and provincial courts, by the federal government or by any of the provincial governments which choose to do so. I would be very happy if someone—perhaps the minister who is promoting this bill—would point out anything that can be done under this bill which cannot be done at the present time. As a matter of fact, some of the things about which we now hear complaints are being done. This is a pretty clear indication—I trust they are not being done illegally—that they can be done without the passage of this bill.

I can see no substantive civil rights being given to anybody by this bill and no civil duties being imposed upon anyone. There is no criminal offence being created and no criminal sanctions imposed on anyone. It does not entitle anyone to sue or be sued. The bill

does not suggest that anyone can be prosecuted or convicted. I suggest this is a purely administrative bill.

Clauses 9, 10 and 11 of the bill are the clauses which relate to the role of the federal government. If we examine these clauses carefully, we must conclude that they do not place any duty on persons within the government services to implement their provisions if and when the bill becomes law. Perhaps unfortunately, the bill does not indicate under which department of government its administration will fall. We do not know which minister of the Crown will be responsible for its administration. In all seriousness, there is absolutely nothing in the bill which imposes any duty on those who may be called upon to administer it.

It is true there are clauses in the bill which purport to order the administrative implementation of the provisions of the bill by the Senate and the House of Commons. It has been established for some time that the Senate and the House of Commons, in spite of the provisions of any statute much less this bill, are the masters of their own houses. They and they alone can interpret any statute purporting to impose duties upon them. Therefore, I say that this is an administrative bill in substance and in form. Everything it suggests can be done, can be done under the present administrative powers of the federal government. I say, therefore, as I have already suggested, that for the most part this bill may be just window dressing.

• (9:40 p.m.)

There are some defects in the bill. For example, it sets up what is known as a Bilingual Districts Advisory Board. Under the provisions of the bill, this board is set up for the purpose of conducting an inquiry into whether or not an area should be designated as a bilingual district. This is a very important function so far as the proper carrying into effect of the bill is concerned. But unfortunately the bill as drafted provides that the board shall consist of not less than five and not more than ten people. In effect, this means that a board could be set up consisting of only five members. I seriously suggest to the government that a board as important as this one will obviously be, should have on it representatives of all the provinces of Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. McQuaid:** I say this because this board will determine whether a district shall be established as a bilingual district. I think that in all fairness every province of Canada should have the right to be represented on the board rather than, have it limited to five members.

Another serious defect in the bill, is that the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board is not required to conduct any public inquiry before it arrives at a decision. I suggest that public inquiries should be held. This government holds itself out as an exponent of participatory democracy. If we want to carry participatory democracy to its ultimate conclusion, I suggest that the people affected by a decision of the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board should have some say as to whether they want their district to be categorized as a bilingual district.

For example, I suggest there are in Canada areas which have in them 10 per cent of French speaking people who feel they are getting along perfectly well as they are. They are not anxious for change and perhaps do not wish to be categorized as a bilingual district, as a ghetto, as one hon. member suggested earlier in the debate. Therefore, I say that in fairness to these people the advisory board should be authorized to hold public hearings in respect of those areas where there is to be a determination as to whether they shall be classified as bilingual districts.

Clause 17 of the bill provides that the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board shall lay its report before parliament. Unfortunately, there is no provision in the bill for getting this report off the table of parliament. There is no provision whereby the report can be debated, unless of course it is debated on one of the opposition days. I think there should be an opportunity for the representatives of the people of Canada to debate the report of the Bilingual Districts Advisory Board.

Unfortunately, and I say this advisedly, the bill as drafted prevents the people of Canada, through their elected representatives in this house or the appointed representatives in the other place, asking any questions concerning the report of the advisory board. They cannot question the government on it at all. It is perfectly meaningless to write a provision into the bill that the report shall be laid upon the table, and not provide any means whereby that report can be debated. Surely, this is a serious defect which I suggest, in the interest of the proper administration of the bill, should be corrected.

These are some of the defects of the bill that I see at first glance. I have not had an

opportunity to examine in detail the amendments presented today by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). I apologize to the minister and the house if any of the matters I have criticized tonight with respect to the bill have been corrected in those amendments. However, I believe those matters I have mentioned should be corrected in the interests of the proper administration of the bill.

As I said at the beginning of my speech and as I now repeat, I do not see anything wrong with the principle of the bill. I think the bill is not necessary because it is purely administrative, but if it does become law I believe that some of the safeguards I have attempted to point out in my remarks should be considered by the committee with a view to their being written into the bill before it is sent back to the house for further consideration.

**Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville):** Mr. Speaker, the principle of the bill and its real thrust is stated at the very outset in the clause which declares the status of languages. That clause reads:

> The English and French languages are the official languages of Canada for all purposes of the parliament and government of Canada, and possess and enjoy equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all the institutions of the parliament and government of Canada.

This principle seems so appropriate, so logical and so inevitable for our country that looking back from the vantage point of 1969 it seems rather surprising that we did not have its provisions written into our constitution in 1867. Perhaps, indeed, the Fathers of Confederation were closer to this principle than we now realize, because if we look at the federal act of 1870 which established the government of Manitoba we find that the same linguistic guarantee which occurs in section 133 of the British North America Act is found in section 23 of that act. If we had continued to have what is perhaps the early spirit of confederation, along with the good will which seems natural to it, we would probably not have had the school question in Manitoba, regulation 17 in Ontario, or the innumerable slights, too small for history to record but too large for memory to forget, which have marked the experience of many French speaking citizens in various provinces of this country. But we now have a second opportunity, a second chance, and the wit and resolution to take advantage of it. It is to be hoped that this measure we are debating tonight will be soon supplemented by provincial action and ultimately by constitutional amendment.

The principal legal arguments against the bill are without either substance or shadow of merit. The argument based on section 91 (1) of the B.N.A. Act is to the effect that that section denies to parliament any power to legislate respecting the use of the English or French languages. But the fact is that section 91 (1) merely prohibits the amendment of section 133 to prevent any derogation from the limited constitutional rights granted in that section respecting the use of the languages. The official languages bill does not in any way derogate from the guarantees contained in section 133, and therefore does not offend section 91 (1).

• (9:50 p.m.)

The second argument is based on an interpretation of section 133 as a limitation on the use of the French language rather than as a guarantee of the minimum use of that language. The fallacy of this interpretation is obvious from the fact that section 133 refers equally to the English and French languages. The limitation in section 133 is thus clearly for a minimum and not a maximum of usage.

The third legal argument is to the effect that the coincidence of what is proposed in Bill C-120 with constitutional changes proposed by the federal government shows that this is a matter for which a constitutional amendment is necessary. But even if there were an identity of content, the argument would be a non sequitur. What constitutional enshrinement would add would be a limitation on federal power henceforth to repeal the law which by ordinary federal standards of statute making would be repealable.

As a simple example may I point out that I assume many hon. members join with me in feeling that even if we are not able to get a bill of rights in the near future which may, among other things, prohibit the introduction of illegally obtained evidence in the court room, we should go ahead and insert a provision in the Criminal Code to prevent the introduction of such evidence even in the absence of a constitutional provision. There may be a coincidence of the two provisions, but this does not prevent legislation in advance of constitutional amendments.

It is true that there is no explicit power with regard to language in the British North America Act for either level of government. This means that it either comes under the federal residual power or—and this is the more usual interpretation—it is ancillary to other powers in the constitution. The federal government therefore can legislate with

regard to language only in areas of federal jurisdiction, federal government institutions, and areas of federal authority such as procedure in the criminal courts.

It seems to me that the only legal argument which presents some difficulty is that which gets us into the rather murky divide between criminal procedure, which is a federal power under subsection 27 of section 91 of the B.N.A. Act, and the constitution of courts of criminal jurisdiction, which is part of the administration of justice and a provincial power under section 92(14) of the B.N.A. Act. This situation is even more confused because of the procedural jurisdiction which the federal government has allowed the provinces to exercise over the years even though constitutionally the power was in the hands of the federal government. But except with regard to this point, the force of which has now been largely removed by the amendment which the government proposes to introduce, and on which therefore I will not dwell, the legal case against the official languages bill does not, in my opinion, rise to the level of intellectual respectability.

What is important is not that the legal arguments are bad but that they are raised at all. This shows the concern among many of our fellow citizens about the effect of this legislation. To the extent that such concern arises from a rejection of the symbolic nature of the change which we hope to bring about by virtue of this act, it seems to me that we can neither accept it nor compromise with it. Both historically and functionally this country has a bilingual character.

I would not want this to be confused with biculturalism. Our country is, and I hope will remain, a multi-cultural country in which many cultures which have come from other parts of the world continue to exist and enrich the Canadian mosaic to which we sometimes refer. Our country is multi-cultural but it is also bilingual. The symbol of bilingualism must be maintained. The fact of biculturalism must also be maintained.

But to the extent that the concern about this bill expresses the fear of discrimination against people themselves and their families, especially with regard to employment, there is something I believe, that we must take into account.

My own riding of Windsor-Walkerville is one in which all the currents of the country at present are felt. We will have the privilege of being part of the bilingual district which I expect, on the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Essex county will become. We have a very large ethnic population and we also have a heavy concentration of industrial employees. These last two groups are among those which in our country have subjectively real fears, that some aspects of this bill, or rather some possible means of carrying it out, might restrict their opportunities in our country. I believe we must see to it that these subjectively real fears do not become objectively real and valid as the act begins to be applied.

The official who will enforce this act has been referred to as a linguistic ombudsman. I believe he will have the duty of seeing to it, not only that the rights of French speaking peoples in various parts of the country are protected, but also that in the creation of new rights for the French speaking minority the opportunities of other groups in the country whose native language is neither English nor French are not subjected to unduly restrictive pressures. The linguistic ombudsman will have a job to do on both sides.

We share a continent with an economically powerful and culturally aggressive neighbour. I say to some of my friends opposite who are troubled about this bill and yet are very concerned with the importance of maintaining our separation from the United States, that there is no surer guarantee of our retaining our independence than through the institution of official bilingualism in this country. It is historically true that our French speaking compatriots in large part saved us from being submerged in the United States both at the time of the revolutionary war and during the war of 1812 to 1814. But the argument in favour of bilingualism is not such a negative one—it is a positive one. It creates an opportunity, not only for our French speaking citizens, but for all of us, to share in a cultural life which is richer by reason of being linguistically fuller.

There is no compulsion in this bill except on the federal government. There is no compulsion on the citizens of this country to learn or speak French. The only compulsion is on the government. For the people, there is freedom.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have to bring to the attention of the hon. member that it is ten o'clock. It being ten o'clock, it is my duty to put the questions to be debated at this time.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

INCOME TAX—REQUEST FOR EXEMPTION OF OLD AGE PENSIONERS

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 23, as recorded in *Hansard* at page 7859, after there had been a reference to the budget or the budget speech which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) said he would be making toward the end of May or in the early part of June, I put the following question to the minister:

> In preparing his budgetary statement, is the minister still considering including in it a provision so that taxation will not continue to be levied on old age pensioners who have only their pensions and the guaranteed income supplement on which to live?

The reply of the Minister of Finance was in these words:

> In the preparation of the budget we consider all submissions which have been made to the government in this regard.

That was about the fourth or fifth time that the Minister of Finance or his parliamentary secretary had assured the house concerning the question of making necessary adjustments so that those who have only the old age pension and the guaranteed income supplement will not have to pay income tax on that income. The matter was discussed in the late show on April 1 as well as on March 5 and on one or two other occasions. There have been a number of questions on the orders of the day, and it came into the debate on March 17 when we spent a full day on the question of pensions.

• (10:00 p.m.)

I want to say quite frankly that I have been around here long enough to know that budget secrets are not given out in advance. But I have also been around here long enough to know that there are certain things which have to be pressed for repeatedly, desirable though they may be, before the government can be induced to act as it should. I plead very strongly that whatever else the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) may do in his May or June budget he will deal with this matter, because I am sure all of us in the house think it is most unfair for the government, with one hand, to provide a guaranteed income supplement to bring old age pensioners up to a certain level, and then to take away with the other hand a portion of that guaranteed income in the form of income tax.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I realize that the people who are hit hardest by this arrangement are those between the ages of 65 and 70; once a pensioner is 70 years of age he qualifies for the extra $500 income tax exemption which formerly applied from the age of 65 onward, and the hardship suffered in many cases by those below the age of 70 eases, to that extent, when the age of 70 is reached. Nevertheless, it seems to me that this is a situation which nobody intended. I do not blame the government for it happening in the first place, but I do blame the government for not doing something about it.

The present income tax exemption levels were set in 1949. They are due for a change, there is no question about that. But in 1949 the old age pension was much lower. It was not in sight of the income tax exemption levels. Things have changed and old age pensions have got caught in the technicalities which have arisen in consequence of some of the changes that have taken place.

Speaking of technicalities, I was quite interested in a sentence used by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce on Friday of last week. The occasion was the discussion during the oral question period of the $80 million which the government forgave to the automobile industry. This is a case of $80 million which should have been paid, according to the law, by the automobile manufacturers, but it was forgiven by order in council. The issue arose because the Auditor General drew attention to it. I still think, along with the Auditor General, that the course followed by the government was a wrong one. Be this as it may, when the matter was the subject of questions and answers on Friday of last week, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said this: "This is why we have been quite willing to accommodate the industry when some technicalities arose. This is what we have done in the remission of $80 million in potential tariff which the government of Canada could have collected under an agreement."

Without defending what was done on that occasion—in fact, I think it was indefensible—if the government can say to the

automobile manufacturers "This $80 million you are required to pay is just a matter of a technicality; we will pass an order in council to get around it", then I think something should be done about the technicality which arises when old age pensioners get $105 or $109 a month on the basis of the guaranteed income supplement only to find that part of it is taken away in income tax.

I say that if a technicality is good enough ground for action in the case of the automobile manufacturers, the same kind of action should be taken to the advantage of old age pensioners. This could be handled quite simply; a tax credit could be provided, or the additional $500 exemption could be allowed at age 65. Another solution would be for the guaranteed income supplement to be declared as non-taxable income. I know the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance is sympathetic about this. I know there is sympathy on all sides of the house. I earnestly hope that that sympathy will express itself in appropriate action by the Minister of Finance when he brings down his budget before the end of June.

**Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member has confirmed that there is sympathy for the concept he has raised this evening on all sides of the house. I say this because, obviously, our traditions of budget secrecy would not permit me to give any indication of possible changes, if I happened to know what they were. At the same time I wish to make clear that any changes he seeks which are desirable and which might be presented to the house by the Minister of Finance would not be brought in solely or primarily because of the hon. member's repeated asking of the same question, followed by a repetition of similar answers by myself, but because of representations made from all sides of the house, including representations made from the Liberal side, as well as the government's own intention and desire to do the right thing for the people of Canada.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** That is fine, as long as you do it.

**Mr. Gray:** I think it should be noted, Mr. Speaker that it is my impression that the purpose of the adjournment debate is to permit an hon. member to raise at 10 o'clock a matter to which he may feel he has not received a satisfactory answer when the question was asked on orders of the day. The hon. member has been kind enough to make this clear. Certainly, he is one of the oldest and most knowledgeable parliamentarians here in terms of service at least and he certainly knows that traditions of budget secrecy prevent disclosures of tax changes before a budget is presented. Therefore, he could not have expected any definite indication of any change here. He must in fact have been satisfied by the answer of the Minister of Finance at the time when the question was asked, in the sense that as a person knowledgeable with respect to the rules he would know that the answer the minister gave was the only one that could have been given. This answer was that in the preparation of the budget we consider all submissions which have been made to the government in this regard." I think that this is really the answer the hon. member was expecting and is expecting at this time.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

## COMMUNICATION—BELL CANADA—ALLEGED DISREGARD OF INVESTMENT RETURN REGULATIONS

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, on May 1 I asked the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) whether he, on behalf of the government, would make representations to the Canadian Transport Commission in order to oppose the request of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada to increase its profit to 9 per cent on invested capital. This is not the first such request on the part of Bell of Canada. On a number of occasions that company has asked for its rates to be increased. It has wished for higher profits but has consistently ignored orders issued by government regulatory agencies. During the 1950's the regulatory agency of the day, Board of Transport Commissioners, fixed Bell's return in a judgment at $2.43 per share. In 1964 this rate was equivalent to a 5.9 per cent profit on Bell's over-all capital.

Despite that order of the board limiting Bell's profit to $2.43 per share, Bell earned substantially more than that in 1959 and every year following. In 1959 the company made $2.48 per share; in 1960 profits were $2.52 per share; in 1961 they were $2.50; in 1962 they were $2.66; in 1963 they were $2.58; in 1964 they were $2.71 and in 1967 they reported a return of 6.8 per cent on invested capital. At that time the Board of Transport Commissioners, in a ruling handed down, had allowed the company a return of about 6.6 per cent on invested capital.

Despite its earlier order, the Board of Transport Commissioners in January, 1968,

decided that Bell could maintain a 6.8 per cent return without reducing its telephone rates. For the year ending March 31, 1969, Bell's return on invested capital was 7 per cent. Yet the Board had set a legal limit on profits of 6.8 per cent. Not satisfied with twice violating the orders of the Board regulating their rate structure, Bell Canada now has the gall to apply for permission to increase telephone rates so they can make a return of 9 per cent on their invested capital. The ability of Bell to ignore orders of the regulatory agency is a serious matter to the people of Ontario and Quebec. The minister, as a member of parliament from Quebec, certainly realizes that a profit increase of ½ per cent to 1 per cent for Bell Telephone represents an overpayment by the people of Ontario and Quebec of between $10 million and $20 million a year.

• (10:10 p.m.)

In a similar situation a few years ago in the State of California, the public utilities commission of that state ordered a refund to the telephone subscribers of $60 million because they found that the Telephone Company of California had overcharged the subscribers by that amount. I suggest the government of Canada insist that the regulatory agency enforces its rules. The government has the staff, economists and statisticians, necessary to examine the whole problem of rate structure and profits of Bell Canada. I suggest they make recommendations to the regulatory agency, the Canadian Transport Commission, along these lines.

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** I have answered this question on previous occasions, Mr. Speaker. I answered by simply stating the Canadian Transport Commission is a creation of this house. This house endowed that Commission with all of the authority and responsibility necessary to make the judgments and rulings that are necessary in the interests of the Canadian people. In other words, it gave to the Canadian Transport Commission authority as a quasi judicial body to either accept or reject any demands that Bell Telephone can make. The hon. member suggests this government should, in effect, make representations to its own body. I do not accept that. I believe the Canadian Transport Commission is perfectly competent to consider the application of Bell Telephone and to make a proper judgment.

The hon. member suggests we in the government have the proper research facilities. It is about time the hon. member and other members of his party did something. They are great talkers, complain at great length, and whine a great deal. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan) felt substantially the same way as the hon. member who has just spoken. He went to a great deal of trouble to prepare a very lengthy brief. The hon. member for Essex is a member of the government. He is a member of the Liberal Party. There was nothing to prevent the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) or anyone in his party from doing the same. For the first time in history, this government has given to all opposition parties research funds in order to enable them to do a better job, both in the questions they ask in the house and the statements and positions that they take regarding various legislation being debated in the house. I think it is time that they made an appropriate and constructive use of these funds. In particular, I think it is high time that the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) followed the example of the hon. member for Essex.

## REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—ATLANTIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD—GOVERNMENT POLICY

**Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova):** Mr. Speaker, on May 8 I asked a question concerning the third report of the Atlantic Development Board on fisheries. I must admit that I am in favour of most parts of this report, but the portion that concerns me greatest is the idea of concentrating operations in a single port. I am wondering how you can take a viable, established fishing industry and suggest that it be dismantled in favour of other parts of the country.

How can we suggest to a fisherman or farmer, as other reports have done, that he must move to another part of the country? What we are really telling him is to sell his gear and equipment and move to the city. I am not against the Atlantic Development Board. It has done a tremendous job, but I am concerned about this whole idea of centralization. I suggest there is a lack of planning, particularly on the part of government, with respect to the way we are presently going. The present trend is to centralization, to get rid of our countryside and to urbanize everything. But what will happen in 20 years time? In 20 or 25 years time we shall have to think of moving the people back to the country, and of getting them away from the city. I suggest that the computers have not calculated far enough ahead.

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

I object to the idea of certain growth centres being built up at the expense of rural Canada. For example, I can think of Halifax and Saint John in Atlantic Canada. I do not mind these centres being developed at the expense of Montreal or Toronto, but I object very strongly if they are to be developed at the expense of the countryside surrounding them. The people living in rural Canada are slowly being deprived of the necessary facilities and services. In this connection I am thinking of post offices, customs houses and other facilities. If taking away these things is the answer to our problems, then again I object very strongly.

What is happening in our fishing communities? Post offices are being closed. Wharves are being allowed to deteriorate. Fish are being taken by foreign vessels, thus reducing markets for our own fishermen. Fishing communities do not need much to survive and survive well. They require that their wharves be maintained, that dredging take place in some places, and that lighthouses and coast guard facilities be provided. These are the basic and simple things required for the proper management of the fishing industry. Once these services deteriorate then one has no choice but to think of centralization, and this has been happening within the past couple of years.

I know of one company in my area whose manager told me last week that if something is not done soon he will have to move out and go to another part of the country. Industry is viable in the southwestern part of Nova Scotia, as in many other parts of Canada. At least the present industries there are viable. One need only look at the statistics to see this. We find an increase in the number of boats, and in the catch in all parts of southwestern Nova Scotia. Why should we want to concentrate all this into one single port?

• (10:20 p.m.)

We might look at the statistics in respect of Yarmouth, Digby, Pubmico and Cape Sable Island. I received a brief last week from the Clare Board of Trade. It shows that in 1950 the approximate value of boats owned by fishermen was $350,000. Now, it is over $5 million. The landed value of the catch in 1950 was around $389,000. Now this has increased to $2 million or almost $3 million. The number of fishermen employed has increased greatly.

This is the reason I am concerned about any report or any thought of too much centralization. I hope the government can base its policies and decisions on facts and weigh these facts against the present tendencies. Last week I expressed concern outside the house and I repeat that the cities are getting richer and rural Canada is getting poorer. We must at least provide the basic facilities.

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** The minister considers the reports of the Atlantic Development Board to be important and valuable studies. He was, therefore, very glad to act on the board's request that they should be published even though most of the texts are reaching their final stage only since the board in its previous form was replaced by the Atlantic Development Council.

The minister and his officials will certainly be paying close attention to these studies in their formulation, in consultation with the provinces, of plans and programs for economic expansion in the Atlantic region. The factual and analytical material in the studies will, indeed, be essential to the work of the new department.

Recommendations made in the reports will also be carefully considered, but of course it should be understood that the publication of the reports in no way means that the views expressed are necessarily those of the minister. The recommendations will be considered along with others.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Wednesday, May 21, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

### NATIONAL PARKS

GASPÉ—ANNOUNCEMENT RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENT OF PARK IN QUEBEC

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce today that an agreement has been reached between the federal government and the government of the province of Quebec to establish a national park on Forillon Peninsula.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear,

**Mr. Chrétien:** The discussions concerning the establishment of this national park go back to the signing of the Federal-Provincial Rural Development Agreement between Canada and Quebec, in May, 1968, which dealt with the development of the Lower St. Lawrence region of the Gaspé area and of the Iles-de-la-Madelaine.

Since my appointment as Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, I have stated on several occasions that I attach great importance to the establishment of a national park in the Gaspé area and that I would do everything in my power to bring it to fruition.

The Gaspé national park is the first national park in Quebec. It is also the twentieth national park in Canada.

The establishment of this park completes our transcontinential network of national parks and permits us to maintain intact an extremely picturesque corner of our country for the benefit of future generations.

Under the terms of the agreement reached between the two governments, the province of Quebec will place the site of the Gaspé park at the disposal of the government of Canada for a period of 99 years. The agreement states, as well, that the province of Quebec will have the right to regain possession at the end of 60 years on repayment of all federal capital expenditures incurred by the federal government during the 60-year period.

In either case, the government of Quebec agrees that the land would be used for the purposes of a park and conservation in perpetuity. This arrangement is renewable by agreement of the two parties.

Finally, the agreement provides that the park will reflect the linguistic character of Canada, and in particular the French character of Quebec. It is essential that any national park located in Quebec should be in keeping with the very personality of Quebec. The development of the Gaspé national park is above all a victory for the inhabitants of the Gaspé area. The population of the Gaspé peninsula in the past year has consistently urged on both governments the creation of this park, which will undoubtedly contribute to the economic development of that area.

The agreement reached by the federal government with the province of Quebec to establish this park is unique. This agreement completes the national park system by providing at least one park in each province. I hope that the same spirit of co-operation which has resulted in this agreement will make it possible to create other national parks in Quebec within established policy.

The transfer of administration and control of the land required would be for a term in this instance, but a term of such length that we are satisfied that future generations will not reverse it if it is as successful as we believe it will be.

The people of Quebec have not hitherto enjoyed the benefits which come from taking part in the national parks system. It is my belief this park will be recognized by all the citizens of Quebec as a significant enhancement of the economic and social well-being of the province. It will become, I am convinced, a permanent part of Quebec and of Canada for the benefit not only of the present generation but of untold generations to come.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

• (2:10 p.m.)

**Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Progressive Conservative party, we welcome the agreement

between the federal government and the province of Quebec for the establishment of a national park in the Gaspé area.

Of course, this is good news not only for the country but also for the people of Quebec, and I must say that under this agreement both parties keep their jurisdiction, and that Quebec keeps also jurisdiction over its territory. This is the result of the dialogue and the mutual understanding which we would like to see at all times between the federal government and the province of Quebec.

Obviously, as implied in the statement, because of its special character, Quebec is very often asking for some assurances in regard to the establishment of national parks or the distribution of jurisdictions between the federal government and the province.

Mr. Speaker, as a member for Quebec and on behalf of the Progressive Conservative party, I am glad that this agreement has been reached, as it will help, I am sure, to promote the economic expansion of Quebec and to reduce significantly unemployment in this part of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, we deplore however that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) attempted to interrupt the dialogue between provincial authorities. When he went to the Gaspé peninsula, he addressed the Chambers of Commerce and tried to provoke a reaction within the population against the Quebec government. I am happy to see that the minister reversed his attitude, and I feel it is that reversal of attitude which has resulted today in the conclusion of this agreement.

On behalf of my party, I congratulate the Minister on having understood the situation and the demands of Quebec, and on succeeding in reaching this agreement, which will be beneficial not only, as I said as while ago, to the citizens of the lower St. Lawrence region, but to all Quebecers as well.

I urge the minister to carry on his dialogue and to show an understanding mind with Quebec authorities, so as to be able, in the near future, to enter into other agreements for the development of national parks in Quebec.

I read in a Quebec newspaper during the weekend that the minister intended to develop about ten national parks in the province of Quebec. It was even said that it was his intention to develop one in my own riding, in the Saguenay area. If the minister needs my influence with the Quebec government for the development of this park as soon as possible, I will be pleased to co-operate.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we welcome this agreement, and we congratulate, not only the minister concerned, but also the Quebec authorities who understood the problem and were able to negotiate.

[*English*]

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, for two reasons we listened with some pleasure to the announcement of the minister. We listened with pleasure first because this exhibits that element of co-operation between the federal government and a provincial government we hope will be extended to other provinces in respect of other matters and for other reasons. We listened also to his announcement with pleasure, because a national park is like any other park in that its existence is one thing which contributes to the aesthetics of our life in this nation.

Even though, as I understood the minister to say, this completes a chain of national parks, we hope it will not be the end of this national chain, but that there will be opportunities for greater co-operation and participation in respect of parks development. I must put in a plug for my own area. Because of the great interest which exists in that vast northwestern section of British Columbia, so far totally ignored by the federal government in matters such as this, we hope this co-operation will extend to that area.

I am sure we all appreciated the enthusiasm with which the minister made his announcement. I hope he has the same enthusiasm when he is dealing with people that he has displayed in dealing with things such as national parks. We looked forward in the hope that today would be the day he would make a policy declaration about Indian affairs, because this is something we have been awaiting for a long, long period of time.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, we congratulate the minister on his statement regarding the new agreement which has just been reached. For the first time in Quebec—this was long overdue—a national park will be established.

During the year when the negotiations were being held, we felt there was a great deal of uncertainty and of hesitation, and on some occasions we felt that the statements made by both parties were jeopardizing the future of that park.

We are happy to see that statements from both parties have now come to an end. I would not want to blame the minister for statements which rather tended to impede negotiations and to create misunderstandings.

We are proud to realize that the federal government has at least succeeded in coming to terms with the Quebec government in order to establish our first national park in our province, it being the 20th in Canada. This means, therefore, that we, in Quebec, have certainly not been spoiled with regard to national parks.

I would like to remind the minister—as he already knows—that in Quebec, many sites could be developed into national parks. We hope that the decision made today, in cooperation with the Quebec government, will lead to further agreements, other negotiations, so that other parks will be established in Quebec, particularly in my area, where the question of developing another national park is being seriously considered at the present time. In Quebec, there are some very fine holiday resorts, and I know that the establishment of national parks would help attract more tourists, in short, develop the tourist industry everywhere in Canada. That industry has not been neglected, judging by the number of national parks that have been developed in other provinces. But it was time the minister realized the situation created in Quebec and concluded an agreement with the government of that province.

We are happy for the people of the Gaspé peninsula. This region is known to everyone in Canada from sea to sea. It offers special touristic attractions and we are happy to see that after having been neglected for so long, it will get a national park which will promote its development, both from the touristic and the economic point of view.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

## TRANSPORT

### DECISION TO DEFER REVISIONS IN RATES ON EAST COAST FERRY SERVICES

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, for some time now there has been speculation in the house concerning possible rate revisions on the government ferries operating from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to Prince Edward Island, from Nova Scotia to Newfoundland and from Nova Scotia to the State of Maine. The matter of rates for different classes of traffic on the government ferries operated on the east coast has been very carefully studied both by the government and by Canadian National Railways who operate these ferries on behalf of the government. Consultations were also held with officials in the provinces concerned. These studies have shown that a revision in rates is necessary.

In any such revision, careful attention should be given to the individual characteristics of each type of traffic; such factors as whether the service was essential or non-essential to each class of user, the structure of competitive rates, the cost of handling different types of traffic and the cost of alternative routes should be examined. Therefore, while it is clear that some rate changes must be forthcoming on these ferry services, not all of which I hasten to add will be upward, before instituting such changes the government wants to be certain that what has been proposed is consistent with and reflects the new transportation policy currently being developed for the Atlantic provinces. For this reason it has been decided not to institute rate revisions on the east coast ferry services until such time as the new Atlantic provinces transportation policy has been worked out and the government has had the opportunity to examine the proposed rates in light of this new policy.

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating the minister upon his announcement. I only hope that it indicates a change of heart in the Department of Transport, inasmuch as the transport committee spent a great deal of time in the Atlantic provinces looking into the problems of transportation which are, of course, interrelated with this matter.

I think it is a very wise move on the part of the minister to place a freeze upon these rates until the government works out a policy. I hope the government will now pay more attention to the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. Attention by the government to these recommendations has not been evident to date. We look for a greater measure of appreciation of the transport committee's work in this regard.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I very much hope that the matter of placing a freeze upon freight rates, which is of course very closely interrelated with ferry rates, will come before the house—I am sure most hon. members share this hope—before we recess for the

summer. We have on a couple of occasions come close to dealing with this question. I hope the minister is able to persuade his colleague the house leader to bring this matter forward for discussion before the house recesses for the summer.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** I wish quite sincerely to congratulate the minister on his statement and I would like to call his attention to a problem between Lévis and Quebec City. As a matter of fact, the Canadian Vickers and the Davie Shipbuilding might build some boats. Then, instead of asking for reduced rates, we would ask for boats in aid of the Lévis-Quebec City ferry.

[*English*]

## CANADA DISASTER FUND

MEASURE TO DECIDE POINT AT WHICH FEDERAL FUNDS SHOULD BE AVAILABLE

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West)** moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-196, to provide for the establishment of the Canada Disaster Fund.

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

**Mr. Harding:** Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to meet the problem of deciding at what point disaster losses are beyond the capacity of a province to deal with effectively, and the disaster essentially becomes national. The bill sets up a fund to which contributions can be made in advance by federal and provincial governments and by individuals, companies and institutions. The board of trustees each year determines in advance, in respect of each province, the provincial financial tolerance point above which losses are of national scope. Should a disaster occur in that province, the board contributes to the province out of the fund in respect of the losses above the tolerance point. This bill will ensure prompt and efficient assistance to those areas which qualify and will help to eliminate any future provincial-federal disputes over the sharing of costs.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

**Mr. Speaker:** When shall the said bill be read a second time?

**An hon. Member:** At the next sitting of the house.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

# QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

PROVINCIAL FARM UNITS

Question No. 1,913—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. How many farm units were there in each of the provinces in each of the last five years?

2. In each of the last five years, how many farm units have received loans under the Farm Credit Corporation?

3. In each of the last five years, what was the total of loans granted under the provision of the Farm Improvement Loans Act?

4. In each of the Provinces, how many farm units have reported taxable incomes under the Income Tax Act in each of the last five years?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Finance and the Department of National Revenue as follows: 1. According to the Bureau of Statistics 1966 Census of Agriculture, the number of census farms by provinces are:

| | Number of Commercial Farms* | Number of Small Scale Farms | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Newfoundland | 301 | 1,403 | 1,704 |
| P.E.I. | 3,328 | 3,020 | 6,348 |
| Nova Scotia | 2,867 | 6,726 | 9,593 |
| New Brunswick | 2,938 | 5,751 | 8,689 |
| Quebec | 41,961 | 38,185 | 80,146 |
| Ontario | 70,724 | 39,081 | 109,805 |
| Manitoba | 27,372 | 12,336 | 39,708 |
| Saskatchewan | 69,962 | 15,469 | 85,431 |
| Alberta | 48,971 | 20,279 | 69,250 |
| B.C. | 8,407 | 10,650 | 19,057 |
| Canada | 276,835 | 152,910 | 429,745 |

*Commercial farm is one from which value of farm products sold in 1965 was $2,500 or more. Does not include institutional farms.

2. The number of loans disbursed by the Corporation for the last five fiscal years: 1964/65; 9,845; 1965/66, 11,049; 1966/67, 11,632; 1967/68, 11,559; 1968/69, 9,275 (Estimated).

3. 1964, $150,836,329; 1965, $202,706,910; 1966, $212,796,464; 1967, $203,664,856; 1968, $40,243,867.

4. The information is not available in the form requested. Available statistics relate to individuals since this is the basis of reporting incomes on tax returns.

NOVA SCOTIA ARDA PROGRAM

Question No. 1,966—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. Has the government under the ARDA programme assisted the Government of the Province of Nova Scotia in the acquisition of land for parks?

2. If so, where are the parks located for which land was acquired between April 1, 1963 and March 31, 1969?

3. What has been the total amount expended during this period for the acquisition of land and for the development of the parks?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** 1. Yes.

2. Annapolis: Valleyview; Clements; Cottage Cove. Antigonish: Beaver Mtn; James River; Linwood. Colchester: Five Islands; Tatamagouche; Balmoral; Shubenacadie. Cumberland: Wentworth; Pugwash; Shinimicas; Fenwick. Cape Breton: Mira; Ben Eoin. Digby: Smugglers Cove; Savary; Lake Midway. Gysboro: Two Mile; County Harbour; Ecum Secum; Marie Joseph; Boyleston. Hants: Smiley Interval; Selma. Inverness: Southwest Margaree; Craigmore; Lake Law; Harvard; Mabou; Whycocomagh. Lunenburg: Bayswater; East River; Second Peninsula; Sims Settlement; Graves. Pictou: Caribou; Salt Springs; Green Hill; Powells Point; Malmerby Beach. Queens: Ten Mile. Richmond: The Battery. Shelburne: The Islands. Victoria: Plaster; North River. Yarmouth: Ellenwood.

3. Land, $80,885; Development, $410,212.

HEALTH AND WELFARE SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Question No. 1,985—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of National Health and Welfare provide subsidies and/or support programs for any segment of the economy groups or individuals inside Canada and, if so, to what extent, in what amounts, and to whom are the amounts paid?

2. What amounts have been paid for subsidies and/or support programs during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** 1. No, the Department of National Health and Welfare does not provide subsidies: the reference to subsidies has been interpreted to mean other than the shared-cost programs and other programs of the department which indirectly provide assistance to the economy or groups of individuals in Canada.

2. Not applicable.

SUDBURY, ONT., UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Question No. 1,992—**Mr. Serré:**

1. How many applications for unemployment insurance benefits were received by the Sudbury office during 1968 and of these, how many were by residents of the constituency of Nickel Belt?

2. What was the total amount paid in unemployment insurance benefits to claimants resident in the constituency of Nickel Belt during 1968?

3. How many applications for unemployment insurance benefits were received by the Sturgeon Falls office during 1968 and of these, how many were made by residents of the constituency of Nickel Belt?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** 1. A total of 10,553 initial applications for unemployment insurance benefit were received by the Sudbury office during 1968. The number of initial applications received from residents of the constituency of Nickel Belt is not available.

2. This information is not available.

3. The office at Sturgeon Falls was closed in July 1966, therefore this information is not available.

THE "POSTMARK"

Question No. 2,025—**Mr. Mather:**

1. When did the Post Office publication for its employees, called the "Postmark", first commence publication, and what is the present annual circulation in English and French?

2. Has the "Postmark" been now terminated?

3. If so, was the decision wholly or partially due to the new postal rate increases?

4. What, if any, alternatives are being considered by the Post Office regarding publication of communication for the employees?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** In so far as the Post Office Department is concerned: 1. (a) In 1939; in the latter part of that year publication was discontinued for the duration of the war. Publication was resumed in May 1948; (b) Latest circulation, English, 32,350; Latest circulation, French, 10,715.

2. Yes.

3. No. The introduction of various weekly or monthly publications, by employee unions and recreational organizations, have tended to make a departmental staff magazine redundant. It was therefore decided that the magazine would be discontinued as of March 1969.

4. The whole question of communications within the postal service is now under study and several alternatives are being considered. One possibility is the use of regional publications of a tabloid nature.

*Questions*

SEED DISTRIBUTION

Question No. 2,080—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. Is free seed distribution to growers still practised by the Canada Department of Agriculture?

2. What seeds are distributed and to whom?

3. Who can qualify under such a program and where should application be made?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** 1. No free seed is distributed to growers by the Canada Department of Agriculture.

2. N/A.

3. N/A.

PORTNEUF, QUE., FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Question No. 2,092—**Mr. Godin:**

1. Does the federal government have part-time employees in the constituency of Portneuf, who report to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics?

2. If so, what are their names and addresses?

3. How many hours per month does that work require of each employee?

4. Do such employees work in connection with (a) the federal constituency, or (b) the provincial constituency?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** 1. Yes, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics employs one person part-time in the federal constituency of Portneuf.

2. Mrs. Gertrude Renaud, 106 Jacques Cartier Blvd., Donnaconna, Que.

3. Mrs. Renaud works approximately 30 hours per month as an interviewer on the Labour Force Survey.

4. Mrs. Renaud works in the federal constituency of Portneuf.

LOAN TO COMMONWEALTH TRUST COMPANY

Question No. 2,112—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. Did the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation make a loan last November of two and a half million dollars to the Commonwealth Trust Company?

2. If so, did they ask for a financial accounting, including an audit, of the affairs of the Company before making the loan?

3. Is the government prepared to table the audit?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** 1, 2 and 3. It has not been the practice nor is it considered appropriate for the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation to make public any information relating to the affairs of any member institution.

[Mr. Kierans.]

BUSINESS PRACTICES IN JASPER NATIONAL PARK

Question No. 2,113—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. Have officials of the Parks Branch of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development received from a number of businessmen in the Jasper National Park a pledge that they will close their stores and offices on certain days in order to protest the parks department's policies relative to Jasper National Park?

2. If so, what has been the action of the Department in consideration of this reaction by businessmen who have been operating in the Park for a number of years?

3. Was any authorization given by the Parks Branch to the Superintendent of Jasper National Park to publicly qualify these businessmen as "rabblerousers" whose case should be rejected out of hand?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. No.

2. N/A.

3. No. Full details with respect to the independent appraisal of land values in this community were provided to the Jasper Chamber of Commerce April 14, and by press release and press conference April 22, by the Western Regional Director, Mr. William McKim.

SASKATOON, SASK., UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE STAFF

Question No. 2,124—**Mr. Gleave:**

1. How many persons are employed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan?

2. What is their average wage?

3. Are any of these positions being declared redundant and if so, for what reasons?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** The Unemployment Insurance Commission advises: 1. The Unemployment Insurance Commission has 36 regular employees and 10 casual employees in Saskatoon.

2. The average salary for regular employees is $6,157 per annum. The average salary for casual employees is $1.93 per hour.

3. There are no redundant positions at Saskatoon.

UNION OF MARITIME PROVINCES

Question No. 2,146—**Mr. Corbin:**

Is the federal government participating in a study on the union of the Maritime Provinces and, if so, in what manner?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Yes. The Atlantic Development Board made a grant of $125,000 (half of the estimated cost) to the study.

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,155—**Mr. Coates:**

What are the names and salaries of the Chairman and the Commissioners of the Public Service Commission?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** J. J. Carson, Chairman, $28,750; Ruth E. Addison, Commissioner, $24,250; Yves Labonté, Commissioner, $24,250.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Question No. 2,158—**Mr. Coates:**

What are the names and salaries of the Executive Officers of the National Film Board?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Dr. Hugo McPherson, Government Film Commissioner and Chairman, National Film Board, $24,840; Mr. Gérard Bertrand, General Manager, $20,600.

MEDICAL DOCTORS IN CANADA

Question No. 2,178—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Has the number of doctors increased or decreased in Canada in the last three years?

2. Has the ratio of doctors to population improved or decreased in the same period?

3. What is the rate of medical school enrolment for the past three years?

4. Has immigration of doctors to Canada accelerated in the last three years and, if so, by what extent?

5. Has the number of doctors leaving Canada in the last three years increased or decreased and, in what numbers?

6. Has the number of doctors who are becoming specialists increased in the last three years and, if so, to what extent?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** 1. The number of doctors has increased in the last three years.

2. The ratio of doctors to population has improved in the last three years.

3. Enrolment in Canadian medical schools was 4,023 in 1965-66, 4,230 in 1966-67, and 4,416 in 1967-68.

4. Yes. The number of immigrants whose intended occupation was physician or surgeon increased from 995 in 1966, 1,213 in 1967, to 1,277 in 1968, an increase of 28 per cent.

5. Figures are only available on the number of physicians and surgeons who leave Canada for the United States. Their number increased during the last three years for which figures are available from 380 in 1965 to 449 in 1967.

6. Yes. The number of successful candidates in the specialty examinations of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada (excluding Fellowship) increased by approximately 45 per cent from 1966 to 1968.

SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I., CANADIAN FORCES BASE

Question No. 2,186—**Mr. McQuaid:**

1. How many armed services personnel were stationed at Canadian Forces Base, Summerside (a) on April 30, 1968 (b) on April 30, 1969?

2. How many civilians were employed at Canadian Forces Base Summerside (a) on April 30, 1968 (b) on April 30, 1969?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** 1. (a) 1,368; (b) 1,116.

2. (a) 306; (b) 270.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSION

Question No. 2,189—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. At the present time, how many Canadians are serving in South East Asia with the International Control Commission?

2. Of this total, how many are (a) military (b) civilian, personnel?

3. Of the above, how many are stationed in (a) North Vietnam (b) South Vietnam (c) Cambodia (d) Laos?

4. Since the establishment of the Commission, how many Canadians have served in the area of its responsibility?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1. There are three separate International Commissions operating in the area of South East Asia formerly known as Indochina, one in each of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. Although the membership is the same in each case (Canada, India and Poland), and co-operative arrangements exist between the three bodies, the terms of reference under which each operates are not identical. At the present time there are 52 Canadians serving with the three commissions.

2. Of this total, 25 are military and 27 are civilians.

*Questions*

3. These Canadians are stationed as follows: (a) North Vietnam, 4; (b) South Vietnam, 28; (c) Cambodia, 7; (d) Laos, 13.

4. Since the establishment of the commissions in 1954, it is estimated that 1262 Canadians (861 military and 401 civilians) have served with these organizations.

*LAKEHEAD ELEVATOR STORAGE SPACE

Question No. 2,199—**Mr. Muir (Lisgar):**

1. What is the total storage space of the Terminal Elevators at the Lakehead?

2. What is the total storage space owned by (a) each of the Prairie Pools (b) individual line elevators?

3. What was the total amount of grain shipped from the terminals from January 1, 1969 to April 30, 1969?

3. How many bushels of grain has been shipped out of each Pool or line elevator terminal during the above period?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is as follows:

1. 107,321,110 bushels.

2. (a) Saskatchewan wheat pool, 36,117,210 bushels; Manitoba pool elevators, 17,080,000 bushels. (b) Federal Grain Limited, 21,200,000 bushels; United Grain Growers, 13,000,000 bushels; Richardson Terminals Ltd., 9,500,000 bushels; National Grain Co. Ltd., 5,835,000 bushels; Canada Malting Co. Ltd., 2,888,900 bushels; Parrish & Heimbecker Ltd., 1,700,000 bushels.

3. 37,200,644 bushels of the principal grains.

4. The Statistics Act does not permit the disclosure of information concerning operations of individual companies. However, total shipments from terminals were: Wheat pool terminals, 15,297,268 bushels; Line elevator terminals, 19,508,239 bushels; Private terminals, 2,395,137 bushels.

*AGREEMENT RESPECTING NATIONAL DEFENCE OVERSEAS SCHOOLS

Question No. 2,210—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. On what date was the present wording of the current agreement under which teachers serve DND schools overseas finalized?

2. What is the earliest effective date for the commencement of the teachers' service under the current agreement?

3. On what date and at whose request were copies of the current agreement supplied to the Canadian Teachers Federation?

[Mr. Sharp.]

**Hon. Leo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is in three parts. 1. February 16, 1968.

2. September 1 of the year in which agreement is signed.

3. Copies of the current agreement were supplied to the Canadian Teachers Federation as a result of a verbal request from federation officials sometime between January 8 and February 18, 1969.

INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR COUPONS

Question No. 2,276—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. What was the total sum of income tax deductions claimed by manufacturers covering the distributions of "cents off" coupons to householders or retailers?

2. Does that sum cover (a) the face value of coupons returned to the manufacturer (b) the postage or other delivery expense in connection with the distribution of coupons?

3. What was the amount of deductibility claimed in respect of (a) and (b) of part 2 of this question?

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue):** 1, 2 and 3. This information is not available.

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

ADVERTISING—GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND BODIES

Question No. 1,253—**Mr. MacLean:**

1. What is the advertising budget of each department of the Government of Canada and each agency or corporation of the Government of Canada for the fiscal years 1961-62, 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69?

2. For each department, who were the advertising agencies in each year?

3. What were the commissionable billings?

4. What funds other than commissions on billings were paid to the agency and for what purpose?

Return tabled.

EXPENDITURES ON PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICIAL RESIDENCE

Question No. 1,890—**Mr. Coates:**

What have been the amounts of public funds expended on the official residence of the Prime Minister for each of the fiscal years from 1957-58 to the present and of that amount in each year, how much was for maintenance and how much for improvements and in each instance, what were the improvements carried out?

Return tabled.

EXPENDITURES ON PRIME MINISTER'S SUMMER RESIDENCE

Question No. 1,891—**Mr. Coates:**

What have been the amounts of public funds expended on the summer residence of the Prime Minister for each of the fiscal years from 1957-58 to the present and of that amount in each year, how much was for maintenance and how much for improvements and in each instance, what were the improvements carried out?

Return tabled.

TRADE MISSIONS, FAIRS AND EXHIBITIONS

Question No. 2,114—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Since January 1, 1966, what trade missions or delegations have been sponsored by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and what products were promoted?

2. Since January 1, 1966, what trade fairs, exhibitions, etc., have been supported or promoted by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and what products have been promoted?

3. Has any trade mission or exhibition been sponsored or promoted by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce having to do with the sale of seed potatoes?

4. Is consideration being given by the Department to organize a trade mission or exhibition to increase the sale of seed potatoes?

Return tabled.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, it is frequently suggested to members of the house that they should put their questions on the order paper. I placed a question on the order paper on May 5, and it is a starred question. It is not one which requires statistical information or collaboration between departments. The question reads:

Will the government give favourable consideration immediately to giving a guaranteed floor price for wheat for the years 1969 and 1970?

With galloping inflation in the cost of the things the farmer has to buy, and the lower returns he receives on the small amount of wheat he is able to sell, this question should be answered.

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, on April 15, I placed on the order paper a question asking whether the white paper on external policy will be prepared and presented to the house for debate prior to the summer recess. It has been there for well over a month. It requires no more than a simple yes or no, and I wonder why it has not been answered.

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** The short answer is that we are not quite sure whether there will be one white paper or several. We are trying to make up our minds.

**Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova):** On May 9, Mr. Speaker, I put down a question regarding the manpower office in Digby. It has ten parts. I would ask that this be answered as soon as possible because the changeover from one office to another is taking place next week.

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 131, 141, 143 and 170 for the production of papers are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house that notices of motion Nos. 131, 141, 143 and 170 be deemed to have been adopted?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

RECALL OF MOTOR VEHICLES

Motion No. 131—**Mr. Mather:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Canadian automobile companies regarding recalls of motor vehicles due to faulty workmanship referred to by the Minister of Transport in answer to Question No. 1,898 in *Hansard* of April 23, Page 7850.

Motion agreed to.

TEACHERS IN OVERSEAS NATIONAL DEFENCE SCHOOLS

Motion No. 141—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all telegrams, correspondence and other documents relating to 1967-1969 teaching contracts for service in Department of National Defence Schools overseas as well as a copy of such contracts and regulations as would apply to such postings.

Motion agreed to.

*Motions for Papers*

REPORT BY METRA CONSULTANTS

Motion No. 143—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by METRA Consulting Group Limited on the Sydney Steel Corporation prepared for the Atlantic Development Board.

Motion agreed to.

HIRING OF CONSULTANTS

Motion No. 170—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the federal government's Contracts, Regulations, Orders in Council 1964-1467, 1966-533, 1967-12, 1968-465, pursuant to the Financial Administration Act, and the Treasury Board Management Improvement Policy Statement (MI-9-66) and Treasury Board Guidelines (Information Bulletin 1966-2), referred to by the President of the Treasury Board in answer to Question No. 933 on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Forest:** Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 153 and 166 are acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations as to privileged documents and the consent of the government authorities concerned.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Subject to the reservations or conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the house that notices of motion Nos. 153 and 166 be deemed to have been adopted?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

BONNE BAY, NFLD., NATIONAL PARK

Motion No. 153—**Mr. Marshall:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence between the Government of Canada, particularly as represented by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Province of Newfoundland with respect to the creation of a National Park at Bonne Bay, Newfoundland.

Motion agreed to.

INDIAN AFFAIRS POLLUTION STANDARDS

Motion No. 166—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all standards on pollution established by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Forest:** Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call notices of motions Nos. 121, 122, 123 and 132?

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

[*English*]

STUDIES ON SATELLITE SYSTEMS REFERRED TO IN HOUSE

Motion No. 121—**Mr. Schreyer:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the cost-benefit studies on the domestic communications satellite systems referred to by the Minister of Communications in answer to Question No. 1,881 in *Hansard* of April 23, 1969, Page 7849.

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Communications I wish to report the following: The cost benefit studies referred to in answer to question No. 1881 in *Hansard* of April 23, 1969, were undertaken as confidential studies in the preparation of the white paper on a domestic satellite communications system for Canada and in connection with subsequent work on the domestic satellite communications system. The information contained therein was for the most part privileged, or obtained on the understanding that it should remain confidential. Under the circumstances it would not be in the public interest to release these studies and I therefore wonder whether the hon. member would consent to withdraw the motion.

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Perhaps I might be allowed to say a word in connection with that request, Mr. Speaker. I would say that inasmuch as the government is asking members of this house to approve legislation in this connection which would involve the expenditure of $60 million to $70 million I think we are entitled to ask for full disclosure of the financial details. Accordingly, I should like to request that the motion be transferred for debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** Transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48.

STUDIES ON SATELLITE SYSTEMS REFERRED TO IN STANDING COMMITTEE

Motion No. 122—**Mr. Schreyer:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the cost-benefit studies related to the proposed satellite communication system of the Government of Canada referred to by the Minister of Communications and his officials before the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, on April 22 and April 25, 1969.

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** I have exactly the same answer to give with regard to notice of motion No. 122, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Transfer it for debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** Transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48.

CORRESPONDENCE ON SATELLITE SYSTEMS REFERRED TO IN STANDING COMMITTEE

Motion No. 123—**Mr. Schreyer:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the provincial governments regarding the federal government's satellite communication system as referred to by the Minister of Communications before the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts on April 22, 1969.

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** On behalf of the Minister of Communications I wish to report the following, Mr. Speaker: The correspondence referred to before the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts on April 22, 1969, constitutes an exchange between the federal and provincial governments as part of continuing consultations at various governmental levels regarding the federal government's satellite communications system. The correspondence forms part of confidential material in government files and it would therefore not be in the public interest to release it. Under the circumstances I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the government is not infrequently asked to produce papers which involve provincial governments and that the usual practice is to ask the provincial government concerned for its concurrence. I am wondering why the federal government will not do so in this case.

**Mr. Speaker:** Transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE POLICY—SUBMISSION ON OCTOBER 24, 1968

Motion No. 132—**Mr. Lewis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the agreements and arrangements between the Defence Research Board and foreign countries and foreign defence science agencies referred to in the Submission of the Department of National Defence to the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy on Thursday, October 24, 1968, Page 327 to Page 329, Number 4 of the Proceedings of the Committee.

**Hon. Leo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, two of the documents requested by the hon. member for York South are considered to be privileged, as they contain classified information which it is felt it would not be in the public interest to release. Two others have been classified at the request of the governments concerned. No formal agreement exists in the case of three others but a brief outline of what the agreements cover has been prepared. If the hon. member is willing to accept these limitations I would be prepared to accept this motion and table the remaining documents immediately.

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** I can understand that the government cannot table documents that some foreign governments object to having tabled, but I would have to be persuaded more completely than the minister has been able to do that some of the other material should not be made available to members of this house in addition to the summary which the hon. gentleman says he is prepared to table. I am not disposed to accept the suggestion made by the minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** Transferred for debate pursuant to Standing Order 48.

[*Later:*]

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to thank the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) for his customary courtesy in letting me see the papers which he was willing to table in connection with motion No. 132. I have looked at them and with your permission, sir, I would gladly consent to withdrawal of the motion in view of the papers the minister now is ready to table.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is notice of motion No. 132 dropped?

**Mr. Lewis:** I do not know whether it should be dropped or merely interpreted in terms of the papers which are to be tabled.

**Mr. Speaker:** Subject to the terms and conditions expressed is it the wish of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATIONARY FACTOR OBSERVED IN GOVERNMENT POLICY

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance relating to the forecast he made in his budget address that there would be an inflationary factor of 3½ per cent this year—and the subject is very relevant in view of the announcement made yesterday by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Having regard to the fact that inflation has already increased by nearly 2 per cent in the first three months, I should like to ask whether this is still the inflationary factor upon the basis of which the Department of Finance is operating.

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** As I have indicated many times in this house, rises in costs and prices in Canada are a continuing source of concern to the government.

MINIMUM WAGES FOR INDUSTRIES UNDER FEDERAL JURISDICTION

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the wage settlements that the government has authorized recently involving increases averaging about 8 per cent a year, is it the intention of the government in the near future to increase minimum wages for industries under federal jurisdiction, as it is now nearly four years since these wages were increased and the cost of living has gone up by more than 16 per cent in the interim period?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, this question is based, of course, on the false assertion that the government authorized any increases in wages. Any wage increases granted in recent years have been the result of free collective bargaining between the interested parties and which have been conducted completely free and devoid of any government interference, as the Prime Minister has pointed out on many occasions. The hon. gentleman knows that as an ex-minister of transport he permitted a strike to continue for 71 days on the west coast, precisely on the issue of wages.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. Mackasey:** So I suggest the question answers itself.

**Mr. Hees:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The reason I spoke as I did is because the minister has so proudly announced these settlements from time to time.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. We cannot debate the question.

**Mr. Hees:** I do have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it not clear from the government's refusal to act on this question of minimum wages that the just society exists only for the strong, the unionized and those able to embarrass the government with a work stoppage?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. This is supplementary debate, not a supplementary question.

**Mr. Hees:** We all know what the answer is: It is yes.

### THE BUDGET

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PRESENTATION ON JUNE 3

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to indicate to the hon. gentleman that I shall be presenting a budget on Tuesday, June 3, and that I shall be tabling the relevant white papers on Tuesday, May 27. In my budget address I shall fully review the economic position in Canada as it currently stands.

### FINANCE

POLICY TO COUNTERACT U.S. TAKE-OVERS

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** May I direct a question to the Minister of Finance arising out of the fact that in the past ten days there have been three major take-overs by United States corporations? I want to ask the minister whether it is his intention to introduce legislation similar to that in effect in many countries giving the government power to prevent such take-overs when in its opinion they would be against the public interest.

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** I think the hon. gentleman will understand that in view of the fact that Canada is a federal system such legislation would be very difficult for the federal government to introduce.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Since Royal Securities Corporation

Limited is one of the larger companies handling Canadian financing does the government intend to introduce any legislation dealing with companies of this nature similar to that already adopted with respect to banks?

**Mr. Benson:** No decision in this regard has been made.

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Is the Minister of Finance giving any consideration to the position of Royal Securities Corporation, which is a marketing agency for the Bank of Canada, in view of its take-over by a United States firm?

**Mr. Benson:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

## AIRPORTS

### INQUIRY AS TO LOCATION AT STE. SCHOLASTIQUE

**Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

As Dr. E. McWhinney has raised constitutional objections to the choice of Ste. Scholastique as the site for the new international airport in a report he sent to the newspaper *La Presse*, does the minister intend to establish a joint commission to study all the relevant factors in the choice of the site of the airport?

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, we have not allowed ourselves to be sufficiently impressed by Dr. McWhinney's opinion to be led to that decision.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Asselin:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Following that report, have the Quebec authorities requested the minister to establish a joint commission to study again all the relevant factors in the choice of the airport site?

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** Certainly not me, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

### NATO—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON DEGREE OF OVERSEAS FORCES REDUCTION

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the fact that the minister is due to leave in a few days for a meeting of NATO ministers, at which meeting we have been informed the government's conclusions regarding reduction of Canadian forces overseas will be brought to the attention of our allies in NATO, will the minister inform the house whether such decisions have been reached by the government, and will he make a statement to parliament on the degree of reduction of our forces overseas before he leaves for Europe?

**Hon. Leo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** Obviously, Mr. Speaker, some decisions will have been made by the government before I leave, but it is my intention, of course, to follow the practice of consulting with our allies. Therefore, I think the proper way to conduct myself would be to report to parliament when I come back from the NATO meeting. I intend to do that on June 2, which I believe is the Monday after I have returned from the meeting.

**Mr. Lewis:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Minister whether, since this parliament was given the opportunity to discuss the general philosophy, as the Prime Minister called it, of the government's new defence policy, the minister would consider it necessary that parliament also discuss the application of that philosophy in actual terms before he brings the decision—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question is argumentative.

## GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

### FUNCTION AND ORGANIZATION OF CABINET SECRETARIAT

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Prime Minister. Arising out of the announcement made by the Prime Minister yesterday of the appointment of an assistant secretary to the cabinet for economic policy, an assistant secretary to the cabinet for cultural policy and two other planning secretaries, will the Prime Minister make a statement now or within the near future on the purpose of these two new positions and indicate what the relationship is to be within the government organization between these assistant secretaries and the ministers and deputy ministers who have executive responsibilities in the field of economic policy, cultural policy and planning?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I suggest to the hon. member, and no doubt he will agree with me, that this is the type of statement that should be made on motions.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, my question was purely that of asking the Prime Minister whether he would make such a statement on motions.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is really asking a question about the whole function and organization of the cabinet secretariat. Such a statement would be rather lengthy. I think it would be interesting to parliament and to the Canadian public to know how the cabinet secretariat works. I have had occasion to discuss this—

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** The Prime Minister need not sit down in full flight, because he is telling us precisely what we want to know.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think I have to revert to the suggestion I made to the hon. member and inform the Prime Minister that this is the type of information which I am sure the house would agree should normally be given by way of a statement on motions.

## PEST CONTROL

ASSESSMENT OF CONTAMINATION THROUGH USE OF PESTICIDES

**Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. May I ask him whether there has been any reassessment in regard to federal registration of certain pesticides in light of public concern over recent indications of a latent danger to humans due to chemical residues such as d.d.t., and if a full Canadian investigation is under way to assess the degree of contamination to which Canadians may be exposed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. It seems to me that the hon. member is asking a question which was asked either yesterday or during the last few days.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

[*Translation*]

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIMINAL ACTS

**Mr. André Ouellet (Papineau):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question to the Minister of Justice.

Has he received a brief prepared by a working committee of the Law faculty at Osgoode Hall, recommending that compensation be paid to victims of criminal acts, and does he intend to implement these recommendations by introducing soon legislation to that effect?

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, as I stated recently, I shall defer all these matters to the commissioner of legislation uniformity and to the representatives of the provinces' Attorneys General.

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

LAY-OFF OF CANADIAN VICKERS EMPLOYEES

**Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Pursuant to the announcement made by Mr. Harrington about the closing in the near future of the Canadian Vickers shipyards in Montreal, would the minister tell us what steps he intends to take to provide employment for the 1600 workers who will be laid off?

[*English*]

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, we have been aware of this situation and we will make available to the workers all the facilities within the Department of Manpower and Immigration.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ricard:** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Is the minister contemplating any concrete measures, in addition to what he has just announced?

[*English*]

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, on the subject of the Vickers closing, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In view of the fact that the workers in the plant

are very upset, have taken part in a sit-down in the plant, and have been informed that the plant may be modernized through the expenditure of a not very large amount of capital, has the minister given consideration to the possibility of assisting in this situation, so that the plant can be saved and shipbuilding work continued?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for York South is aware of the programs that come under the jurisdiction of my department. Those programs presently apply to rural and semi-rural regions. There is also an industrial incentive program that is applicable to designated areas. However the Montreal region is not yet a designated area.

[*English*]

**Mr. Lewis:** A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that parliament has been waiting for some time for the new industrial incentives bill, and that Vickers is apparently not waiting for that bill before shutting down the plant so that its workers become unemployed, can the minister not find some way to deal with this problem?

## TRANSPORT

### PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CAUSEWAY—RELEASE OF STANFORD RESEARCH REPORT

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the acting house leader. May I ask whether he has now ascertained the reason for the non-production of the Stanford report on the feasibility of the Northumberland crossing concerning which this house adopted a motion some time ago?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, as I recall it these papers were to be brought forward a day or so ago. I will check into the matter again and see what is the delay.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

### EFFECT ON TAIWAN OF CANADIAN RECOGNITION OF MAINLAND CHINA

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, in connection with the negotiations between communist China and Canada with reference to recognition, will the Secretary of State for External Affairs say whether within the last two days any representations have been made to him by the government of the Republic of China or by the Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church of China who is currently in Ottawa? Have any representations been made concerning assurances that in the event of recognition the leaders and people in Taiwan will not be permitted to be sacrificed in any way?

In connection with those negotiations, is Canada pressing in connection therewith for the payment of the $12 million owing by communist China in respect to the Ming Sung ships? Has there been any change in attitude by the government in this regard?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** May I say to the right hon. gentleman that, like him, I also had the pleasure of meeting His Eminence the Cardinal. Because this assembly was called for two o'clock, I was unable to listen to the address by His Eminence.

To answer directly the questions asked by the right hon. gentleman, I have not had any representation from either the Ambassador of the Republic of China or His Eminence on the matters referred to. I did ask for a copy of remarks made by the Chinese Ambassador when he was commenting on these matters. Other than that I have had no requests from either of these eminent gentlemen.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I ask the minister whether the government intends to live up to the undertakings he and the Prime Minister gave in 1968, that unless the government of communist China were to give the assurance that Taiwan would not be sacrificed, that would be the end of the application for recognition?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is really relevant to the question of recognition. I do not think anybody is being sacrificed under these circumstances. What we are trying to do, and I am sure this is the view of the great majority of the people in Canada, is to enter into diplomatic relations with 700 million people not now represented here.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure the house that diplomatic recognition of communist China will proceed as fast as possible?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is a general wish in the house that these proceedings be as rapid as possible. Of course it takes two to make a bargain. As I understand

the bargaining methods of the Chinese authorities, they are very deliberate and I expect it will take considerable time.

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Has the Secretary of State for External Affairs any report he can give to the house regarding the progress being made in this one-sided love affair between Canada and communist China?

## NATIONAL SECURITY

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES BY COMMUNIST CHINESE

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** I wish to direct my supplementary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and ask him the same question I directed yesterday to the Minister of Justice. It has to do with the remarks of His Eminence in Washington in which he alleged that, "there are centres of small communist Chinese subversive activity in Canada". Can the minister advise this house whether he had any discussions with the Cardinal or members of that group concerning this particular matter?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** No, Mr. Speaker. As I answered to the right hon. gentleman for Prince Albert, I have had no representations of that kind. I can assure the house if the situation envisaged by the Cardinal should arise, there are various means open to the government to protect Canadian security and to ensure that embassy personnel in Ottawa from any country do not behave improperly or illegally.

## CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

CLAIM BY CANADA TO INTER-ISLAND WATERS OF ARCTIC ARCHIPELAGO

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** I have a question for the Prime Minister which arises from a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for York South. Did Canadian officials on behalf of the Canadian government at a meeting with United States officials claim the waters between the islands in the northern archipelago for Canada?

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

## EXTERNAL AID

BIAFRA—CANADIAN RELIEF THROUGH RED CROSS

**Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane):** My question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In the face of recent developments in Biafra, and a report in the *Globe and Mail* which states that Canairelief is doing what the Canadian government feels it cannot do without offending the Nigerian government, but that this should not prevent Ottawa from offering financial assistance by matching the contributions, would the minister indicate if Canada intends to match donations from the private sector?



**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** No, Mr. Speaker. The policy of the Canadian government is to make our relief available through the International Committee of the Red Cross. That will continue to be our policy. One reason for this is that the International Committee of the Red Cross provides assistance both to Biafra and other parts of Nigeria.

**Mr. Stewart (Cochrane):** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Canadian government consider giving help in the form of another plane?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, we have had no request from the International Committee of the Red Cross for a plane. As I say, I think it is wise for the Canadian government to deal with agencies which provide relief to both parts of Nigeria.

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Would the government consider doing what the United States government is doing in this field, that is provide a payment for each ton of goods delivered by joint church agencies as well as by the International Committee of the Red Cross?

**Mr. Sharp:** In this matter, as in other matters, it is better to follow an independent Canadian policy. I think it suits better the wishes of the Canadian people, and is one which receives general support. We should deal with the acknowledged international agency that serves both parts of Nigeria.

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

POSSIBLE INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES IN SLOW GROWTH AREAS

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. My question is in relation to the visit of the Prime Minister to the Atlantic provinces over the weekend, and the statements made by the Prime Minister that the government plans anti-inflationary measures and will

have to spend more for regional development? Can the minister inform this house whether this means the estimated expenditures for the regions of slow growth in the country will be increased in the current fiscal year?

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, we will be doing more in the maritimes than has ever been done before.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could give a straightforward answer to a straightforward question?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition has a supplementary.

**Mr. Stanfield:** In view of the Prime Minister's statement, does the minister propose to increase the estimated expenditures of his department in the present fiscal year?

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** I think the incentive act will be tabled in the house very shortly. At this moment I think the Leader of the Opposition will understand what I mean when I say we are going to give more than has been given in the past.

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, would the minister take some of the money it cost to send the Prime Minister to the Atlantic provinces in a special jet and pass it around among a few poor New Brunswickers?

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

RE-OPENING OF LOCAL OFFICES

**Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour on a slightly different topic from the one with which he has been preoccupied recently. When is he going to reverse the process of dehumanizing the operations of the Unemployment Insurance Commission by reopening the local offices which have been closed and by establishing new ones in other locations?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. This question should be placed on the order paper.

## AGRICULTURE

CANCELLATION OF MEETING WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can he advise the house why the meeting he was supposed to have with the provincial ministers of agriculture this week has been cancelled?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. It was cancelled because when we were making the arrangements last week there was some uncertainty about travel arrangements for the provincial ministers and their staffs.

**Mr. Schreyer:** Can the minister explain how it is possible for the representatives—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member knows he cannot ask his supplementary question in an argumentative form. Unless the question is changed it is not in order.

**Mr. Schreyer:** I will rephrase my question. Can the minister tell us when he hopes to be able to reconvene this crucial meeting?

**Mr. Olson:** Now that it appears that travel arrangements will be easier to make, it will probably be in a few days. However, I would like to advise the house that it is not easy for all ten provincial ministers of agriculture to find a day on which they can all be here on short notice.

[*Translation*]

## SPORTS

PROTESTS RESPECTING RESERVE CLAUSE

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Could he tell us whether the president of the National Hockey League, Mr. Clarence Campbell, has officially protested to the minister regarding the reserve clause which affects particularly the players of the National League and which is dealt with in the minister's report?

**Mr. Speaker:** I think that this question could be easily considered and discussed at the time of adjournment.

[*English*]

## TRADE

WHEAT—FURTHER SHIPMENT TO JAPAN IN SETTLEMENT FOR INFERIOR QUALITY DELIVERED

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In a way it is supplementary to one I directed yesterday to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. I ask it in light of the complaint by Japan about the shipment of tough grain and poor No. 4 grade

wheat last November and in light of the cash settlement made by Canada with Japan. Has Japan indicated to the Canadian government that it is interested in purchasing more grain in this crop year?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, as has been said a number of times in the house, the actual amounts and the dates of delivery are negotiated by the Japanese Food Agency and the Canadian Wheat Board and other selling agencies in Canada. I could not give a specific answer to this question, except to say that the indications I have seen in the press and so on show that the sales to Japan have been satisfactory.

**Mr. Horner:** As a supplementary question, if the Japanese are interested in taking more shipments of wheat in this crop year, why was the settlement for the previous shipment not made with wheat rather than with cash that came out of the farmers' pockets?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would think the question as asked is argumentative.

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Agriculture assure the house that an effort was made to determine the real cause of the damage to the shipment of wheat to Japan so that we will know whether the cost should have been charged to the farmers or to the government of Canada?

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member is asking a question which was asked yesterday, but perhaps hon. members may wish the minister to reply.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce indicated yesterday, what was made was an *ex gratia* payment by the Canadian Wheat Board to settle an outstanding dispute. So far as we are concerned the grain that actually made up the cargo was up to our grading standards, but we have to bear in mind that there were some changes in its quality attributable to the very difficult harvesting conditions last year. In the result, it is in our interest to have our customers satisfied.

[*Translation*]

[*Later:*]

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister of Agriculture.

[Mr. Horner.]

In the light of the statement made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to the effect that the fate of the farmers in western Canada is in the hands of Peking and Moscow, does the minister agree that his department should be dissolved?

[*English*]

## AIR TRANSPORT

SHORTAGE OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

**Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton):** Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago I pointed out to the Acting Minister of Transport the critical situation arising at major airports in Canada because of the shortage of air traffic controllers. In celebration possibly of national transportation week, I wonder whether the Minister of Transport can tell us what action his department is taking to correct this critical situation?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I have met briefly with the representatives of the air traffic controllers and we have set up a more formal meeting, I believe in the first week of June when they will be in Ottawa, at which time I propose to hear all their representations. At the same time the air branch of the department is preparing a summary of recommendations so that we can move ahead in this area.

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, would the minister be prepared to make a statement to the house on motions after he has had this meeting?

**Mr. Jamieson:** Yes. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I intended to do so recently, but since I am going to meet the air traffic controllers I feel it is more appropriate now to wait until that date.

## DEFENCE PRODUCTION

H.M.C.S. "BONAVENTURE"—POSSIBILITY OF SCRAPPING

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. In the light of persistent rumours, can he give a proper burial to the suggestion that because the government has decided not to go ahead at this time with the annual overhaul of H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure* it is about to be scrapped at an early date, and assure the house that this does not necessarily follow?

**Hon. Leo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Forrestall:** As a supplementary question, can the minister indicate whether the Department of National Defence is now giving consideration to an early decommissioning of H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure*?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** Mr. Speaker, we are considering all sorts of options and that may be one of them, but we have not decided on what the form of the new posture will be. The given role has been changed to a degree —as a matter of fact, it has been augmented —and we have still to determine how we are going to apply the policy.

## LEGISLATION

### INQUIRY RESPECTING FEDERAL CO-OPERATIVES MEASURE

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Will the government introduce its long promised federal co-operatives act before the summer recess?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the legislation is being drafted by the Department of Justice, which has had an extremely heavy work load this spring. I am hopeful of being able to introduce the bill for first reading before the summer adjournment so that people can have sufficient time to study it and make representations to me. If I am not successful in introducing it before the summer recess, however, an opportunity will be afforded to the provincial governments and other interested parties to make representations to me on the bill.

**Mr. Burton:** As a supplementary question, has the minister consulted with the co-operative organizations in preparing this legislation and do they agree that it takes years to prepare such a bill?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

### MEASURE TO ESTABLISH INDEPENDENCE OF AUDITOR GENERAL

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want the President of the Treasury Board to move with the unseemly haste with which the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs moved, but can he tell the house when he intends to introduce the legislation promised by the Prime Minister with regard, specifically, to the independent position of the Auditor General?

**Mr. Trudeau:** I never promised that.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Yes, you did.

**Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of any such undertaking having been given but I will do some research to see whether there was such an undertaking.

## CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

### CONSULTATIONS RESPECTING PENSIONS OF RETIRED EMPLOYEES

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Now that the minister is obviously well established in his new department—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** —is he in a position to report on a matter about which I questioned him the first day he took office? What progress is he making in his consultations with Canadian National Railways about increasing the pensions of its retired employees?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I can assure my hon. friend that I am not that well entrenched in my department yet, but I am working on it.

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

### INQUIRY AS TO PRESENTATION OF WHITE PAPER

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Can he predict with some certainty when he will be presenting his white paper, or whatever it is, on Indian affairs?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I hope it will be between the 15th and 30th of June, but I cannot make any promise regarding the date.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

[*English*]

## THE BUDGET

INTRODUCTION OF OUTSIDE EXPERTS IN PREPARATION

**Mr. Bruce Howard (Okanagan Boundary):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of indications in the press that the minister is interested in formulating some arrangement to bring in outside experts to assist in the preparation of budgets, I should like to know whether such action is being given consideration in respect of the preparation of the current budget?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Not this budget, Mr. Speaker.

## INDUSTRY

TASK FORCE REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, this question is for the President of the Treasury Board. Over two months ago I asked the minister whether he would make a statement to the house soon on the task force study of the government in respect of industrial research and development, at which time he said he would soon. I know that the government has no undue commitment to haste but I am wondering again whether the minister would be prepared to make a statement soon?

**Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. gentleman is not urging haste but rather thoroughness on the part of the government. It is a policy of thoroughness we are pursuing.

## NATIONAL PARKS

BRITISH COLUMBIA MARINE PARK AGREEMENT

**Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. While the minister is still in the mood to make announcements about national parks, can he tell the house whether the government has signed the agreement with the government of British Columbia with regard to phase one in the establishment of the west coast marine park and, if not, when he expects the agreement will be signed?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Soon, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

GASPÉ—TURN OVER OF LAND IN PERPETUITY

**Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, this question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the announcement concerning the agreement with regard to a national park in Gaspé, which we were pleased to hear, can he say whether agreement has been reached to turn over the necessary land to the government of Canada, without encumbrance, in perpetuity?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Chrétien:** The agreement was signed for 99 years, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I should like to ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whether the acceptance by the federal government of a long term lease in connection with the park in Gaspé means that the federal government has adopted a new policy which in future will require only the granting of a long term lease from a province, rather than a deed in fee simple which has always been the requirement in the past?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, that agreement had previously been reached under a FRED agreement. In fact, the FRED agreement stipulated that a park would be developed under the conditions accepted today. This is the first national park to be set up in Quebec, and we trust there will be more of them under the terms of the National Parks Act.

[*English*]

**Mr. Stanfield:** I wonder whether the minister could answer my question?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Chretien:** Mr. Speaker, the policy with regard to our national parks is flexible. The agreement reached with the Quebec government is in every way consistent with the spirit of the National Parks Act.

[*English*]

SECOND NATIONAL PARK IN MANITOBA

**Mr. Ed Schreyer (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate to the house when

he will be in a position to announce the establishment of a second national park in Manitoba.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest to hon. members there are many national parks in the country and I wonder whether we will have to spend 10 or 15 minutes of the time of the house every day on questions asked about each national park. In my view these questions ought to be placed on the order paper.

**Mr. Schreyer:** Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase the question. In view of the fact that this is the fifth anniversary of the Liberal government's announced intention to establish a second national park in Manitoba, can the government indicate whether this will be done this year?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## FINANCE

BRINCO—BENEFIT TO U.S. THROUGH GOVERNMENT INCENTIVES

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I directed a question to the Minister of Finance regarding a report to the house on the financial incentives which had been granted by the government to Brinco. Is the minister ready with his report?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Not yet, Mr. Speaker, I will look into the matter.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, in his position as acting house leader, whether he would advise the house of the plans of the government for the remainder of this week and also whether there is any change in the business following completion of the official languages bill?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, we will continue with the official languages bill today. If it should be sent to the committee this afternoon we would take up some smaller bills such as the bills in respect of the Historic Sites and Monuments Act and the Canada Shipping Act to fill out the day. Tomorrow will be an allotted day, and on Friday we would continue with the official languages bill if necessary. Following that the housing legislation will be taken up and then the tax bill.

If it is agreeable to the house, Mr. Speaker, I might suggest that we arrange for the pattern of speaking tomorrow. Last time it was agreed that the mover of the motion and the minister who replies would have 30 minutes, that the leading spokesmen for the other opposition parties would have 20 minutes and that other members would have 10 minutes. I wonder whether that would be an agreeable arrangement for the debate tomorrow.

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker, this seems to be the pattern that is developing in connection with these allotted days. I think we should agree to it.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, it may well be that we will be prepared to agree to this arrangement, but I think we should wait to see what motion is to be discussed. If the motion should be one put by our friends of the Ralliement Créditiste, as I believe it will be, it may be that the 30 minutes should go to them instead of to someone else. I suggest that we let this stand until we know the exact terms of the motion which we will be debating tomorrow.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify that, may I say it was my proposal that the mover of the motion would initially have the 30 minutes.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

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

The house resumed, from Tuesday, May 20, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen (for Mr. Trudeau) that Bill C-120 respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

• (3:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville):** Mr. Speaker, last night I had discussed some of the legal arguments which had been made against the official languages bill and had come to the conclusion that the most important fact about them was not the character of the arguments—they were poor arguments in themselves—but the fact that they

had been made, which showed there is concern among some of the people in this country about the possible implications of this bill. At the hour of adjournment I was coming to the question of compulsion which had been raised earlier by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). That hon. member said, and I quote from page 8869 of *Hansard* for yesterday:

> I think the nub of the matter is that this legislation represents compulsion to many, and no one likes legislative compulsion.

I regret to say I cannot understand the reasoning of my hon. friend. In looking over his speech the only substantiation I find is his quotation of what the leader of the Creditiste party said, which I think rather inaccurately states what the official languages bill attempts to do.

There is, however, a much more extreme statement of what I take to be a similar point of view about compulsion. I refer to an expression of opinion by the Hon. Joseph T. Thorson, the former president of the Exchequer Court of Canada, a civil libertarian of note but, to judge from his recent public utterances, not a constitutionalist of distinction. In an article published in April of this year in Chitty's Law Journal entitled "Bilingualism in the Courts—Is it Justified?", Mr. Thorson writes, as found on page 113:

> —an intensive attempt is now being made to create a dual English-French Canadian nationality in Canada and to force its acceptance on the people of Canada on the ground that it is essential to Canadian unity.

I fail to understand the reasoning behind this line of argument. In the official languages bill there is perhaps an inducement, and certainly an opportunity, to the people of this country to participate in another of the official languages, but the only compulsion exercised by the bill is a compulsion which is exercised on the government and agencies of the government. What there is in the bill is a kind of persuasion, and persuasion is surely of the very essence of the democratic process. Sometimes democratic governments find it necessary to use compulsion and the force of the law with the imposition of penalties, but this is not the case with this bill. At most, in this case there is an inducement, one which I believe the Canadian people will sincerely welcome.

The argument of the hon. Mr. Justice Thorson, to which I referred a moment ago, is on the same level with his other arguments in respect of the official languages bill. I refer to his own interpretation of section 133 of the British North America Act. Before going on to discuss this section I should like to draw its terms to the attention of hon. members. Section 133 of the British North America Act provides as follows:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the houses of the Parliament of Canada and the houses of the legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this act, and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec.

It also provides that:

> The acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages.

In his most literal explanation of section 133 the hon. Mr. Justice Thorson said, and I quote from page 110 of the article to which I have referred:

> —French is not an official language of Canada anywhere in Canada . . . except as specified in the section, the French language does not have any special status in Canada.

I believe that to be an accurate conclusion in respect of the meaning of section 133, but Mr. Justice Thorson went on to say:

> It follows that any legislation either by Parliament or by the legislature of Ontario that would attempt to make French an official language or endow it with a status equal to English in an area where it is not now an official language or does not now have such a status would be in conflict with the provisions of section 133—

He further went on to say at page 112 of the same article:

> It follows as a necessary consequence that, except as specified in the section, English is the only official language of Canada.

The statement that English is the official language of Canada is an extraordinary one. Nowhere in section 133 is it specified that English is the official language of Canada, and nowhere in the British North America Act is this so specified. Why should an inference be drawn from the silence of the statute that English is the official language of Canada when the section specifically deals with both the English and French languages and confers exactly the same rights and privileges upon both? How could English come to be the official language of Canada? Would it be by an act of the parliament of Canada? This is the very thing that the hon. Mr. Justice Thorson has contended cannot be done. Would it be done by an act of the legislature of the

province of Ontario or, indeed, by any provincial legislature or any combination of them? Certainly there is nothing either in our constitutional theory or history to warrant such a method of establishing an official language.

The fact is that there is no official language in Canada at present because the constitution of Canada does not establish an official language. Nor does Bill C-120 attempt to establish an official language. It does attempt to establish an official language for certain limited purposes under the jurisdiction of the federal government, but in constitutional law we have no official language. It is true, by reason of a predominance of English speaking people in our political life, and because to some extent of the facts of economic life in this country, that we have had a language which has the status of a predominant language. However, the Minister of Justice points out that some lawyers cannot handle either English or French.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** They speak jargon.

**Mr. Alexander:** It just depends on where you are from.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** As I stated last night, such arguments as those raised by Mr. Thorson do not come up to the level of intellectual respectability. If I may put it in another way, as a professor of constitutional law, if I were marking his examination paper I would have to give him a failing mark for such an answer.

**Mr. Alexander:** You wouldn't have the nerve.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** The fact is that it is not in the constitution but in the living life of Canada that the future of the English and French languages in our country is to be determined. This bill is an attempt to influence these living practices of the people of Canada. It is an attempt at long last to give an opportunity to our French speaking citizens in the province of Quebec, and those spread throughout other provinces, to use their language in an official way in communication with the government and its agencies.

The bill itself is indeed a solution in law, but it is also a solution which will have an effect on the practices of the people. It gives us an opportunity which we have not had before, that is, to express bilingualism and, indeed, to begin to approach multilingualism. I believe that most people in the country welcome this opportunity. It is for this reason I believe that the young people of Canada, the people who see the future most clearly, are the ones who are most enthusiastically behind this bill.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The Minister of Justice said yesterday that the young people of this country, English speaking and French speaking, are strongly in favour of this legislation. I know that this applies in my own heavily ethnic riding. The young people of Canada understand what is the future of the new world and of Canada as part of that world. If we pass this bill we will be honouring our past, fulfilling our present, and securing our future.

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this bill because it is based upon the principle embodied in the British North America Act which guarantees the right to use both our official languages in any part of the country in which a sizeable minority resides. Recently Ontario and New Brunswick, which have large French speaking minorities, introduced legislation guaranteeing the use of the French language within their borders.

Last July there was unanimous approval in the Ontario legislature for a resolution establishing the right to address the house in either English or French. Premier Robarts announced that four task forces had been established to look into bilingualism in the courts, the provincial public service, municipal government and the publication of statutes and official publications of the house in both official languages. School legislation was adopted in Ontario providing for greater use of French as a teaching language in high schools and making the traditional use of French in some elementary schools a legal right. In the high schools a course must be taught in French if 20 or more students wish it.

In New Brunswick, a province with a 60 per cent English speaking majority, the legislature has unanimously passed a bill proclaiming official bilingualism at the provincial level.

Such legislation was acceptable to the English speaking majorities in those provinces largely because of the generous attitude taken by the province of Quebec toward its English speaking minority, even though no legislation guaranteeing the right to use the English language had been passed.

*Official Languages*

Last autumn Premier Bertrand of Quebec introduced Bill No. 85 which would guarantee English speaking rights by law. Shortly after its introduction, however, the bill was suddenly withdrawn, no substitute was introduced in its place and there is no indication that a suitable substitute will be introduced.

Many English speaking Canadians believe strongly that French speaking rights in their part of the country should not be guaranteed by law unless those living in the area where French is the predominant language, the province of Quebec, show an equal willingness to guarantee by law the rights of English speaking Canadians in that province.

If the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would leave his ivory tower in Ottawa and talk to people in all parts of the country, particularly those in western Canada, about this matter, he would be familiar with the very strong feeling which exists.

I am convinced that the purpose of a bill such as the one before us should be to promote national unity in all parts of our country. I am convinced that if this bill is passed before the province of Quebec passes a suitable substitute for Bill No. 85, which was withdrawn last autumn, it will contribute greatly to disunity in this country. I therefore urge the Prime Minister to confer with Premier Bertrand while this bill is being seriously considered in committee over the next few weeks, as I am sure it will be, and persuade him, in the interests of national unity, to reintroduce and pass without delay a suitable substitute for Bill No. 85, guaranteeing by law the rights of the English speaking minority in Quebec. This should be done before the bill comes back into the house for third reading and final passage. I am convinced that this is the only way people in all parts of the country—I underline "all parts of the country"—can be persuaded that this bill is a fair measure and should be accepted, thus making it possible for national unity, not disunity, to be promoted across our country.

I am also very strongly of the opinion that to pass the bill before people in all parts of the country are so convinced would not be in the national interest. Therefore I urge the Prime Minister to speak to Premier Bertrand about this matter. The Premier of Quebec is a very reasonable man who I am sure is anxious to see national unity in all parts of Canada. I believe he is just as interested in achieving national unity as we all are. After giving this matter considerable thought, and after consultation with those in his government, I am sure Premier Bertrand will introduce—in the Quebec legislature a suitable substitute for Bill No. 85, and his government will pass it, thereby making it possible for French speaking rights to be guaranteed to those parts of the country which have French speaking minorities. This would make our country more truly bilingual and fair-minded in keeping with what the Fathers of Confederation had in mind when more than 100 years ago they passed the act of confederation.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal this afternoon with Bill C-120, an act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada.

Several members have already spoken in French. I have taken an immersion course on two occasions at the civil service school of languages. I come from Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and I started long ago to learn French at school. Like all English-speaking citizens of the province of Ontario, I did not learn it too well.

I take this opportunity to thank the teachers of the civil service school of languages who were very competent. They have helped me a great deal to improve my French. I think other members should also avail themselves of this opportunity to improve their knowledge of the second official language of the country.

[*English*]

For the past two days, Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate on the official languages bill. One of the most striking features of that debate has been the nature of some of the speeches. Obviously, the basic principle of the bill touches a deep, emotional chord in many people. I think particularly of the speech made last week by the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) and that made yesterday by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin), whom I see in the house at this time.

In many ways the debate recalls the election campaign in the constituency I have the honour to represent, Ottawa West. My Conservative opponent in the last federal election campaign, as in the previous three election campaigns in which we faced each other, took a position similar to that of the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek. He campaigned against a policy of bilingualism in the public service and against the principles

embodied in the official languages bill. I believed then, as I do now, that the official languages bill is an essential instrument of national unity which embodies one of the principles upon which we will re-establish our federal state.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in introducing this bill last October, attacked the concept of two nations and maintained that Canada had to survive as one national state. Within this state there is no room for special status, and there is no room for a degree of autonomy granted to any province that is not available to any other province. The federal power must speak for the French language minority outside Quebec as well as for the English language minority within Quebec. In order to secure these rights, it may well be necessary to embody them in constitutional amendments.

In this House of Commons there can be only one class of member. There cannot be a member elected in any part of Canada who does not have a right to legislate, to vote on the matters that come before us, and to make decisions involving the national interest, equal to the rights enjoyed by every other member. There cannot be members elected from the province of Quebec who would make decisions affecting areas outside that province which they cannot make for the province in which they were elected. It follows in a most logical fashion that if we are to maintain the House of Commons in the style we have known, with members elected from all regions having equal authority to make national decisions, then the concept of one state, one national sovereignty, must be an essential part of the process.

It is equally clear that we cannot be a single national state if the rules are different for any one province in regard to official language. The principle of bilingualism is imposed by the British North America Act for one province alone under section 133. It is clear today that Quebec will no longer accept the status of being the only province required by the constitution to give full status to two official languages. It is the object of this bill to extend full status to the two official languages throughout Canada.

Those of us who believe in the principles of the bill are under no illusions concerning the difficulties in its practical application. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), who spoke yesterday, undertook a process of consultation with the authorities in each province to determine what difficulties could be anticipated. As a result of these discussions, a series of amendments was introduced yesterday afternoon.

The amendments are designed, among other things, to reassure the spokesman for some of the western provinces who were concerned. Perhaps the most frequently expressed fear has been the possible exclusion of candidates from western Canada from the public service. The Minister of Justice yesterday cited statistics on applications from graduates of western Canadian universities indicating that these have risen very sharply. Certainly the interest in seeking employment in the public service shown by graduates of western Canadian universities has not in any way diminished but has increased.

It may be that this represents a trend which will be accentuated in future years. It may be that the students who are seeking employment in the public service are those who have had more interest in language training and who now find that the public service offers exciting career possibilities for which their language training gives them an additional qualification. But for the overwhelming majority of positions in the public service language training is not enough. The fundamental requirement must continue to be, as it always has been, competence in one's profession or work.

It is the public service aspects of the bill that give me the most concern, in part because the constituency I represent has a very large number of public servants residing within its boundaries. I note that the amendment to clause 40 proposed yesterday has the effect of re-emphasizing the basic principle of merit in regard to the duties of the Public Service Commission. There should be no hesitation whatsoever about repeating this on every occasion when any doubt is cast on its application.

In 1964 the right hon. L. B. Pearson, then Prime Minister of Canada, made a statement indicating the general principles which would guide the application of a policy of bilingualism in the public service. Mr. Pearson stated that bilingualism was to be encouraged as a matter of policy but that individuals who were recruited prior to the introduction of the bilingualism policy would not suffer any impairment of their public service careers because of their lack of knowledge of a second official language. In practice, the application of these two principles creates serious difficulties. To a considerable extent

they are not reconcilable. To the extent to which a bonus is given for a second language in a promotional competition, there must be some impairment of the career of the candidate without the second language.

It is to the credit of the Public Service Commission that they have used a great deal of sense in applying the policy directives. In my opinion there is an area of possible conflict between the legislation now before the house and the legislation which established the Public Service Commission. The Public Service Commission in effect must be the agency responsible for applying the policy of bilingualism in large sectors of the public service. Its regulations must be consistent not only with the act directly establishing it but with the intent of the official languages bill.

It is my sincere hope that the Public Service Commission will give early consideration to measures designed to give protection to the career civil servant who was recruited some time ago but is now at the stage in his life when it is most difficult to begin to learn a second language. I believe there are some special instances where an enlightened and humane policy by the Public Service Commission to protect such long service employees would be in the national interest. The Public Service Commission must also establish at the earliest possible date objective tests of language competence, not only for initial appointments but especially in promotional competitions.

In speaking to this bill last Friday the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) pointed out that there is no provision in the bill dealing with the National Capital Commission or any policy for development of the national capital. In these areas we await the final recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism and we will follow closely the statements by the minister responsible for policy in this area. It is to be hoped that the minister will make an authoritative statement in the near future in view of the speculative stories in the press in recent weeks, which have come from undisclosed sources. These speculations have done a great deal of harm and are endangering the good relations that exist between the cities of Ottawa and Hull.

I have no hesitation in supporting this bill and the principles that are embodied in it. I believe, as strongly as I believe in anything, that Canada must be built on the recognition of the rights of both official languages. As the Minister of Justice pointed out yesterday, this bill has the support of an overwhelming majority of the younger generation in Canada. The bill itself is perhaps a prelude to the intense discussion which must take place on the amendment of our national constitution. I repeat that the bill is a cornerstone on which the constitution itself will be rebuilt.

The principles of the bill are the most effective answer to those who put forward the concept of two nations or separate status for any one province. I urge its adoption by all of those who, regardless of political affiliation, believe as I do that Canada must be one nation with two official languages from coast to coast.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conclude my remarks without replying to the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin) who said yesterday in the house that it was a shame that at the United Nations, for example, only English-speaking people would speak on behalf of Canada.

If that were true, it would certainly be a shame, but it is incorrect. Two years ago, I was appointed as a member of the Canadian delegation to the general Assembly of the United Nations. Among the delegates was the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Pelletier) who, last Friday, spoke in this house about the bill under consideration.

That delegation consisted also of two ambassadors, Mr. Ignatieff, who knows several languages, and Mr. Paul Beaulieu, the present Canadian ambassador in Paris.

Therefore, the Canadian delegates were 40 per cent French-speaking.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Charlevoix was referring yesterday to an incident which occurred several years ago, he should have said so, but he did not. We have made progress since. Our civil service is becoming increasingly bilingual. For the sake of national unity, we have to recognize the advance which we have made.

• (3:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I hope all members of the house will support this bill.

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few observations with regard to the bill now before us. Some of them do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the New Democratic party but I believe it is only right that I

should say in this chamber what I believe to be true in this country of ours.

I was pleased to hear the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) express the view yesterday that this bill should be dealt with in the political arena rather than be surrounded by an aura of suspicion. I agree with him in this respect, and I congratulate him on that statement. I do not, of course, agree that every member who stands up in this house should parrot the statements made by members of the cabinet. Individual members have a responsibility to those in the areas from which they come to express their concern at this time. I do not believe this debate need be a lengthy one but I do believe that certain things ought to be placed on record.

I am sure no reasonable person in this country takes exception to section 133 of the British North America Act. Everyone here agrees that proper recognition should be given to the provisions of this section and that there should be no discrimination of any kind when carrying out the intent of that act. Nevertheless, it is my belief that at this time in the history of Canada we are moving on a particular course far more rapidly than the people can accept. In my view, and I say this sincerely, the people of Quebec have just cause for their suspicion of the English speaking population of Canada. During the past 100 years they have had just reason to express their suspicions, and in many cases there has been justification for the action they have taken since 1960. I think we should look at history before we form a definite attitude toward these events. In 1964, according to a professor of sociology of the University of Montreal, which I attended for a short while, only 51 out of 760 people in the corporate elite in Quebec were French Canadians. This leads one to conclude that French Canadians were virtually being eliminated from an area they were entitled to occupy.

Let us look at history further. I am not going back too far; I am sure the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) will recognize the effect of the words to which I intend to refer briefly. The reason for much of the concern felt in the earlier part of this decade was that the bishops wrote to the industrialists asking them to pay low wages so that French Canadians would go back to the farms, which were the only road to heaven, and avoid occasions of sin in the cities; moreover, urban life was dominated by English speaking people.

As Members of Parliament go about the country and justify the bill before us, as most of us do to the best of our ability, we realize that certain ministers of the government are also moving about Canada laying the blame for some of the circumstances in which we find ourselves at the present time at the doors of the English speaking people. For myself, I think we ought to go back and determine what the facts really are. I was concerned on reading some of the statements which the minister who introduced this bill has made in various parts of the country. It is only right that we should look at these statements to determine whether or not some extremism has been shown by the minister concerned in his addresses to members of the French community throughout Canada.

I was disappointed to read in a speech released by the minister's department on December 7 in Winnipeg certain of the statements made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) to the group he was addressing. According to this release he stated that though the report of the B and B Commission had been in hand only a short time measures were already under way to implement the recommendations it contained. Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been many reports from royal commissions and task forces, including the Carter Commission and the Woods Commission, but none of them has met with the prompt action accorded by the government to the recommendations of the B and B Commission which, I might add, has not yet completed its final report. There is nothing wrong with a government taking prompt action on a report which contains good recommendations. But it seems that the government is more concerned today about acting on this particular report than it is about the reports of all the other royal commissions and task forces which have been set up in this country. It is high time the cabinet looked seriously at some of the other reports which have been submitted for perusal and took immediate action with regard to them.

The Secretary of State told his audience:

> We have taken measures not only to make superficial changes but to alter fundamentally the situation which exists.

Any representative of the political parties here, or any individual politician, would be condemned by this house if he went across the country making statements of a type which could be considered extremist. But the very minister who introduced this bill into the House of Commons is guilty of extremism in making statements of the sort he has made.

I refer again to the hon. gentleman's speech at Winnipeg. He stated that thousands of civil servants had signed up for courses in the official languages. This I subscribe to. Then he went on:

> Every year, dozens of families move to Quebec City or Toronto for a total immersion experience in French or English.

I bring this out because I feel that at this point in our history, even though 102 years have gone by since confederation, the people of this country cannot afford the extra tax burden placed on their shoulders in an attempt to make every individual bilingual. I agree with the leader of the Creditistes that this is not a process which can take place overnight. It has to be started within the school system. I want my children to become bilingual and they are taking French courses now in Ottawa schools. Effective French courses should have been available in our schools long ago. My point is that this process has to start at the bottom, not at the top.

A short while ago the minister addressed a meeting in Regina. The editor of the Moose Jaw *Times-Herald,* in commenting on this meeting in an article which appeared on April 18, expressed his point of view in words better than any which occur to me at this moment. The article is headed, "Realities Ignored", and reads:

> The trouble with intellectuals also running the country is that, at times, their ideas may run counter to realities.
>
> A case in point is presented by State Secretary Gerard Pelletier, one of three Quebec bright men persuaded to enter politics a few years back (the others are Prime Minister Trudeau and Mr. Marchand).
>
> During a visit to Regina, Mr. Pelletier said he would like to see "a first class French school in every city in Canada . . ." He said this would allow French Canadians to become as mobile as English Canadians.
>
> The idea may have some merit but the practice is something else again.

● (4:00 p.m.)

> There are several reasons for suggesting the idea is impractical, for the present and many years to come.
>
> One is that of costs, another is a very real shortage of teachers, a third is that there is no barrier to mobility at present.
>
> Of costs, the additional burden of a strictly French school in "every city", as Mr. Pelletier would have it, suggests a high French-speaking population. And, of course, such a school would have to be from kindergarten to grade 12.
>
> The teacher shortage has been, is and will continue to be one of the main reasons that, in the main, the teaching of French in our present system of education is so poor. It would seem to us that the primary objective is to improve the teaching of languages in all schools rather than to aim at segregation of a type. Teaching of languages is beneficial to all people and should not be restricted to a minority.
>
> On the subject of mobility, it will forever remain a fact of life in Canada that French Canadians who wish to move to English speaking sections will have to learn the English language. What is changing in Canada, and this is to the good, is that English speaking Canadians who are moving to Quebec must display equal desire to learn the French language.
>
> Mr. Pelletier's suggestion may be intellectually stimulating but it ignores realities of life.

**Mr. Pelletier:** Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Skoberg:** Certainly, sir.

**Mr. Pelletier:** The hon. member has been talking about extreme statements and mentioned two I had made. In one, I described a state of fact, which is the policy of the government. In the other, I said it was desirable to have a good French school in every major city of Canada. Would the hon. member make clear whether he considers either one or other of those statements extreme? I am asking him because I have not been able to understand what the word means as a result of the way it has been used over the last few days.

**Mr. Skoberg:** Mr. Speaker, I can assure the minister I used the word "extreme" in the sense that the government believe they must implement bilingualism across Canada today. I will go on to point to some other statements that the minister made in Boston, and I believe in New York, as the sort of statements that are creating an atmosphere in Canada today which is bringing about an animosity between east and west that I do not like.

I have just referred to an editorial and I quoted not my own words but those of the writer of the editorial, who I might point out is a French Canadian. The part of the statement that is extreme is that the minister now says it is essential to have a French school in every major city in Canada. If the minister did not say that, then I should like him to clear up the matter now. If he did, then I think my point is well taken when I say that municipal taxation across Canada today is such that we simply cannot afford this type of luxury. I would be the first to agree entirely with the principle behind the language bill, but I would be the last to agree that the people of this nation today can afford the luxury of a French school in every community, as the minister says as he goes across the country addressing various groups.

I sincerely suggest to the minister through you, Mr. Speaker, that he tread very softly, carefully and slowly in the over-all implementation of bilingualism across Canada. I know of too many senior citizens at the present time who are losing their homes as a result of taxation. As a former alderman of the city of Moose Jaw I know that 53 cents out of every dollar goes toward education, and this cost is increasing all the time. If the minister will stand in his place and say that the federal government will absorb the added cost of implementing bilingualism in every major city of Canada, then I personally will applaud him forever and a day. But I know this will not be the case.

The cost of education in this country is on the upswing and will continue to be so. Unless the federal government absorbs more responsibility for the cost of education, this whole country will collapse because of the dilemma facing our seniors whom we revere so much but who cannot pay their way. I am sure every member of the house realizes there are too many other things in this country requiring immediate action besides bilingualism.

I am not saying for one moment that bilingualism itself is not important, because I believe it is. It is very important for the mobility of people across the country. I am sure the editor of the Moose Jaw *Times-Herald* recognizes that fact. As he puts it, he recognizes the facts of life.

A former minister in the present Liberal government has stated that the intellectuals are forgetting the nuts and bolts of the situation. I subscribe to that statement. Intellectuals cannot run this country because they do not provide the bread and butter to those who need it.

This point has already been made so I will not belabour it. I realize the minister has given some explanation as far as employees of the National Capital Commission and the museums are concerned, but I want to make the point that anybody who is hired in the civil service or in a government agency should be bilingual if that is one of the conditions of his employment. But I do not buy a situation where conditions of employment are changed after people have been hired and have been employed for a good many years.

Throughout my working days—I do not know whether I am still working but that is beside the point—I have belonged to a trade union, and I have always objected to a company changing conditions of employment after an agreement has been signed. I earnestly plead with the minister not to change the conditions of employment of those already employed in the civil service. Do not change the conditions or place of employment of guards at museums and other public buildings.

I think it is a national disgrace when a man who has served as a guard or commissionaire at the front door of a public building is relegated to the back door or some other place. It is a national disgrace when this government or any other government deliberately takes a man from where he has been rightfully employed for many years and relegates him to some other position. I think the minister should give due consideration to this question. Some of these men are in their later years, and until they retire I suggest that other personnel be made available to serve those who speak only French.

Too many things have been said throughout this nation which are regrettable from the minister's point of view, as well as from my point of view as a Canadian. But let me assure the minister that if his desire to unite all of Canada is sincere he will have the co-operation of every person in Canada. I can also assure the minister that if he is insincere and uses unfairly the provision in the bill whereby the Governor in Council may make such regulations as he deems necessary to effect compliance with the act and the conduct of affairs by the government of Canada and its departments and agencies, then Canada will no longer exist as a country.

One other statement of the minister of which he should be aware and to which I personally have taken great offence was made when he addressed a certain group of people in Boston. I do not have the date of his speech but I am sure he will recognize it. At page 7 of his address he said:

> From 1867 to 1960, our country, like yours, underwent a period of immense economic development. But compared to yours—

He is talking about the United States.

> —our political and cultural life seems dull and somewhat monotonous.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I do not subscribe to statements of this sort made by Canadians going to other countries. In my own province the premier is continually making statements outside the province which condemn and damn the very province of which he is a native. I do not endorse the actions of people who deliberately declare in other places that life in Canada seems dull

and somewhat monotonous. I do not think the past 100 years in Canada have been dull and monotonous. I can assure the minister that even with the implementation of the language bill we will continue to fulfil our moral obligations. I do not think the people in the province of Quebec and elsewhere appreciate the minister condemning in this and other countries what we have known in the past to be a fact of life. We are Canadians, and the minister should realize this fact when making speeches outside this country. I am certain the people of the province of Quebec realize this without the language bill, although I am sure it will bind us more closely together.

I plead with the minister not to move too quickly on the language bill. When travelling throughout the country addressing public meetings we can explain the situation as it should be explained. If inflammatory statements such as I have referred to continue to be made, the language bill will not be regarded in the context the minister and every member of this house wishes. I ask the minister and the cabinet to go slowly with the regulations and give the people time to be educated in the two languages. Let the two languages work into the employment of this country. Do not insist that civil servants at all levels become bilingual immediately.

I am sure most people in my constituency do not oppose the language bill. They are just as proud as I to be Canadians. They are very concerned about the cost of implementing the language bill. They are also concerned about provisions such as clause 10 which may mean that every railway employee in this country, every civil servant and every employee of a crown corporation could be required to learn to speak both languages at a very late time in their lives. It would not be easy for me at the age of 42 to learn a second language. However, I will be willing to make an attempt when I have the opportunity next year. To ask the people of this country to learn a second language would burden them with additional municipal debt. The economics of this country today will not permit it unless the government will assume the complete cost of the entire implementation of the language bill.

**Mr. Jean-R. Roy (Timmins):** As this is my first effort, Mr. Speaker, let me at the outset make the solemn pledge to Your Honour and hon. members that I will not at any time needlessly take up the time of the house simply to speak as often as some other hon. members, or for the benefit of indirectly influencing a few voters, or to further my personal position or gain. I will speak only when I have something of substance and significance to say for my constituents or for the good of our country. I sincerely hope Your Honour will call me to order whenever my words do not reflect this substance or significance.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

The bill now under discussion is of paramount importance to Canada and to my constituency. Of my constituents, 45 per cent are bilingual citizens of French extraction. I deem it most important that the small number of French speaking members in this house who are not from the province of Quebec should bring the viewpoint of their French Canadian constituents forcefully and clearly to the attention of the house. French speaking members from the province of Quebec cannot possibly represent our thinking and attitude any more than can the English speaking members. I therefore hope every French Canadian member from other than the province of Quebec, without regard to party, will speak in this debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, during the electoral, campaign, I said to the French Canadians in the constituency of Timmins that this is now our last chance to remain French Canadians in Canada, outside Quebec, and that, besides, our fate rests mainly with the Quebecers.

My opponents took exception to that statement, but my constituents elected me so that I could come here and say it again. For us, French Canadians from outside Quebec, it is our last chance to remain French Canadians, and it is the Quebecers who will finally decide.

This is quite clear. How can we justify our language in Canada, if Quebec is not a part of Canada? Without Quebec, it would disappear immediately and completely. And why not? Why should the other Canadian citizens be interested in French Canadians if the French Canadians in Quebec felt no concern at all about those people who number one and a quarter million?

The separatists claim they want to preserve language and culture. Nevertheless, through a simple decision, namely to separate, they would jeopardize the future of a million and a quarter French Canadians. That is how the separatists would safeguard things.

More than a million and a quarter French Canadians would be abandoned and they want us to believe that it would be to protect

us. What nonsense, what kind of argument is that? And that without ever consulting any of the one and a quarter million people interested. What a civilized way of doing it.

Mr. René Lévesque said in Timmins and I heard him with my own ears:

> Let the French Canadian people in Ontario look after themselves. What do you want us to do? We must look after ourselves, in Quebec.

That is intelligent.

Mr. Lévesque also said: French Canadians outside Quebec asked me to work out a policy aimed at bringing them back to Quebec; it is the only way for them to remain French Canadians. I do not know where his information comes from, but he is completely off the track. He should contact other people than separatists if he wants to get accurate facts.

My father was born in Saint-Anaclet, near Rimouski, and my mother was from Cap-Saint-Ignace, near Montmagny. Can you beat that for being a Quebecer? And I can tell Mr. Lévesque straight out that never would my father agree to go back to Quebec under any circumstances. I can tell him that it would never be to my interest to move to Quebec.

He would never be able to convince even 100 French Canadians, out of 30,000 or more in our constituency, to move to Quebec—not that we do not like Quebec, because, on the contrary, Quebecers and ourselves are all the same—but just because our homeplace is the Timmins riding. Why would they move? They left Quebec because they had reasons to do so. Since they did not go back, they also had reasons not to. Why would these people give up good salaries for smaller ones, interesting jobs for less attractive ones, the advantages of bilingualism for narrow unilingualism? Mr. Lévesque is just day-dreaming and altering facts.

In my constituency, I know a young girl who was a strong supporter of the separatist movement and who last summer was the lucky winner of a trip to France. She now deplores the separatists' fate and never stops criticizing France where social life, according to her, is fifty years behind ours in Canada.

Mr. Lévesque is also saying that we are dead ducks and that we will not survive. What a mistake! What a misguided notion! What blindness!

• (4:20 p.m.)

The same thing applies to those who advocate unilingualism in Quebec. We are told that it is to preserve the French language; but how can it be done by passing a law, without consulting anyone? That would deny the right of 1,250,000 French Canadians who live outside Quebec to the French language! That is exactly what would happen, because, how could we justify the teaching of French in Ontario schools, if Quebec should refuse the teaching of English in its schools? You see, that does not make any sense.

At the beginning of the session, Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin) say that he was speaking as a French Canadian from Quebec and on behalf of the other French Canadians from the remainder of the country. I should ask the hon. member to give us his support, his attention, his interest, but I would ask him, for heaven's sake, not to speak on our behalf. Too often, some people who do not know what we think at all, claim they are our spokesmen without ever consulting us. They have their own interests and do not understand our way of thinking. That is why I say to the hon. member: "Support us, but for heaven's sake, do not speak in our name."

Mr. Speaker, last fall, I heard the hon. member for Témiscamingue say what is reported in *Hansard* at page 1494. I wish to congratulate him sincerely. I have a great deal of admiration for him. I sincerely believe that he has done at least as much as anybody else to promote bilingualism at the federal level. The hon. member was telling us that three of his colleagues, who did not speak English, had been arrested by an Ottawa policeman who did not speak French. As my hon. friend, I think that the policeman in question would be able to perform his duties more efficiently if he could speak French.

But, on the other hand, how can the members who do not speak English serve their electors adequately since they cannot even talk with the English-speaking members or get to know what they think?

True, we are provided with simultaneous interpretation in the House of Commons, but parliament does not consist of the House of Commons only. Communications must be established with people outside the house. Therefore, I earnestly suggest to the hon. members to register immediately for an English course. What applies to English-speaking Canadians also holds good for French-speaking Canadians. Such action on their part will prove their sincerity.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to tell our brothers from the province of Quebec who, for the major part, have not yet agreed to separatism, to whom we feel very close and of

whom we are proud, not to be taken in by slogans, misleading catch phrases, shallow statements and policies that offer crumbs to everyone, not bread.

I also tell them: Look carefully into those policies and, I entreat you, speak your mind. Do not let the remainder of Canada think that those separatists represent the public opinion in Quebec, and that they are a majority. Do not become yourselves separatists by not taking a stand. Denounce those hypocritical and evil-minded trouble makers. Do you believe that those mean trouble makers, that the great general who has now left the political stage, that a frustrated Minister of Cultural Affairs, that a very narrow-minded school board, are going to preserve and develop the French language in the province of Quebec and in the rest of Canada? Not at all! That will rather depend on the initiative of every French Canadian everywhere on the sound judgment of the great majority of politicians in Canada on the good-will of the great majority of citizens everywhere and, above all, on the influence of Quebec within Canada.

I entreat the province of Quebec not to forsake the million and a quarter French Canadians who are not living in Quebec. Our ancestors left their homes and their families to go out and spread the French fact throughout Canada. Are we going to let their efforts go to waste?

Those good people have spread all over Canada and have multiplied to the point that they now number one and a quarter million. All this was to develop and reinforce the French fact in Canada. Are we going to allow the results of their struggle to amount to nothing? It would likely have been much easier for our people to stay home. But if they had not had the courage to spread, if they had refused to leave, if they had not foreseen our vast bilingual country, where would we be now? The French language and culture would no longer exist outside Quebec. We would not have Canada as we know it today. Let us not thank them by forgetting them. Let us not show our appreciation by denying them. Let us continue to give them our support and our encouragement.

[*English*]

The final test, Mr. Speaker, is here and now. As at the end of a school year students eventually have to face examinations, so this parliament must now face the test of two official languages. The statements, the promises, the positions have looked good. They have reassured to a large degree, but now is the time when the law must guarantee. There is no turning back. And, Mr. Speaker, now that the principle has been established, now that the formula has been enunciated, I am completely amazed at the weak excuses that are appearing to delay further, to suspend, to sidetrack, and to evade the decision.

What a laugh when I hear some say, "We agree with the law but we should have it tested constitutionally!" What hypocrisy, what baloney when they say, "Sure, we should have two official languages, but it is too costly!" What of the cost to parents of private French schools which are just now beginning to receive reasonable government support? And what about the economic and social costs of the drop-outs from the French schools because of the too great financial burden on the parents, who pay twice for their children's education?

What rubbish when they say two official languages will mean discrimination in the civil service! What about the arrogant discrimination that went on for years and years, even in the heart of Quebec, and in national transport agencies? Where has the fair play been in all those instances? Where is it today? Are we ready to accept our responsibilities? Have we matured enough? Have we the courage to call a spade a spade and stand and be counted, yes or no, clearly and honestly?

My French ancestors came to Canada in 1623. That is a long time ago. Does this mean that I am more Canadian than he who came here in 1923? Of course not. Does the fact that my ancestors were French while someone else's were English make me more Canadian than him? Of course not. Does the fact that I speak two languages while someone else speaks only one make me more Canadian? Of course not.

But, Mr. Speaker, let no man—I say no man—tell me that I do not fit in in Canada because I am French Canadian. Let no man tell me that I will have to speak English because he does not speak French. Many people do not want to be hyphenated Canadians. Why not? What is wrong with being a hyphenated Canadian? Canada would not be Canada if it did not have hyphenated Canadians. We would all be Americans. Canada is Canada and Canadians are Canadians because we have two great working languages, because we have many nationalities and many cultures, all this tempered by the influence of the huge American society to the south of us. What is wrong with that? These

are the reasons it is great to be Canadian and it is great to remain Canadian.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) said in the house last December, as recorded on page 3929 of *Hansard*, that the French Canadians had been given bilingual cheques. In a Prime Minister's career, what a pitiful contribution to look back to! What sadness must be in his heart today—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Roy (Timmins):** His horse and buggy friends are up in arms now. What sadness must be in his heart today that he did not do more then! What a pity to have peddled the surface symbols but never to have contributed to the substance of bilingualism! He went on to say, "Now they want more."

**An hon. Member:** What about the simultaneous translation?

**Mr. Roy (Timmins):** How pathetic to think of official language rights and such subjects as goodies that we distribute, not if it is right or wrong, beneficial or not, but rather whether or not our French speaking citizens have been good little boys and whether they deserve another lollipop! What misunderstanding! What a sorrowful record!

**Mr. Peters:** What distortion!

**Mr. Roy (Timmins):** The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), as recorded at page 1491 of *Hansard*, some time ago deplored the fact that too many affairs of the western provinces were being handled in this government by ministers from Quebec. What a ridiculous attitude! How many of the affairs of Quebec are handled by ministers from other provinces? Heaven forbid that the affairs of western Canada should ever be handled by the member for Crowfoot. The hon. member went on to say that there was a natural trend in Canada for the French Canadian to be assimilated. I do not know how it is in Crowfoot, but I know from that statement that the hon. member cannot have seen too much of the rest of Canada.

There are as many French Canadians outside Quebec as there are people in Alberta. They will be there speaking French after the hon. member is gone, after his children are gone and after his grandchildren are gone. Let us not search the past for legal loopholes, for traditional balderdash, for old prejudices, for feelings of bigotry, for any excuse to oppose the two languages.

I was pleased the other day by a choice bit of wisdom on the part of one of my constituents. The gentleman in question spent considerable time decrying the official languages bill to me. He expressed his completely partial viewpoint that French has no place in Canada outside Quebec. He made a very strong representation against the bill. Then he said—

**Mr. Bigg:** As a good Canadian, do not repeat it.

**Mr. Roy (Timmins):** The hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Bigg) should go back on his horse. This constituent said, "In spite of all I have just told you now, in spite of anything else you have heard, you, the politicians, should vote for what you think and know is right and reasonable if you are really honest with yourselves." It does not matter to me what happened 100 years ago or 200 years ago. I am interested in the life I live and the life my children and their children will live. To me that means bilingualism, multiculturalism, a fuller life, a richer life, a life truly Canadian. For these reasons I give full support to the Prime Minister's bill, one which I am sure will be the pride of this house and the pride of its members, indeed, the pride of Canada itself.

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question at this time?

**Mr. Roy (Timmins):** Gladly.

**Mr. Aiken:** I know the hon. member wants to be fair, but is he not aware that the simultaneous translation system in this house, among other things, was brought in by the government of the right hon. member for Prince Albert?

**An hon. Member:** Peanuts.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please.

**Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River):** Mr. Speaker, it is not easy for me to rise to speak on this bill. I realize that whichever side one takes on a subject such as this one will find oneself being accused of prejudice. This bill, on the face of it at least, would seem to be acceptable, but when one delves a little deeper and explores the possible application of the bill one must, I think, have reservations which I should like to put forward at this

time. I shall not go into the constitutional aspect of the bill. Other members have covered this principle. I shall not struggle with the bill in terms of its legal aspects. This, of course, is a field which is foreign to me. I shall deal with the bill in terms of how I consider it relates to human beings, national unity and the community in which I live.

First, from the point of view of nations becoming great and from the point of view of national unity I think history will bear me out in my observation that the melting pot theory is far more successful than the mosaic theory and that nations have become great not by emphasizing the differences in people but by projecting their similarities. If this were legislation that would do away with all records of racial origin and all the requirements for records of racial origin, I could give it my unequivocal support. Then we could get down to the business of being Canadians instead of having this endless haggle over English and French.

Many of my closest friends are of French origin. Many of them are of other nationalities. I come from a part of the country where men and women are taken at face value, for what they are, not who they are, and where race, colour, creed and, I might add, racial origin mean nothing. So it is rather mystifying and strange to me to come to this portion of Canada where a person's ancestry means so much. It is not evident to me that your idealistic theories on the beautiful mosaic of culture and creed have brought you very much unity or as much genuine understanding in the 300 years you have been here in eastern Canada as I think we have achieved in 80 years with our melting pot theory in the west.

If there is one mistake that we made in this country which we should remember it is the mistake we made in respect of our Indian population. One hundred years ago we made them different in a way far in excess of merely their colour or creed. We set them apart on islands unto themselves and called these islands reservations. We did not stop there. We looked after them by giving them special privileges and concessions as well. There is no need for me to finish that story. But is there not a parallel that can be drawn with the situation which confronts us here? I say, let requirements of culture and language fall as they may by the law of supply and demand, or should I say in the light of a language situation by supply and demand. I have travelled this country from coast to coast. I have heard much of the English majority and the French minority. Statements of this kind, however, do not bear close scrutiny.

[Mr. Downey.]

• (4:40 p.m.)

With relation now to western Canada and taking this figure from current statistics, I notice that 50 per cent of the people in the prairie provinces list their racial origins as other than English or French. Therefore, if we are going to be totally accurate we have to say that the population is comprised of Canadians of all ethnic origins including German, Ukrainian, Polish, Italian, Chinese, English, Scandinavians and a dozen others, the majority of whom use the English language in business. If we consider the number of minority groups in Canada, certainly we must conclude that those Canadians of French descent constitute one of the two majorities. With this mixture of people thrown together in this country, the farther we stay away from guarantees and special concessions to any group, the closer we will come to achieving what surely must be our ultimate goal—a united and strong Canada and a better standard of living.

For a moment I should like to dwell on what one might term a Trojan horse quality in respect of this proposed legislation. It may be that the government has no other intent in respect of this bill than that already expressed openly by its sponsors and authors. The fact remains that the terms of the bill make it capable of manipulation by determined and unscrupulous people toward the achievement of ends which would be impossible to attain directly and openly.

The organization and procedures envisaged in this bill are such as to open the door to the worst kind of political philandering and manipulation. As I read the terms of the bill it is open to any small group or even a single person, wholeheartedly dedicated to advancing the cause of the French language and culture across Canada, to arrange things so that a 10 per cent area could be created within any province. Because of the structure and terms of the bill, and because of the machinery provided to protect and nurture such areas, there is little doubt that such an area once established would flourish and grow despite the disproportionate cost which would be required in government effort and expenditure.

We must now consider such an area, duly established under this legislation, in the light

of what other benefits it might receive from existing federal legislation and legislation yet to come. I have in mind all the resources available to bolster and assist such areas, including those now available under this government, particularly from departments like that of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier). On the purely economic side I think of the vast resources already at the arbitrary beck and call of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). In view of the public speeches and statements of the two gentlemen at present holding these two portfolios, it would not be unreasonable to expect that they might pay more attention and give more assistance to one of these newly set-up areas. Of course the statements of the Prime Minister did nothing to allay the fears in this regard. Let me read from his statement to the constitutional conference held in Ottawa. He said:

> I repeat today, in the name of the federal government, that we are prepared to consider the provision by the federal government to the provinces who want to deal with the minorities in their province of the other official language, providing to them technical or financial assistance of one kind or another.

I will not labour that because I think it speaks for itself.

Let me go on to say that this bill contains the seeds of a plant about which we know nothing. We do not know, nor have we any way of calculating, what shape it will assume as it grows, what it will look like or what its characteristics may be. We are assured by the sponsors of this legislation, including the Prime Minister, that it will have an innocent and beneficial bloom. Watered by the cultural theories of the Secretary of State and generously fertilized by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, it could grow into a monster and choke off the healthy growth of our nation, causing untold problems.

I suppose one might say that the ultimate extension of possibilities inherent in this bill might lead into the political field. Once a 10 per cent area was established as a special bilingual area it could be carefully nursed through federal government assistance to the point of development where it would invite gerrymandering in the future redistribution of federal electoral seats. We should remember that such areas, once established, will inevitably attract special attention and treatment from Ottawa. This could only be done at the expense of equality in the treatment afforded other provincial centres. None of these things may happen, but in all seriousness I suggest that the possibility they will is in essence the basis of this legislation. There can be little doubt that its provisions make this entirely possible.

I should like to point out at this time that some of the objections voiced against this bill, objections which I notice are coming at least in part from western Canada, are based on economic grounds and have to some extent been built up by discontent with the province of Quebec. Many of these involve small matters, probably oversights on the part of busy cabinet ministers. One might say they are not related to this bill at all, but in context with the position of the west they are relatively important. Let me cite a few examples.

I quote from a submission presented by the Manitoba Dairy Commission which states in part that there has been a transfer of the dairy products quota from the prairie provinces, amounting to 8,300,000 pounds, to the province of Quebec. This means in round figures a reduction to Manitoba of two million pounds, four million pounds to Saskatchewan, and two million pounds to Alberta. This does not in itself seem too bad, but when the people out west realize that they import 14 million pounds of butter from the province of Quebec, in respect of which the Canadian Dairy Commission is paying the shipping costs to the prairies, one can understand their discontent.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I quote from a report of the Western Hog Growers Association which is contained in the Edmonton *Journal* of April 11. This article states that the federal feed freight assistance and storage policy is a direct subsidy to eastern hog growers. It is calculated that this program subsidized Quebec hog growers to the extent of $8.10 per animal last year, compared with a subsidy of 40 cents in the western provinces.

I have another example, Mr. Speaker. I was thumbing through the order paper and noticed that 132 post offices were built in the province of Quebec in 1968, whereas in a province with a greater population, Ontario, only 72 were built or a little more than half the number built in Quebec. In Alberta only 13 post offices were built in that year, and poor old Manitoba had to settle for nine.

All these things contribute to the opposition to this bill. There is nothing wrong with our basic program of building post offices. There is nothing wrong with much of our present

dairy policy. There is perhaps nothing wrong with the laudable aims presented on the face of this languages bill. But the crux of the matter is the interpretation and administration of these policies and laws. This is where the bind will come. Do we have confidence in the men who have established these policies and will administer the law? If we do not, are we not just opening up new avenues to advance inequality under the guise of equality?

I object to this legislation on other grounds, Mr. Speaker. To my mind it represents an attempt to do good by the wrong means. I do not believe the cause of bilingualism or national unity will be well served by resorting to law and compulsion. The legalistic approach reflected in the government's attempt to ram this legislation through parliament can lead only to endless trouble, needless expense and the creation of yet another bureaucratic monster, an expensive monster, to say the least. It will breed opposition to French language rights where none is now present. It will harden attitudes hopelessly in some areas of this country. There still exists a very good chance that opposition across Canada to the general acceptance of the French language can be overcome by time, experience and a policy of voluntary gradualism. In my opinion nothing will more quickly bring about the doom of this policy than any suggestion of compulsion or coercion.

There are in this country very few areas in which all these services are not now provided. This legislation could very well defeat its purpose and spawn resentment. If we impose bilingualism, not on the basis of its own intrinsic virtues but on arbitrary and highly questionable grounds, we will only widen the breach between French Canada and the rest of the country. No one can argue that Canadians being able to speak two languages is not a good thing. I have a very earnest desire to be bilingual. This is an achievement that brings great benefit to anyone. But the way to achieve general proficiency in both languages and general acceptance of the use of two languages must rest upon individual desire and co-operation, not on compulsion of federal law and enforced acceptance thereof.

It would be well if supporters of legislation such as this reconsidered the matter and studied closely the dual language problems of countries such as Switzerland, Belgium and South Africa. Let them study the background and evolution of language use in these nations and then compare the language conditions that exist in those countries. Perhaps even more important, the supporters of this legislation should take into consideration the attitude of the province of Quebec in this matter. This legislation has been received by the authorities of that province in a manner which, if one were entirely charitable, would be called something less than enthusiastic.

In addition, the general trend expressed by the leading men of all political parties in Quebec has been toward a unilingual, not bilingual, province. If the heart and home of French Canada, the cultural and linguistic core of the French Canadian society, is not in favour of this legislation or even of the concept of national bilingualism, how can we expect residents of Alberta, British Columbia or Newfoundland to be enthusiastic?

I shall not dwell upon the objections as to the cost the passage of this bill will entail. It is obvious that duplication of services and facilities will require a vastly increased amount of money which can only be raised by taxation. There remains the unknown and incalculable heritage that this bill will impose upon Canadians of generations to come. I foresee this heritage as only a fertile producer of trouble and more problems. At best, this legislation will create an unseen, unspoken barrier for the stubbornly unilingual, no matter of what racial origin. This shadow barrier will be erected and bolstered by federal legislation. Even now this barrier exists in some areas.

In the public service of Canada bilingualism is the dominant, though hidden, fact of life. In the public service of today it is an unmentioned but potent condition of employment, and certainly of advancement. If this policy is further buttressed by legislation such as that now before us, it will effectively debar from the public service all but a handful of Canadians whose mother tongue is other than French. If such an obvious step is taken to alienate western Canadian citizens from their capital and central government, it will not be surprising if the voice of western separatism becomes louder and louder.

This bill has been advanced on the premise that it will reinforce national unity. But in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, the passage of the bill could very well serve, no matter how well intentioned it is, only to disunite the people of Canada in the years to come.

**Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour):** Mr. Speaker, one of the notable features of this debate has been the general support by spokesmen of all parties in the house for the

principle of this bill. There has been a responsible approach to the issue of the official languages bill; hon. members have spoken responsibly and well in support of the measure. As a member of the government ranks, I have listened with great and appreciative interest to the remarks of certain opposition members.

Politics makes strange bedfellows. We have just heard a speech, not a notable one, delivered by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey). If all the actions which we contemplate in this house were to be judged only in terms of the worst eventualities of those actions, nothing would ever be accomplished by the House of Commons. Indeed, if the same philosophy had been applied to the field of invention the motor car would never have been invented because it is a danger to the pedestrian by virtue of the fact that cars travel upon roads. It was not the kind of speech which is a vote of confidence in Canada.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I happen to have on my desk a speech made by René Levesque as reported in the Toronto *Star* of April 28, 1969. He said the same thing as did the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey). Addressing himself to a cheering audience in Montreal he said: "We are taking Quebec out in five years. There will be no confederation any longer". He said that the government of Canada "denies English Canada this efficient centralization which it needs while at the same time tries to impose by force a fundamental amendment on biculturalism which it never wanted."

The hon. member for Battle River must have been reading Mr. Levesque's speech. But Mr. Levesque and separatists in all parts of Canada have a vested interest in making sure that nothing is ever done on the issue of culture and language. They are the only ones who will profit immeasurably from the continuation of the historical misunderstanding which has plagued Canada from coast to coast. It does not matter what language a separatist speaks—and they are not all confined to one province in Canada—he does not want any kind of rapprochement at all in this country because he knows the jig is up if there is any kind of agreement or better understanding between the two linguistic groups which founded this country. The hon. member for Battle River can have Mr. René Levesque. He may agree with his philosophy and he can get additional speeches made by him and quote from them, but the majority of the members of this house will not support him.

I am not saying that it is our party's exclusive concern to ensure the future of this country and to protect the rights of our citizens. Any member in any party in this house who makes that claim is being dishonest because it is not true. I have many friends in the house who are in other parties than I am and they have made very good speeches on this subject. I may disagree with them but they have as great a concern in keeping this country strong and united as I have, and I gladly admit it. I do not care about what might have been said from political platforms.

A few hon. members have spoken in opposition to the principle of the bill. I hope that despite this apparent disagreement, members of this house are going to provide unanimous support in the vote on second reading involving the principle of the bill. It does not matter whether there is disagreement now because we have to remember that we are going to refer the bill to a special committee which should call before it as many witnesses as possible to provide the assurance to members in all parts of the house that no one's rights will be violated in this country. We should hear from people concerned about civil servants and people concerned about the cost which the implementation of this bill will entail. That point was well made by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg). There is a legitimate concern in some parts of this country about the cost. This is certainly so in British Columbia although, as hon. members know, it will not cost very much in that province. Nevertheless there is concern about the cost in British Columbia as well as in other provinces.

Some hon. members have spoken as if approval of the principle of the bill will somehow destroy for all time the possibility of change or amendment. In fact, if we expedite second reading of this measure we will have the bill in committee where it should be right now so that members of all parties can subject it to scrutiny, and some of them are pretty talented in that field. If, after reviewing the testimony of witnesses and examining evidence, these members remain intransigent in their opposition, they will have every opportunity to register that opposition when the bill comes back to the house. They will have the right to vote against it if they wish to do so at that time. However, it would be a fine thing at least to have the unanimous consent of all hon. members to send the bill to the committee in the first place.

A word must be said about those on the opposition side of the house who have shown restraint during the discussion of the language bill. The language bill is a very tempting target for political demagogues and there are a few of them across the country, though I am not suggesting in this house. During this debate I think the chamber has been remarkably free of political demagoguery. Perhaps no other measure touching on our emotions to such a great extent, which has come before parliament, has provided such an opportunity for the construction of ramshackle arguments fabricated to stir public emotions and even hatred. Creating straw men and then knocking them down is an old political practice and the grand national sport of some people in public life. To an admirable extent most hon. members have taken the high road and have rejected the temptation to advance thinly disguised prejudices.

Efforts have been made to relate this measure to Rosenberg's racial theories in Nazi Germany, to suggest that this bill will make Canada into a banana republic and that the bill represents compulsion. I believe that a sinister kind of compulsion is suggested. These are arguments without credibility. Some hon. members have professed to see in the bill a violation of the B.N.A. Act. This is a legitimate concern on the part of some people. Of course, the same document is cited on occasion by these very same speakers as being outmoded and out of tune with the times. We heard an excellent speech by the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) as recorded at page 54 of *Hansard* of September 16, 1968. At that time he said:

> I am sure Canadians hope that when we are ready with reforms and amendments to our constitution we shall be able to achieve those reforms and those amendments here in Canada.

He was speaking for the official opposition and urging constitutional reform. Yet some spokesmen in this debate have stood in their places and said that this bill is a violation of that sacred precept, the B.N.A. Act. They say that the bill is out of tune with the times and that the B.N.A. Act is a sacred precept which must not be questioned. Let us remember that if we are prepared to challenge this measure on the grounds of constitutional violation we will open to question a number of actions in many fields, including every other piece of legislation dealing with the French or English language adopted by the federal authorities since the year 1867. It would not be a very profitable discussion, but perhaps it would be a field day for the lawyers.



There is a general consensus in all the parties today that there is nothing sacrosanct about the B.N.A. Act. It stood the test of time and some of it is relevant today but some of its provisions have become irrelevant, obsolete and detrimental to the development of Canada. All the parties recognize this. Our party does not have a monopoly on this view.

Some hon. members have said in this debate that economic problems are more important than linguistic or cultural matters. The point has been made time and time again that we cannot leave aside the resolution of Canada's basic problems other than culture and language, and of course that is entirely correct. However, it is a misinterpretation of the views of the government to suggest that this is the intent of the government. On October 17 of last year the Prime Minister said the following, and I quote from page 1487 of *Hansard* of that day:

> —it is a dangerous illusion to think that this resolution and the bill which will follow are the most important aspects of the problem of Canadian unity, important though they are. Even more important is the problem of poverty and of economic and social inequality across this country. It is the continuation of inequality and poverty that creates a real threat to our future. It is a well established sociological fact that nothing so much as economic and social insecurity produces deep prejudice which expresses itself in language and in social and racial disorder.

Of course we have to move on these other fronts as well. We have to move on the problems of poverty, regional inequality, housing, and all the others.

**An hon. Member:** Why don't we do so now?

**Another hon. Member:** We will, next year.

**Mr. Perrault:** No, this year. In other words, the government recognizes that the language bill by itself will not bring about the abolition of inequality. It is but one goal along the road to a better Canada.

The question is asked: Who stands to gain from the passage of the official languages bill? I suggest that the vast majority of Canadians in all provinces who want a strong and united country will gain from this bill. Who stands to lose the most? As I said earlier, separatists do, whatever their language, whatever their region. Separatism thrives on hate, discord and misunderstanding. Separatists want to drive a wedge between one part of Canada and the other. Separatists, whatever their language, counsel despair. We have an example in René Levesque. They counsel despair. It does not matter where they live. This is their language.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Here are some quotations I have gathered from various sources: "We'd be better off by ourselves. Let's have a unilingual state... Economically we would thrive." And: "We would be far more prosperous if we did not have to subsidize the rest of Canada." Where have we heard that before? A small handful of equally embittered men in other areas say: "The game's over. We are totally unconcerned about whether or not French language rights are extended in other parts of Canada. We shall go our own separate way." The siren song sung to the people of Toronto is: "You people in English speaking Canada need not worry at all about granting rights to people of French origin in other parts of the country because they will not last, in any case."

What is the true nature of the game these forces are playing? It is to alienate one province from another, to drive the country apart for the sake of their own egotistical political ambitions, to leave unattended the rancours and misunderstandings of history to the end that they may eventually destroy the Canada we know, a Canada cherished by all members of his house regardless of party.

So we have this bill before us. It is not a perfect bill. It is a bill which seeks to provide within certain realistic, even modest limits, guarantees for English speaking groups where French predominates and for French language groups where English predominates. It is often forgotten that it is a two-way bill, a bill which expresses the determination of almost all of us that the will of the people of Canada made clear by this parliament shall prevail over the narrow, insular, hate-wracked views of separatists wherever they may live in this nation.

No longer shall these mischief-makers be able to say: "The French minority is being persecuted in other parts of Canada; let us provide a haven here; let us become an independent state and then we can call them all home." No longer will other shrill separatist voices be able to trumpet the theme: "English language rights are being suppressed in French Canada.. Let Quebec go, and the sooner the better...We would do better on our own.", We have heard that in western Canada. We westerners know. Probably people in eastern Canada have heard it, too.

Of course the bill is not perfect. Nevertheless it represents at least a partial antidote to the hatreds which form the arsenal of separatists everywhere. As the Prime Minister has said, those who argue for separation in whatever form are prisoners of past injustice, blind to the possibilities of the future. The only people who will object to this bill are those who lack a vision of Canada in 1969 and beyond.

If we say to the French speaking Canadian who wants to remain a Canadian that the only place where he can be a French speaking citizen is in Quebec, we are making him look upon Quebec, not Canada, as the sole protector of his language and culture. And Canada would be the loser. If we say to the English speaking Canadian who wants to remain a Canadian that the only place where he can be an English speaking citizen is outside Quebec, we are making him look upon Ontario, British Columbia, or one of the other provinces as the protector of his language and culture. And again Canada would be the loser.

The official languages bill provides guarantees that Canadians can look to the central government not to any one provincial government, for the preservation and development of the language and culture of their language groups, and it guarantees, as well that the rights of all people, of either ethnic origin or of all ethnic origins, will be protected.

Together with others from my province I have received letters of support for this measure as well as letters of condemnation. I have quite an interesting file on the subject, and I am sure other hon. members have one as well. Most of the letters in opposition stem, I am convinced, from a misunderstanding of the bill. The measure has been widely misinterpreted, perhaps innocently in most cases, as an attempt to force English speaking Canadians to learn French. Some suggest it is solely an attempt to make French an official language in areas where there is a French speaking population of at least 10 per cent. Yet, as one western newspaper has stated editorially, it has been overlooked that English has also become an official language in areas throughout Quebec where there is an English speaking population of at least 10 per cent.

As enunciated yesterday by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), it is the government's wish and intention to avoid a confrontation in the courts over the constitutionality of this measure. It is to be hoped—and I express this hope as one who spent some time in a provincial legislature—that the western provinces will not choose to challenge this proposed act. Among other reasons, the bill as outlined will affect the western provinces only to a minimal extent. The delay brought about by a

challenge in the Supreme Court would result in unfairness to minority language citizens in provinces in which the act would be widely applicable.

It should be of interest to those who read into this bill a desire of the government to impose compulsory bilingualism that if we apply the bilingual district recommendations contained in the B and B report, British Columbia would have not one single bilingual district. Alberta would have one, Saskatchewan one—I suggest that Battle River voters should please note—and Manitoba, four. The provinces of New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec, each of which has expressed an interest in bilingual services, would have no fewer than 43 bilingual districts among them. New Brunswick would have eight. Ontario would have 11. Quebec, where the minority language to be protected and served under the proposed act would be English, would have 24 English language bilingual districts. So there would be 24 in Quebec and two in Saskatchewan, the home of Battle River.

**An hon. Member:** No, no. Alberta.

**Mr. Perrault:** Is it Alberta? I am sorry.

**Mr. Horner:** Get your facts right.

**Mr. Perrault:** Yes. I apologize to the people of Saskatchewan.

As was pointed out so well in one of the leading western newspapers, the Edmonton *Journal*, on February 4, 1969:

> If a constitutional challenge is launched, four provinces, involved to the extent of six bilingual districts, would be delaying for years the implementation of federal bilingual services in three provinces involved to the extent of 43 bilingual districts.

In effect, it would deny English speaking residents in Quebec in 24 of these proposed districts the rights to which they are entitled. For reasons which the Minister of Justice gave yesterday there seems to be no valid ground now, if any existed at any time, for a challenge in the Supreme Court. The history of this proposed legislation is one of discussion, consultation and efforts to avoid confrontation. At the federal-provincial conference in February suggestions were made that Ottawa should consult with the provinces when contemplating programs which directly affect the provincial interest. In my opinion there is at least partial validity to the arguments put forward by the provincial premiers in this connection. In the case of the official languages bill, this process of consultation began last October. There has not been a measure in the history of the Canadian parliament concerning which there has been more useful consultation. It has been a two-way dialogue between the provinces and the federal government.

Changes have been proposed in the area of the direct implementation of the bill. I, for one, welcome enthusiastically the amendment which reaffirms and restates the policy of maximum attention to merit in matters concerning hiring and promotion in the civil service, crown corporations and the armed forces. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that hiring policy as it affects civil servants and advancement in the public service must start first of all on the basis of ability to do the job. Willingness, or the ability, to speak the other language must be regarded as a merit factor but competence to perform the assignment must be the top priority with no discrimination shown on any other ground.

It is a constructive proposal to have the provinces determine the point at which bilingual court facilities can be established. Both these amendments indicate an understanding on the part of the national government of the problems facing certain provinces in implementing fully the terms of the official languages bill. Often we hear it said that the problems in the maritimes should be given a greater measure of understanding. It is said that Quebec has problems not appreciated by all of us. The same claim may be made with respect to Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Often the west is portrayed as an area peopled by intransigent, inflexible Canadians enjoying above average incomes in some areas and a below average comprehension of questions relating to national unity. As a westerner this diagnosis represents a vast oversimplification and is not fair to the people living in western Canada.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I ask for understanding for my province of British Columbia. If we are not as bilingual and bicultural as some other provinces, it is because long ago when people first saw the possibility of settlement in our province relatively few people of French language and culture came to help us settle the province. Those who did come made a fine contribution and have maintained significantly their French language and cultural rights, at the same time contributing richly to the development of our economy in British Columbia. When our institutions were being shaped,

formed and developed, few from the French area of Canada were there to help.

We developed a multicultural province. Settling of the province was accomplished by the English, Scots, Irish, Welsh, Americans, Ukrainians, Chinese, Japanese, Germans, Italians, Hungarians, Scandinavians and people from many other lands, but very few French. So if we in British Columbia appear to be bewildered at times about the bilingualism dialogue, at least part of the fault must be laid at the doorstep of the leaders of French Canada historically, who many years ago determined to concentrate on a program of developing primarily within the boundaries of one province their language and cultural institutions. I suggest it is unfair to say to British Columbians that they should get with it and appreciate a dialogue that most of them thought was confined to the St. Lawrence river valley. Perhaps in the context of this historical fact the attitude of British Columbians and many other western Canadians can be understood.

We are as interested in national unity as anyone living in Ontario, the maritimes or Quebec. But we have developed and grown in a different way. We have had people of all races and religions come to the province. It is an area remarkably free of prejudice of any kind. I am proud of the west and I do not like some of the cynical editorials that we see written in eastern Canada which suggest that somehow western Canadians belong in the neanderthal age because they do not fully agree with all the policies that are advanced in other parts of Canada.

The amendments recognize—and this is why I welcome them—the unique evolution of the western provinces. In this sense the amendments are conciliatory and very useful, and I hope they will be welcomed by the people of my province.

As we move to send the bill to a special committee we should remember that only a year ago the Prime Minister travelled to every part of Canada with one message which he delivered in both French and English. He expressed his views on language rights and spoke of them in the campaign everywhere he went, from one end of Canada to the other. Speaking in both languages, he spoke of the need for guaranteeing to each language group the right to the protection and preservation of both languages. He was acclaimed and applauded, and significantly was elected with a substantial majority.

We now have the proposed legislation before us. With its amendments I believe it gives expression to the aspirations of most Canadians in most provinces. Happily it enjoys the support of most members of all parties in this house. This is not the time for hesitation, for criticism and backbiting; this is the time to give the bill second reading, approval in principle. Let us send it to the committee and make certain that it is the best possible legislation that can be produced at this time. Let members of all parties in the house make constructive contributions at the committee stage. It will then be time to approve the bill, either as it is or as amended, to implement it, and then get on with the job of moving on to other trouble spots in this country.

**Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this measure I suggest that this language bill is a conglomerate of administrative decisions compounded by constitutional infringement. To legislate on language rights is a direct intrusion into an area reserved for constitutional enactment.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) knows that the only way he can validly proceed is to bring the matter before the constitutional conference and seek the consent of the provinces to amend the constitution. Since a constitutional conference will shortly be convening this would be an ideal time. Instead, he seeks to do by the back door what he dare not do by the front door. If this government, by a simple majority, can produce a constitutional change in an area so basic as language rights, there is no area of the constitution that they cannot deal with. To legislate the equality of both languages on an official basis is, of course, itself a constitutional amendment. The only real and effective guarantee of equality must be embedded in the constitution.

According to section 91(1) of the British North America Act, which was inserted by the St. Laurent government in 1949, parliament is prohibited from unilaterally legislating in the language field. This is, of course, the reason we have a constitution, so that those things inserted therein are accorded a degree of protection.

Now the Prime Minister has made the constitution a dead letter. He is driving a truck through Canada's constitution, simply treating it as though it did not exist. What one government can do, another government can do.

If constitutional prerogatives are to be treated with disdain, what is to prevent a government from altering the whole basis of educational rights simply by passing a bill in parliament? Then a following government could wipe out this provision by simply repealing it.

There are a number of questions which must be asked in regard to the bill itself. What does it seek to accomplish, and how successful is it in so doing? With regard to the use of the French language in parliament, that is already recognized. The use of French in the civil service was already announced as the policy of the Pearson government. This bill goes farther and translates into legislation what was previously announced as policy. Obviously the intention is that Canada shall become officially a bilingual nation with both languages granted equal status.

What about the bilingual districts? This is a new departure and one cannot be sure at this stage whether it is a wise one. As has already been stated, there is a danger of the bilingual districts becoming bilingual ghettos and of services provided there being denied elsewhere. This is a problem for the government.

What about industry? Will industry going into a district designated as a bilingual district be expected to observe that designation in its personnel policy? Will it be discreetly pointed out that an industry wishing to establish itself in a bilingual district and seek the benefit of area development assistance will be expected to conform to the bilingual character of the district? Is this to be part of the policy?

There are many other unanswered questions about bilingual districts. On what basis will they be set up? Can a minority of 100 in a block be expanded to include 900 of the majority in order to dilute the original ratio to 10 per cent? Can a minority of 1,000 be expanded to include 9,000 of the majority? Especially in rural areas this might mean that people living miles from the minority are included in the majority. If people in a bilingual district are entitled to service in their mother tongue at the federal level, they need it much more at the provincial and municipal level. If one area of government is bilingual at the federal level, how much more important that the lower levels are also bilingual. A citizen would be able to pay local taxes, converse with the dog tax licence bureau, do business with the income tax inspector, the unemployment insurance official and with the R.C.M.P. Indeed this would be a good way to deal with speeding tickets. An army of people will be required to carry out even rudimentary government.



• (5:30 p.m.)

Other questions are being asked. Will bilingual districts be able to dissolve? There is no indication this will be possible. How will the criteria of a bilingual district be arrived at? Presumably the census-taker will decide the mother tongue of the citizen. Will it be the citizen's right to change this? Many citizens change their mother tongue in the midstream of life in a practical way. They start to think in the second language. There has been no definition of a mother tongue.

In a practical way it seems that the bilingual districts will be largely rural. Without the co-operation of the provincial governments, bilingual districts will not be carried forward without language education. Sociologists say that as well as being a poverty creator rural backwardness is largely educational. Will the resources be available to keep the extra educational facilities on an equal level with the neighbouring unilingual districts? In fact the bilingual rural districts will almost certainly be deprived areas.

What about the provinces? What is the situation when the federal government says to a province, we are setting up a number of bilingual districts in this province? What is the position of the provincial government? Surely language is a civil right under the jurisdiction of a province. Is there not going to be some degree of consultation with the province? What if the province's views on what constitutes a bilingual district differs from the views of the federal government?

These are some of the aspects which the government should have carefully studied before presenting this bill, rather than simply accepting the recommendations of the B and B Commission as though they were written on tablets of stone. If the bilingual districts become a bone of contention between the federal government and any or all provinces, surely this legislation will set back the cause of bilingualism rather than advancing it. We must carefully scrutinize the basic question of bilingualism in this country and view this bill in the light of the requirements of national unity.

Obviously the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is endeavouring to bring about a situation where he can point to the official equality of both languages from coast to coast as a counter to those who would separate Quebec

from the rest of Canada, partly on grounds of failure to recognize the language and culture of Quebec outside of that province. The question is whether this bill brings about such a situation effectively. In short, will it satisfy Mr. Levesque? Obviously the answer is no.

Presumably in setting up bilingual districts the Prime Minister has in mind seeking the consent of the provinces for setting up schools in both languages within those bilingual districts. This, of course, could only be done by agreement, and would in all likelihood require a constitutional amendment. It is reasonable that the enunciation of so basic a right should be inscribed in the constitution rather than simply by way of parliamentary enactment.

The real issues are recognition of both languages from coast to coast and education in both languages where warranted by demand. What is required is agreement on constitutional changes. The present bill, in so far as it seeks to accomplish what the Prime Minister knows is fundamental to the problem, is really little more than a declaration of intention. I venture to suggest this because we have been going at the problem the wrong way. Surely the place to start is with the prior consent of the provinces, through consultation and agreement. For some reason it has been very difficult to get the present government and its predecessor to see the necessity of the principle of prior consultation. Once it is accepted, I am sure we can begin to bring order out of chaos.

In essence the bill confirms what is already laid down in the B.N.A. Act with regard to the federal parliament and courts. It breaks new ground in the enactment in statutory form of the policy of bilingualism in the civil service, the provision of bilingual districts and the creation of the office of commissioner of official languages, who may hereinafter be referred to as the bilingual watchdog. Apparently he will be a sort of Auditor General of bilingualism. One hopes he will have more success in getting his recommendations adopted than the Auditor General has had with this government and its predecessor. The only thing that seems to be missing from the comprehensive description of the language commissioner's office and duties is the requirement that he and every member of his staff be bilingual.

This bill effectively rules that the whole of the civil service must be bilingual. This will include all the crown corporations. It is fine to say that merit will be the deciding factor, but when hiring new employees merit is of no value because it cannot be assessed. When an official is hiring new civil servants, bilingualism will be the first requirement. The officials cannot go wrong if he hires a bilingual person. However, he can go wrong when hiring a unilingual person no matter how great and merit-worthy that person may be.

To succeed in the civil service, bilingualism will be necessary. Crown corporations will be composed largely of French speaking personnel. There is no doubt that in the foreseeable future the majority of the business in Canada will be conducted in the English language, while civil service functions will largely be conducted by those with a French background. This will cause considerable inefficiency and probably duplication. Most French speaking Canadians will necessarily be recruited in the province of Quebec. As they move to other parts of Canada their French background may be lost within a generation.

• (5:40 p.m.)

To my knowledge, no country other than Belgium has attempted on a massive scale to have a bilingual population. There are nations such as Russia that have many languages but have remained with one official language. The people of India are struggling with this very same problem. Until now they have been using English, but they have finally decided upon one of their own languages and they intend to impose it as best they can upon the whole of that country.

We cannot live alone. If bilingualism is to be carried forward, surely it will truly embody the idea that French and English will be equally available throughout Canada at the federal level, and it also implies that services in these languages should be available at the provincial and municipal levels. Whether or not the country can afford this remains to be seen.

**Mr. Hy Chappell (Peel South):** Mr. Speaker, I accept the principle of two founding nations and the proposals contained in this bill. I believe that all the premiers of Canada and the majority of Canadians accept the principle of equality of English and French, and that the only real difference between us is by what manner and how quickly implementing procedures can be adopted to bring about our objective in the fairest and most effective manner.

As has been pointed out, the bill will raise some problems in administration but all these can and must be solved. But before we look

at them I wish to mention some of the positive aspects of this legislation so that we may weigh them against the effort required to accomplish the desired result.

What are some of the good things that the bill will do for Canada? It will promote among all French speaking and all English speaking Canadians a feeling of equality. It will improve and increase the mobility of these Canadians in all parts of Canada. It will open up opportunity for many, particularly of the younger generation, to enjoy two cultures and thus share more fully in the Canadian community. It will give Canadians an international image of bilingualism, good will and co-operation. It will carry out the will of certainly the majority of Canadians as expressed in the last election. Above all, without it we cannot maintain unity, or perhaps even long remain as Canadians. It is as simple as that.

Because the philosophy of the bill deals with fundamental human rights it has a status comparable to a constitutional document. Some will argue that the goal can be reached voluntarily and that legislation is not necessary. I cannot agree. At times and in certain places some would allow their personal views and prejudices to overcome the spirit of the principle, and this in turn could stimulate reciprocal intolerances and resentment. For that reason I think it better that the detail be spelled out in legislation so that the courts, the commissioner to be appointed pursuant to the bill, and all others know clearly the intention of parliament. This is not a time for loose ends.

But clause 11 bothers me. There are some wrinkles which require ironing out to prevent confusion in future. Clause 11(2) provides that in every federal court of record—Exchequer, Admiralty and Bankruptcy—held in the national capital region or in a federal bilingual district there is to be simultaneous translation, except where this service cannot be conveniently provided and a party would not be put at a disadvantage.

Clause 11(3) provides that in any criminal court—Magistrates Court, County Court Judge's Criminal Court, Supreme Court or Court of Appeal—the court may at the request of the accused order the proceedings to be held completely in one of the two languages. This would apply to the federal bilingual districts only. This discretionary power in the courts, however, does not apply to subclause (1).

Clause 11(1) provides that in every federal court or administrative tribunal and in every criminal court in Canada, as distinguished from those in bilingual districts only, the court must ensure that any person appearing and giving evidence before it may be heard in the official language of his choice, and that in being so heard he will not be placed at a disadvantage because he does not know the other official language.

This means that an accused or his counsel in being heard can plead, argue, address the court or jury, examine or cross-examine in the language of his choice, and this could take place in any part of Canada. There is no power in the court to relieve, as under subclauses (2) and (3). Certainly this is the ideal and must eventually come because anything less does not create equality. But apparently there were objections, probably based on the lack of bilingual lawyers and other bilingual personnel in the non-bilingual districts. The proposed amendment, tabled on May 20, changes the wording of this subclause to read:

> Any person giving evidence before such court may be heard in the official language of his choice.

This is probably meant to apply to his role as a witness only. But if so it is not necessary. Every Canadian already has the right to give evidence in the language of his choice through an interpreter in a criminal proceeding, and this is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

Dealing with the wording of the proposed amendment I point out that if an accused as a witness is heard in the language of his choice while giving his evidence, surely the court is bound to hear him in argument and in cross-examination in the same language. If so the desired change will not be accomplished. Rather than "heard" it would be better to say "he may give such evidence". Such an amendment could very well avoid an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada and a long period of uncertainty. As an alternative we could leave the clause as it is but make it applicable to the national capital region and the bilingual districts only. This I prefer because it would be relatively simple to provide this right in the bilingual districts where there is simultaneous translation.

I agree that there will be problems, for example in jury trials. But these problems have been overcome in Quebec, India, South Africa, Finland, Switzerland and other countries. It is no answer to say that in some parts of the country the percentage is not large enough. Once we adopt the equality of the two languages it must be as universal as

reasonably possible. With a bilingual bar we could overcome the difficulty almost immediately. Lawyers, next to politicians, will be involved the most, and to them will fall the opportunity to make a tremendous contribution to the success of this measure.

There are solutions available. What is to prevent reciprocal bar privileges and an exchange of students between bilingual provinces and the other provinces? Why can some of their instruction not be in the second language as is the case with many other students across Canada? Quebec and New Brunswick could export or lend us bilingual lawyers pending the development of our own.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Why could this bill not cover drafting as well? In Canada drafting is done in English and then it is translated into French. The preparation of important legislation should not involve the translation from one language to the other. The approach to legislation involving two languages and two cultures must be from a dynamic and not merely a mechanical point of view. Both should be drafted together as is the case in Switzerland. When they have a word there which cannot be translated they send it back to the legislative committee with the suggestion that another word which can be translated into their official languages be used. I suggest it is imperative that this type of drafting be commenced immediately. To save the expense of redrafting legislation in both languages in the nine common law provinces, uniformity in legislation should be encouraged. We should also push ahead with an agreed upon French-English dictionary for legislative purposes as has been done in Belgium. In Canada we are behind. We do not even have agreement among the universities concerning the acceptance of an English-French dictionary.

In conclusion may I say that I hope for speedy conclusion of this debate so that we may get on with the details in the committee as soon as possible.

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker, I rise to suggest that perhaps we might call it six o'clock. Could I call it six o'clock at this time?

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

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** It being six o'clock this house stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at two o'clock.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Thursday, May 22, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Sixth report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, in French and in English—Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Montmorency).

[*English*]

Seventh report of Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence—Mr. Wahn.

[*Translation*]

Seventh report of the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, in French and in English—Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport).

[*Editor's note: The text of the foregoing reports appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

### THE MINISTRY

READJUSTMENT OF MINISTERIAL FUNCTIONS

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) returned to the house recently following his illness he requested, and I readily consented, that he be permitted to work his way back into his portfolio on a gradual basis.

To permit this, a division of functions between the minister and the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatchewan (Mr. Lang) has been concluded and I should now like to inform the house of the area for which each minister will be responsible.

[*English*]

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) will bear full executive responsibility for the broad subject area of mines and geosciences which includes the geological survey of Canada, surveys and mapping, the mines branch, the observatories branch and the polar continental shelf project. He will in addition be responsible for matters falling under the title "Mineral Development".

• (2:10 p.m.)

The Minister without Portfolio from Saskatchewan (Mr. Lang) will bear full responsibility for those subject areas which may be broadly described as "water and co-ordination of renewable resources", and "energy development", including responsibility for the several Crown agencies and Crown corporations active in this area.

I should add that he will also continue to act as the acting minister in the event of an absence on the part of the minister.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might take this opportunity to express on behalf of my colleagues our good wishes to the minister concerned. We are happy to see him back in the house. I express the hope that he will very soon recover his full capacity, if not his former inclination to carve up those of us on this side of the house at will. Certainly we will be anxious to co-operate in respect of the division of authority as indicated by the Prime Minister. Even though this may add further complexity to our position, particularly in light of the fact that everything is now under review by the government, I am sure we can cope with this additional hazard.

### IMMIGRATION

POLICY APPLICABLE TO MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES OF OTHER COUNTRIES

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** I am pleased to make a statement on Canada's immigration policies and practices as they apply to members of the armed forces of other countries who seek permanent entry to Canada.

Members will recall my commitment to make such a statement following a government review of current practices. This review, which began late last year, was made necessary because of a number of difficulties which developed in the treatment of servicemen from other countries seeking landed immigrant status in Canada.

Up until January of last year, and for some years prior to that, Canadian immigration practice was not to process the applications—for permanent entry to Canada—of any persons known to be in the active military service of another country, unless and until such persons showed proof of discharge or imminent discharge.

In January 1968, this practice was eliminated in the case of military personnel applying from within Canada for landed immigrant status. For the most part, these would be servicemen who came to Canada as visitors and decided while here to apply for permanent entry. Under new instructions issued in January 1968, armed service applicants—including United States deserters—applying from within Canada were not to be refused admission because of their military status.

In other words, if a member of the armed forces of another country was legally in Canada as a non-immigrant, then decided while he was here to apply for landed immigrant status, such status was normally granted if he met normal immigration requirements.

At points outside Canada, at border points and immigration offices abroad, the instruction requiring proof of discharge remained in effect until July 29, 1968. On that date, the earlier mandatory practice requiring proof of discharge or imminent discharge was withdrawn, as it had been some six months earlier for military applicants who had already entered Canada as non-immigrants and then applied for landed immigrant status.

It was replaced by a practice which rested on the exercise of discretion given immigration officers under the regulations. Under this practice immigration officers at entry points and offices abroad could either consider or disregard active military service as a factor when processing applicants for landed immigrant status.

There still remained however a difference in the treatment of servicemen applying from within Canada and those applying at points of entry and offices abroad. The former, if they otherwise qualified, were granted landed immigrant status; the latter, on the other hand, could be refused entry even if they met normal selection criteria. The review which we undertook arose in part from this ambivalent situation.

The second matter which caused concern was the onus placed on immigration officers at points of entry and offices abroad to decide what if any bearing an applicant's military status should have on his admissibility. Even though a decision in this regard by an immigration officer at a border point or an office abroad had to be concurred in by a senior official, it still required the immigration officer in the initial instance, and indeed the senior officer himself, to rule on a highly controversial issue. The object of our review was to arrive at a practice which would apply equally to all categories of applicants and which would not require our officials to make such a difficult ruling.



In our review, and in making our decision, we also took note of the fact that our immigration policy is based on the principles of non-discrimination and universality. Hon. members will recall that in October, 1967, immigration to Canada except in the case of sponsored dependants was placed on what has become known as the "point system". Under this approach the normal practice is to admit all persons who achieve the required number of points, meet medical and security requirements, and have no criminal record. As hon. members know, points are based on such things as education, trade or professional training, knowledge of English and/or French, job demand in Canada, and so on.

As I noted earlier, in the case of military applicants steps toward greater liberalization were taken in January, 1968, and in July, 1968. We have now decided to carry the policy a step further. Membership in the armed service of another country, or desertion, if you like, potential or actual, will not be a factor in determining the eligibility of persons applying for landed immigrant status in Canada, whether such persons apply from within Canada at points of entry or at Canadian immigration offices abroad.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. MacEachen:** If a serviceman from another country meets our immigration criteria, he will not be turned down because he is still in the active service of his country. Therefore the selection criteria and requirements applying to him will be the same as those that apply to other applicants. Our basic position is that the question of an individual's membership or potential membership in the armed services of his own country is a matter to be settled between the individual and his government, and is not a matter in which we should become involved.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I might note that in the past 15 months since the new policy was put into effect for military personnel applying from within Canada, some 72 persons identified as U.S. servicemen have been allowed to stay in Canada, and another 27 are currently being processed; 7 decided to return to the United States before their applications were disposed of, and 19 were turned down because they failed to meet normal immigration criteria. Even though the liberalized policy has applied within Canada for some 15 months, the figures do not indicate any substantial entry of U.S. servicemen to Canada as immigrants.

I should like to remind the house that Canada has already undertaken certain commitments in connection with the armed forces of other countries serving in Canada which may be designated under the Visiting Forces Act of 1967. Stated briefly, under the Visiting Forces Act servicemen of countries covered by the act who desert from their units in Canada are subject to arrest in Canada by military authorities, and return to their unit. Subject to this, the decision I have announced becomes effective immediately. The result of that decision is to place all armed service applicants on the same footing regardless of country of origin, and to bring our policy on military deserters into line with our treatment of draft resisters.

• (2:20 p.m.)

**Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, whether or not we agree with the decision the minister has just announced, I believe we all agree that it is a good thing that a decision has been made to at least review the intolerable situation that has existed for Canadian immigration officers and the many other people involved in this issue.

It is obvious that the minister has been paying for the sins of his own predecessor in the ridiculous regulation with which he has had to cope during recent months, according to which Canadian immigration officers at points of entry and in foreign countries have had the responsibility of using their own discretion in dealing with deserters from the armed forces outside Canada who wish to enter Canada, a responsibility that immigration officers inside Canada have not had. This was due to the fact that those who otherwise come into the country are treated differently from those who apply from the outside and seek to cross the border legally so far as immigration laws are concerned. This discriminatory situation, so far as immigration officers of Canada are concerned, has been intolerable and certainly has justified many of the arguments that have been made as to whether or not we in Canada should admit as immigrants those who are actually deserters from the armed forces of other countries.

There is no doubt that the minister has yielded to pressure from within his own party and also has yielded to outside pressure groups which have taken the attitude that Canada should be a haven for those who seek to desert from the armed forces and the military obligations of their countries.

What troubles me about this is simply that here is another example where we are actually taking the lead in encouraging citizens of other countries to flout the law of their own country in order to seek haven here in Canada. I wonder what would be the situation if we were at war as we were in 1939 to 1941 and other friendly countries, particularly those that are our neighbours, were to adopt a policy whereby they became an open refuge for those who sought to desert from the Canadian armed forces. I wonder if the minister would agree with such a policy, as obviously he has placed himself in such a position by accepting deserters from the armed forces of other countries.

It is not just the United States that is involved here, because most countries have compulsory military service. It seems to me that in view of the general breakdown of law and order in the world at large we should be particularly careful about encouraging a further disregard for the laws of our country which I believe the citizens of any country have the responsibility to respect and obey.

I notice that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) seems to find my remarks somewhat amusing. I cannot understand such a reaction or attitude, because in his responsibility as the head of this nation he must understand that we can only maintain law and order in this country when we give respect to the laws not only of this country but of others.

There is just one question that I would like to raise. In making his announcement the minister did not indicate whether or not there had been consultation with the government of the United States prior to his decision. I say this because he himself points out in the announcement the statistics that relate to deserters coming from the United States into Canada. I think that at least if this was to be the basis of the minister's decision it would

only be the act of a friendly nation for Canada to consult with the United States government about the effects of such a policy as it might relate to the government of that country, and those who desert from the United States armed forces.

However, this is not the time for debate. I ask the minister whether this kind of policy is the right policy for Canada to be taking, even having regard for the fact that down through the centuries of our history Canada has been a refuge for people from all parts of the world.

I need only mention the United Empire Loyalists and the situation which existed during the United States civil war, both of which hardly relate to military deserters. In spite of this, in the present situation it seems to me that the least the government of Canada could have done was to consult with the governments of countries whose nationals might be seeking refuge here after deserting the armed forces.

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, the government's decision on this question is one with which free and civilized men everywhere will agree.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Members of the New Democratic party—

**Some hon. Members:** More flower power.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Perhaps those on my right would listen to my comments. Members of the New Democratic party, in contrast to some others, have a profound commitment to small "l" liberalism and to the free movement of people throughout the world. On this question we have said that the government's distinction between draft dodgers and deserters in terms of justice did not make sense and that in terms of Canada's immigration law it was unwarranted. We have said that a man's military status in a foreign country, whether the United States or Czechoslovakia, should have no bearing on his desirability as a citizen of this nation.

It is clear that some deserters and draft dodgers would not make good citizens. It is equally clear that many of them would make excellent citizens. The important point is that a military record as such, whether in the United States or anywhere else in the world, should have no bearing whatsoever on the question.

[Mr. Thompson.]

Contrary to the minister's assertion, however—and this is my only point of criticism—we repeat that we do not believe there is any innovation here in terms of Canadian law. As my party sees it, if the act had been properly interpreted in the first place the distinction made in recent years between deserters and draft dodgers would not have been made to begin with. We are pleased that the government has finally taken the position which should have prevailed in the first place. Just as one does not compliment a man who is normally a thief for not stealing a car, so at this time I do not feel strongly obliged to compliment the government for doing both what our law and civilized behaviour require.

Our tradition of welcoming those who are essentially political refugees goes back, as the hon. member to my right has just said, to the days of the United Empire Loyalists. I am pleased to see that this sound Canadian tradition has been restored.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, at first sight, we would indeed be in favour of banning any discrimination in the choice of immigrants, but if we take time to consider the actual reasons which led the government to change its attitude slightly, we must ask ourselves quite serious questions and our duty is to impart them to the house.

Our new policy, which concerns United States servicemen in particular should not one way or other embitter our relationship with our neighbours to the South.

We should remember other extremely important factors. Are the reasons which lead immigrants to become Canadian citizens strong enough? Are the applicants sufficiently qualified to be eligible? Is it desirable to admit people who come to Canada not because they like our country but because they feel compelled to disobey the laws of their own country? This is a factor that must be considered.

There are also other reasons with regard to this type of immigrants. We remember, as if it had happened yesterday, the conscription of 1942, and we know how deserters were treated. They were outlawed and run down by the authorities. Now, this is precisely the type of people we are going to accept in Canada.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe we cannot fully support this new government action.

• (2:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

## CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT RESPECTING PLACING OF BETS BY ONE PERSON FOR ANOTHER

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-197, to amend the Criminal Code.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

## CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING NEW AND CONTINUED COMPANIES, INTER-INSURANCE CONTRACTS, AND OTHER SUBJECTS

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-198, to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

## PLANT NOISE ABATEMENT ACT

MEASURE SETTING OUT MAXIMUM NOISE LEVELS

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-199, respecting noise in factories.

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

**Mr. Mather:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to combat a major health hazard in industry by requiring that the noise levels in establishments having contracts with the government of Canada shall be at a maximum of 85 decibels. The noise level at 85 decibels is said by health experts to be such that one can hardly hear oneself talk. I might point out that similar legislation to this was enacted earlier this week in the United States and is now law in that country.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

## PRIVILEGE

MR. SKOBERG—REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO RAILWAY SAFETY

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I understand that the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) has a question of privilege that he wants to bring to the attention of the house at this time. Unfortunately, because we moved a little too fast he was not given an opportunity to do so at the opening of the house. Perhaps hon. members might want to allow the hon. member for Moose Jaw to indicate to the house at this time what is the question of privilege that he desires to raise.

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to rise on a question of privilege having to do with the failure of the government to respond to my appeals for a public inquiry into the alarming series of railway mishaps.

I originally brought the matter of rail safety and mishaps to the attention of the minister of transport on January 8, and to date there has not been any action on the part of the government to initiate or establish a public inquiry into the increasing number of mishaps on the railways. As a member of parliament who has some experience in railway operations, and inasmuch as I have been attempting, without avail, to have a public inquiry conducted, and particularly in view of the collision last night in which two members of a crew lost their lives and many passengers were injured, could I not, through you, Mr. Speaker, implore the government immediately to set up a public inquiry with terms of reference broad enough to conduct a meaningful investigation into the causes of such mishaps, and the safety of all rail operations?

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps it should not be necessary for the Chair to make a ruling on the point raised by the hon. member. He suspects, I would think, that this is not really a question of privilege. The hon. member has at most a grievance, perhaps a question that he might want to pose during the question period. I would not think there was a true question of privilege in any event since no motion was proposed by the hon. member. I suggest we go on to the business of the house at this time in our proceedings, which is that of oral questions.

# ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

## NATIONAL PARKS

GRANTS OF LAND IN PERPETUITY

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, following up an answer that he gave me yesterday when he stated that the policy with regard to

our national parks is flexible. I asked the minister whether this meant that the government of Canada had abandoned the previous firm policy adopted by successive governments, and as stated by his predecessor, the present Minister of Public Works, on March 5, 1968, when the then minister said that "the policy is, and always has been, that land for national parks should be made available free from encumbrance, and the national parks system then develops and manages the park".

In view of the fact that the federal government has always insisted on a province turning over absolute title to land before it can be accepted for national park purposes, does this represent a change in policy? I want to make it very clear that I am not objecting to the arrangement made in regard to the province of Quebec; I am seeking information.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I should like to object to the hon. leader's statement. I think he should make his point in the form of a question rather than in the form of a pronouncement. The question is a valid one, of course, and to the extent that the statement is a question the minister may wish to reply.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, the government of Quebec is granting the federal government ownership and possession of the land of Forillon Park for a period of 99 years, in accordance with the principles contained in the Quebec Civil code regarding long leases which allow the transfer of ownership for a term of time.

[*English*]

**Mr. Stanfield:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Am I to understand that the government of Canada, negotiating as it is with the government of Nova Scotia for a satellite park in connection with Kejimkujic, will be prepared to accept land from that province on the same terms? Or, will the terms be negotiated as was done in the case of the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia and as was done in the case of the national park announced yesterday?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the provisions of the Civil Code may be applied in Common Law. We are negotiating agreements with the provinces; I did not receive any other suggestion of this kind from any province, and I have no intention of accepting any.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

[*English*]

**Mr. Stanfield:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am asking the minister if he will review what he said and apply a uniform principle across the country. I ask this question, not to create trouble, but in the cause of national unity.

## FINANCE

POSITION OF ROYAL SECURITIES CORPORATION AFTER TAKE-OVER BY U.S. COMPANY—POSSIBILITY OF COMBINES INQUIRY

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister? In view of the imminent take-over of Royal Securities Corporation Limited by a United States company, may I ask whether the Royal Securities Corporation will continue as a Canadian money market dealer with rediscount facilities and thus participate in the weekly auction of treasury bills, or does the government intend to restrict the rediscounting facilities of the Bank of Canada exclusively to Canadian owned investment dealers?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the details of that question, I must ask the hon. member to refer them to the Minister of Finance. On the principle of the matter alluded to by the hon. member I can only repeat, with more force than previously, what has already been said from time to time in the house. This matter is of concern to the government and may lead us to a position where we shall want to state some general policies that will apply to the role of financial institutions in the country. I can only confess that what the hon. member stated is a new happening and we are not in a position, under the law as we see it, to do anything because of constitutional and statutory considerations. But I recognize the seriousness of the operation and undertake to have the government look more deeply at the policy consequences of this event.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the serious implications flowing from having our financial institutions fall into the hands of foreign investors and in view of rumours that other investment houses are being solicited to follow a course similar to that of Royal Securities Corporation Limited, does the government intend to take steps to prevent this merger, lest it be followed by other mergers that eventually could affect the financial situation of the Canadian government?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, whether we take any steps or not will depend on the policy decisions to which I have just alluded. Because there are these rumours I am stating officially that the government is concerned about these events. There is a need for us to look carefully at such take-over bids. I emphasize that, this position does not contradict the position of our welcoming foreign capital into this country. Nevertheless, we believe there are certain areas of our economy which are of great importance to us, and a decision will be taken by the government with regard to them.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the company will take a decision within a matter of days and since another government acted very quickly in the matter of an attempted take-over by a United States bank of a Canadian bank, will the government act or make some statement of policy before this merger goes into effect?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member realizes that under the constitution banks come squarely within federal jurisdiction. The institutions we are considering here do not fall squarely into the same category, and therefore we are not in a position to state policy with as much strength as would be the case if banks were being considered.

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I realize that what the Prime Minister has just said is entirely correct. Having regard to the serious potentialities in the take-over of Royal Securities Corporation, I wonder whether the government has considered having an investigation conducted under the Combines Investigation Act with a view to taking immediate action?

My understanding is that the directors of Royal Securities Corporation Limited will meet today or tomorrow. Considering the great importance of Canadian financial security and the preservation of our economic independence, I ask why the government would not act as I suggested it should. This is a most serious matter which I raised two or three days ago, and I am gratified to hear the Prime Minister's general statement. But can no specific action be taken now? Can he not communicate with officials of the Royal Securities Corporation and ask them to delay this merger? It is dangerous for Canada when we allow our financial institutions to be taken over in this way.



**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, there appears to be unanimity in this house about the seriousness of this proposition. I believe the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs reported the other day that he was considering the matter. Thus far his information has been that we cannot act under the Combines Investigation Act. The matter is still being reviewed however. I envisage that if we cannot act in a strictly federal sense we might possibly alert the provincial governments to take some joint action in an area as important as this one to the Canadian economy and government.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the prevailing concept of co-operative federalism, will the suggestion I am about to make have any appeal? Could the government of Canada not communicate with the government of Ontario, which has a securities commission with jurisdiction to act in this field? Has the government considered such action?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the questions which are being asked in the house this afternoon and the answers being given will in some appropriate way be brought to the attention of the government of Ontario.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The federal government has power in the matter of granting rediscounting facilities with respect to the Bank of Canada. Will the government indicate whether these facilities will be denied to Royal Securities Corporation Limited so that Merrill Lynch and associates will not be able to do through the back door what they are unable to do at the present time under their own name?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question, as I indicated when talking about the technical aspect of the matter, can more properly be dealt with by the Minister of Finance.

[*Translation*]

## LABOUR

### MONTREAL—LAY-OFF OF CANADIAN VICKERS EMPLOYEES

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

As Mr. Michel Chartrand, a friend of the minister, advised 500 workers of Canadian

Vickers to stay on strike as long as the federal government has not taken action to keep the shipyard in operation, is the minister taking steps to prevent Canadian Vickers from closing it down?

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, as my bond of friendship with Mr. Michel Chartrand is about the same as that of the hon. member, it is certainly not for that reason that there would be an intervention.

As for the problem facing Canadian Vickers, it is extremely serious, and I think this part of the question should be directed to the Minister of Labour, and not to me.

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

As Mr. Michel Chartrand is a friend of us both, would the minister consider advising Canadian Vickers to sell their shares to Mr. Michel Chartrand, so that he could become the employer?

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** The shipyard would close down even sooner, Mr. Speaker.

## SHIPBUILDING

ENCOURAGEMENT TO MAINTAIN MERCHANT SERVICE

**Mr. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, my question is a supplementary to an earlier one and should probably be directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

To avoid the closing down of Canadian Vickers and the laying-off of hundreds of workers, would the minister consider reapplying the policy of subsidies inaugurated by the Progressive Conservative government and which consisted in giving substantial aid to the dockyards for the building of ships?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** That policy is still in force, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Asselin (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question. Does the government still plan, as the minister said during the election campaign, to establish a merchant service in Canada, and in this way help save the shipbuilding industry in Canada?

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the hon. member is asking the minister for a general policy statement, and I do not believe such a question can be asked at this time.

[Mr. Caouette.]

[*English*]

FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

**Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova):** As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce if he or his department has advised the shipbuilding industry that the government will not participate in a committee to investigate shipbuilding in Canada?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but I will find out.

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

HAL BANKS—POSSIBILITY OF RENEWING EXTRADITION PROCEEDINGS

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. A week ago today the Minister of Justice advised the house that he had asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs to confer with the U.S. Secretary of State to clarify the position of Mr. Hal Banks and the possibilities of extraditing this man to Canada. Can the minister advise the house what the results of these conversations have been?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the State Department is now looking into the legal issues and will inform us as soon as possible of its conclusions. They have not yet reached a conclusion.

## IMMIGRATION

SUBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF PERSONALITY BY OFFICIALS

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Now that he has satisfactorily cleared up the vexed question of the military status of would-be immigrants would he give consideration to revising the regulations so as to limit the purely subjective assessment of personality by immigration officers, which plays so large a part in the present point system?

**Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the immigration regulations and the act are under review now, and that matter will be considered also.

## CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

INQUIRY INTO LAXITY IN OPERATING EFFICIENCY

**Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton):** Mr. Speaker, my question has already been alluded to by the hon. member for Moose Jaw, but it is of such a critical nature that I too would ask the Prime Minister if he will order an inquiry into the operations of the C.N.R. to determine if there has been a decrease in operating efficiency and a consequent increase in hazard to the travelling public?

**Mr. Speaker:** While the matter is being pondered I will recognize the hon. member for Calgary Centre.

## OIL

SHIPMENT OF OFFSHORE PRODUCT TO AREA WEST OF OTTAWA RIVER

**Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, (Mr. Greene) or the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatchewan (Mr. Lang), whichever is in a position to answer. Has the government received information that since the opening of the shipping season on the Great Lakes off-shore petroleum products are being shipped into that part of Canada west of the Ottawa River which, under our national oil policy, is supposed to be supplied with western Canadian oil products?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, I do not have information at hand in the nature of a recent report on the situation, but the matter is being looked into at the present time.

**Mr. Harkness:** As a supplementary question will the minister take immediate steps to determine the extent of this penetration by foreign oil, and will he take immediate steps to see that it ceases?

**Mr. Lang:** As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, the facts are being found out and will be brought to my attention at an early date. At that time an appropriate decision will be taken.

MOVEMENT OF DRILLING RIG TO NEW ZEALAND

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources of which I have given him notice. It arises from an announcement that a multi-million dollar drilling rig is being moved by Shell Oil from the Vancouver island coast to New Zealand. Can the minister advise whether this move was caused by the delay in clearing up the administration of Canada's offshore oil resources?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the notice he gave me of his question. The answer is no. There is no such reason for the move. The Shell Oil Company announced ten days ago the completion of its two-year drilling program on the west coast.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PASSPORTS—RELAXATION OF BRITISH REQUIREMENTS

**Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Probably he will take notice of it when he finishes his private conversation with the Prime Minister. It has to do with the trouble that so many thousands of Canadians are meeting in obtaining passports. Is it true that British immigration requirements have been relaxed temporarily because of delay in issuing Canadian passports?

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not have a substantial objection to the question asked by the hon. member, but normally it should be asked directly rather than by asking for confirmation or denial of a statement. Substantially the question is in order and the minister may wish to reply.

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, we have been in touch with the British government representatives here who understand the great difficulties that have been caused by the enormous increase in passport applications, and in the present exceptional circumstances I understand that entry facilities are being accorded in emergency cases to Canadian travellers whose names are notified in advance to the British immigration authorities by the Canadian authorities. In certain emergency cases also the British immigration authorities may admit a Canadian traveller who is able to produce alternative proof of identity and citizenship. In both sets of cases no guarantee can be given in advance. A traveller proceeding in this manner does so at his own risk.

**Mr. Howe:** As a supplementary question, is the same program being carried out with regard to any other countries?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Sharp:** No, Mr. Speaker. Since a very large proportion of the travellers from Canada going overseas are going to the United Kingdom it seemed to us that this was the area of greatest concern.

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the advertising campaign conducted about passports, which appeared in newspapers on Saturday, is the extent of the government's campaign in this regard, or can we expect a more imaginative program?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of this report, and of what he has now said about a certain position of Canadians going to the United Kingdom without a passport, and since British citizens travelling to certain European countries do not require passports, may I ask the minister whether this could be added to the position of Canadian travellers?

**Mr. Sharp:** Mr. Speaker, I will take this as notice, but it is quite some time since we severed our colonial ties.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question of the minister. In view of the considerable interest and desire of a large number of our citizens who speak French to visit France, would the minister consider making the same sort of representations to the government of France as he has done with regard to the United Kingdom in order to assist travellers to that country?

**Mr. Sharp:** I will take this question as a suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

## TRADE

### WHEAT—FURTHER SHIPMENT TO JAPAN IN SETTLEMENT FOR INFERIOR QUALITY DELIVERED

**Mr. John Burton (Regina East):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Is the government giving consideration to compensating the Wheat Board for the $160,000 it had to pay to Japan in compensation for damaged grain shipped to that country?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** No, Mr. Speaker, but I was asked yesterday why it was a cash payment. The answer I received from the Wheat Board is that the negotiations between the board and the Japanese Food Agency were meant to be confidential, but in the light of the publicity given to this matter I can inform the house that there was agreement by both sides that a cash settlement was desirable. It was further agreed that payment would be directed to the wheat research organization of the Japanese Millers Association.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The western farmer pays through the nose again.

**Mr. Burton:** Has the government determined responsibility for the situation which arose in connection with this dispute?

**Mr. Speaker:** It seems to me that the hon. member is asking a question which had been asked previously.

**Mr. Burton:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and with all deference I might suggest that we have not obtained an answer to that question which was asked previously.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

### NATO—INQUIRY AS TO COMPLETE WITHDRAWAL OF CANADIAN FORCES

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Has a decision been made by the government to withdraw completely our forces in NATO, and also has a decision been made to announce the phasing out dates? I ask these questions in view of the remarks attributed to the President of the Privy Council in London yesterday.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, my information is that the President of the Privy Council talked about a reduction and not a withdrawal. Therefore there should be no confusion.

**Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the question addressed to the Prime Minister by the hon. member for Oxford. In view of the fact that the President of the Privy Council said a decision should be made prior to May 31 on the withdrawal of Canadian troops from NATO, was the President of the Privy Council stating government policy when he made that announcement?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Is the hon. member referring to the date now or the vocabulary?

**Mr. Thompson:** The date.

**Mr. Trudeau:** If it is the date, the vocabulary being reduction and not withdrawal, the Minister of National Defence informed the house yesterday, I believe, of the government timetable on that. The minister will be meeting next week with the NATO countries in Brussels. When he is in the house following his return from Brussels, which will be a week from Monday, he will announce to the house what transpired in Brussels. This will bring us, I think, to the first days of June.

**Mr. Thompson:** Mr. Speaker, my reason for the question is the confusion that has arisen concerning dates. The President of the Privy Council gave one date and the Minister of National Defence gave another.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Oxford.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** My supplementary has been largely covered by the hon. member for Red Deer.

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Prime Minister a supplementary question. In view of the fact the Prime Minister stated in the house some weeks ago that it was the policy of the government to be in agreement with NATO that the overall strength in Europe should be maintained, and in view of the fact that the government is now making it clear it is reducing its forces, whom does it expect to make up the deficit Canada is causing in this way?

**Mr. Speaker:** I would think the hon. member's supplementary is argumentative.

## DEFENCE PRODUCTION

### H.M.C.S. "BONAVENTURE"—POSSIBILITY OF SCRAPPING

**Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. Is it the intention of the government to scrap or decommission the *Bonaventure* and the aircraft involved?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. This question was asked yesterday.

## CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

### INQUIRY INTO LAXITY IN OPERATING EFFICIENCY

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the rash of mishaps on Canadian railways and the latest one last night on the Canadian National Railways, would the Prime Minister, with his colleague the Minister of Transport, take it upon himself to initiate immediately a public inquiry into the safety of train operations in Canada and the cause of these mishaps?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, this particular accident is being investigated by officials of the C.N.R. and the rail transport committee of the Canadian Transport Commission. We will wait to see what the report is before making any further statement.

**Mr. Skoberg:** In view of the increase in the number of accidents and mishaps on Canadian railways and the impossibility of having a public inquiry before the Canadian Transport Commission, would the Prime Minister not initiate an inquiry of his own in this regard?

**Mr. Trudeau:** If we did I am sure the opposition would say, "Another inquiry; another task force".

[*Translation*]

## IMMIGRATION

### CANADIANS WISHING TO RETURN TO CANADA

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Is he aware that Canadians, who now are American citizens and who would like to come back to Canada, are facing almost insuperable objections from the Canadian immigration authorities?

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion, the question asked in this way is not urgent. The hon. member wants to know whether the minister or the government is aware of certain facts. The question as put cannot be accepted.

[*English*]

## DOMINION-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

### CONSIDERATION AT JUNE MEETING OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR NATIVE PEOPLES

**Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Is he in a position to say whether questions concerning the constitutional responsibility for our Indian and native peoples generally will be considered at the federal-provincial conference in June?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, this subject is not on the agenda for the June meetings.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Simpson:** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Is the minister giving active consideration to changes in the existing federal-provincial cost sharing arrangement in respect of Indian programs?

**Mr. Speaker:** It would seem to me that this question is of a general nature and of a type which ought to be placed on the order paper.

## HOUSING

INQUIRY AS TO AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister in charge of housing. Now that the minister has had time to study his new responsibilities, can he indicate whether he will present amendments to the bill to amend the National Housing Act now before the house?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, I will be making an announcement on housing policy in my opening statement in the debate on second reading, and all these mysteries will unfold at that time.

## EDUCATION

EMPLOYMENT OF CANADIAN SCHOLARS IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration whether he will take an early opportunity to make a statement about a matter of growing concern in the country. I refer to the difficulty of qualified Canadians in receiving university appointments in this country, and the growth in the percentage of trained personnel from outside the country who are employed. Would the minister make a statement to the house in this regard? Also, in view of the practice of other countries, would he express his view concerning whether it would be helpful for his department to provide a service in association with the annual meetings of the learned societies which might facilitate qualified Canadians having their abilities fully understood and known by Canadian universities?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to consider the possibility of making a statement on this subject. It should be mentioned, I believe, as a preliminary that Canada itself is incapable, according to my information, of supplying the present needs of its own universities. There ought to be, on the basis of forward estimates, great opportunities in Canadian universities for Canadian scholars because at the present time in order to meet our own requirements we depend on the immigration of scholars from other parts of the world. I shall be glad to consider whether I can add anything useful in respect of the general question which has been raised.



## INCOME TAX

POSSIBLE WITHDRAWAL OF EXEMPTION EXTENDED TO FOREIGN TEACHERS

**Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister concerning the employment in Canadian universities of Canadian professors. In view of the fact that United States professors come to this country because they are given a two-year income tax holiday and do so in great numbers for their first two years of teaching to enjoy that benefit, would the minister take up with the Minister of Finance the granting of the same two-year tax holiday to Canadian teachers so they can compete?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has made a representation which I am sure has been noted.

## PUBLICATIONS

POSSIBLE REMOVAL OF EXEMPTION EXTENDED TO "TIME" MAGAZINE

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Postmaster General. Is the government giving consideration to the removal of the exemption given to *Time* magazine in 1964 from the restrictions against foreign publications which became effective at that time?

**Mr. Speaker:** I wonder how urgent this question is. I would think it is the type of question which should be placed on the order paper or discussed at the time of adjournment.

## IMMIGRATION

ADMISSION OF PERSONS WITH CRIMINAL RECORDS

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Are persons with criminal records admissible to Canada as immigrants?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I doubt whether that question is in order. Unless there are circumstances of which I am not aware I do not see why the question should be in order at this time.

**Mr. MacInnis:** With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, when the minister made his statement on motions he referred to the admissibility of immigrants to Canada and to their having no criminal records. I should like to ask whether this still applies.

**Mr. Basford:** How did your ancestors get in?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I understand that the general regulations as to criminal records in respect of immigrants still apply. This may not be the fact but it may involve a condition; and that is a straight answer to the question.

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, will the minister remember that Hal Banks is a deserter we very much want back?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he is aware of the fact that deserters from the United States army are more or less criminals under the laws of the United States and therefore not admissible to this country?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member and the minister that this is a debate and I do not think the supplementary question should be allowed.

**Mr. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, I now rise on a point of order in respect of the remark made by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Let me suggest to the minister, in reference to the remark he made about my ancestors, that it was not his ancestors who were involved but rather the natives who were responsible for that head he has.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think it should be mentioned for the record that both remarks were made in a spirit of levity.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## HOUSING

LIFTING OF FREEZE ON PUBLIC PROJECTS

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. If he has not already done so, is he now in a position to confirm the announcement made by the C.B.C. that the freeze in respect of public housing is to be lifted?

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting speculation. I will be making my statement, as I said before, on second reading of the bill before the house.

## THE MINISTRY

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in connection with his announcement today concerning the division of responsibility in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Will he advise who will be responsible for pollution control policy, if and when there is any?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, in so far as there is a policy coming under that department it will be related to the water aspect, and therefore the responsibility will rest upon the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker, I assume that the minister will also be the sponsor in bringing in the bill relating to the water act?

**Mr. Trudeau:** That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

NEWFOUNDLAND—REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF PLAN

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion whether he is in a position to inform the house if the economic development plan for the province of Newfoundland, including Labrador, has been completed by his department and, if so, when we can expect an announcement?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question some weeks ago.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

We have established permanent contacts between my department and the representatives of the government of Newfoundland, in order to find the best solutions to the economic problems of that province, but no general program for Newfoundland is being negotiated between the federal government and the provincial government.

[*English*]

## FLOODS

SASKATCHEWAN—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT RESPECTING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the heavy losses incurred by many residents of Saskatchewan as a result of flood damage, can the Minister of Public Works now say whether he has received any communication from the Saskatchewan government indicating flood damage costs and, if so, what action has the federal government taken?

**Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall any representations received from the Saskatchewan government in relation to work to be done by my department.

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

WOODS REPORT—REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION BY STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that on April 14 the minister told me not to lose heart and that my patience would be rewarded, and in view of the fact I have not lost heart and have been very patient, can the Minister of Veterans Affairs now tell me when the Woods report will be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs?

**Hon. John-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I will be consistent and advise the hon. member to continue to be patient.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the general notion that this session may adjourn at the end of June, can the minister say whether this report will be referred to the committee before that date?

**Mr. Dubé:** Mr. Speaker, we are advancing as quickly as possible with the preparation of the white paper.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I asked about the Woods report, not the white paper.

[Mr. Marchand (Langelier).]

## NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT RESPECTING SELF-GOVERNMENT

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, before you call the orders of the day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Inasmuch as it was some months ago that the minister said he had made his decision about the structure of local government in the Northwest Territories, can he advise the house now when he intends to inform the public about this decision?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Soon, Mr. Speaker.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—FAILURE TO SHARE THE ABUNDANCE OF GOODS AND SERVICES AVAILABLE

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue)** moved:

That, in the opinion of the house, the government has failed to take adequate measures in order to give Canadians the benefit of a policy of distribution of goods and services which would allow each citizen to obtain his share of Canadian abundance.

Mr. Speaker, the motion we are moving today clearly expresses our sincere belief that—

—the government has failed to take adequate measures in order to give Canadians the benefit of a policy of distribution of goods and services which would allow each citizen to obtain his share of Canadian abundance.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, if we go back a year, everyone will remember—the government members especially—the promises made by this government to the effect that once elected, it would establish a just society in Canada.

In last year's Speech from the Throne we could read in many places that the government planned to establish a just society, to fight poverty in Canada efficiently.

Well, a year later, we notice that the just society referred to, has not yet been established. We notice that the number of poor people is increasing instead of decreasing. We notice that instead of fighting poverty, the

government takes measures designed to fight the poor, and not poverty.

We try to lull the people by emphasizing the fact, for instance, that we live in a tremendously rich country, and while the government and its emissaries go around preaching how tremendously rich and prosperous is our country, the poor increase in number and poverty still exists in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage I should like to quote an article which appeared in the issue of May 15, 1969 of the magazine *Ensemble*, under this title: "Elimination of poverty: a collective responsibility." Here is what it said:

> Mr. Alfred Rouleau, Chairman of the Co-operation Board, stated that poverty breeds poverty, that the poor did not accept any more to be deprived of the essentials of life and that modern means of communication invited them to lead an easy life when they lack the basic essentials.
>
> Addressing a Montreal audience, he said that disorders in cities were due more to the existence of poverty amidst affluence rather than to any ideology.
>
> "In Quebec, about 450,000 persons (including children) are classified as people on welfare, whose family income is between $1,500 and $2,000 per year, that is from $35 to $45 per week. Those are the people who live in blighted areas of our cities and on marginal farms in our countryside. Add to that all the small wage-earners, the low income farmers and you will see that one out five Quebecers lives in poverty".

Such is the situation now, not only in Quebec but in Canada as a whole—because the poor are not all in Quebec.

Last Sunday I think it was, I heard mayor Drapeau speak in an interview in Montreal, about Man and His World.

When a mother blamed the municipal authorities for bringing poor people to "Man and His World", mayor Drapeau said: Admission is free for poor people.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the city of Montreal wants the poor to get in free of charge on the grounds of "Man and His World".

However, on their way there, the poor from the north, the east or the west end of the city realize even more how poor they are and feel worse than if they had stayed in their own backyards.

Mr. Speaker, these poor people are not asking for miracles. They simply claim the right to live a decent life and nothing else. We must admit that the blame for this is to be put on the distribution system in Canada. Production is no problem. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) who is here today knows perfectly well that we lack nothing here in Canada, everything is here in every small community of every Canadian province. But there is a lack of buying power so that Canadians cannot buy the products, share in the affluence which is there, right under their nose.

And what does such poor distribution breed? Want, unemployment, lack of housing and a lot of things of which the people are deprived.

The government has done nothing to settle the economic problems of the Canadian people. There have been commissions, task forces, inquiries to ascertain whether there were indeed poor people in the Gaspé area, in the West, in the riding of Saguenay.

**Mr. Gustave Blouin (Manicouagan):** You have forgotten the poor people from Manicouagan.

**Mr. Caouette:** All kinds of commissions have been set up to find out whether there were truly poor people and their reports state: "Yes, Mr. Minister, we have poor people in Canada."

We have now been here for seven years, and it is always the same old story, year in, year out, whether it be under the Conservatives or under the Liberals: nothing changes or when there is change, we get more of the same, for there is no solution.

**An hon. Member:** The same old gang.

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, the government has done nothing to solve the economic problems of the Canadians. Bright prospects had been held out to us, policy "makers" were appointed, not planners, but policy "makers" to study the possibilities of planning production.

Go and ask western farmers who are stuck with unsold wheat whether they need people to work out policies or whether they need to sell their production.

Go and ask our Canadian industrialists, wholesalers, retailers, small businessmen, small manufacturers, whether they need the government to work out policies to enable them to produce; those people already have what they need and the required know-how to plan and organize their production.

However, consumers exist also. Now, they need those things, but they do not have any purchasing power. The problem is one of "distribution" not of "production". And yet we waste time, in the House of Commons, talking about increasing production.

I heard the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) tell us not so long ago: let us increase our productivity. We do not even manage to dispose of our present production, and stupid people talk about increasing it on the ground that it would solve the economic problem. But it is exactly the opposite that happens: we still have production surpluses. Underconsumption does exist in Canada. We are more concerned with getting into bedrooms than with solving economic problems. What have we been doing for a month and a half? We have been studying Bill C-150 to know whether a man could go to bed with another man and whether women could get an abortion. We have been discussing all sorts of things.

According to the government, economic matters are not urgent.

At present, we are still dealing with the question of official languages, which is no doubt important, but not the most important. Those who are hungry, in Montreal, in Quebec City, or in my own area are not calling for a legislation on languages. They are asking for bread, clothes and decent housing, because those are their needs.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Caouette:** There is a common saying: It's no use preaching to a hungry man. If the government were more hungry, it might listen more readily to grievances than it is doing now. But we have everything we need in this house. It is obvious. But our constituents, our fellow citizens, in short all Canadians are lacking something when there are in our country 432,000 unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, if the problem is not tackled at the root, it is because governments are controlled by financial interests. "Tell me who pays you, I will tell who you serve". This old saying still goes and is still true. When some people are elected with electoral funds, they shut up in the house. That prevents people from taking a stand.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Caouette:** Some will say that the problem does not exist in Canada alone, but if government authorities do not take a stand, Mr. Speaker, who will run the risk of tackling economic problems?

In the U.S. publication *The Machinists* of May 15, one could read the following: "Money lenders dominate this Congress", with reference to the American Congress—

[*English*]

Money lenders dominate this Congress.

One out of five members of the present Congress in Washington has financial ties with banks or savings and loan institutions.

[*Translation*]

—so those people cannot speak freely. A kind of financial muzzle prevents them from defending the small, the oppressed, those who need protection and deserve it. Where is the evil, the obstacle which paralyses the distribution of plentiful wealth?

In 1934, a world-famous American economist, whose books are translated in French, Harold G. Moulton, made a study of the material resources and the services the United States could provide to individuals and families. In his book "America's Capacity to Produce", he came to the conclusion that at the peak of their prosperity, of the boom, they produced to only 80 per cent of their capacity and in the worst period of depression, to only 50 per cent.

At the same time, some people are destitute. Some are without work, unemployment is tolerated or, in other words, it is poverty amid riches.

In 1934, here in Canada heaps of wheat were burnt, flour bags were thrown in lakes Superior, Erie and Ontario, potatoes were blue-washed in New Brunswick, oranges were poisoned in the United States and millions of gallons of milk were poured daily in the sewers of New York, and Chicago.

At the same time, there were 6 million unemployed in the United States and about 600,000 or 700,000 in Canada, while our population was only some ten or eleven million.

Mr. Speaker, those are facts. Goods are destroyed rather than being distributed. What is lacking? Production? No. Distribution!

This is what Economist Moulton wrote in his book, and he added that yet thousands of people were starving to death.

One could say the same of Canada today. Plants are not operating at full capacity in many areas and there are 432,000 unemployed in Canada, according to official statistics. The increase in the number of people with jobs between the months of March and April has been higher than usual for this time of year. The figure of 7 million represented an increase of 158,000, but our population has increased more than that. The situation in Canada is worse than ever.

Mr. Moulton carried on his study on how the needs of Americans were being met. He gave some diagnostics in a study entitled: "America's capacity to consume", while the one already referred to was entitled: "America's capacity to produce".

• (3:30 p.m.)

He said it was a matter of lack of purchasing power. There is the rub.

We are short of money to buy the goods offered for sale. Everywhere in Canada, stores overflow with goods of all kinds. There is plenty of clothing to clothe all Canadians, there is enough food to feed all Canadians. There is no lack of lumber, nails, workers or contractors to build suitable and salubrious homes for the whole population.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, a great many of our fellow-Canadians are deprived of all these things and must be satisfied with the scanty pittance offered by the welfare services or the Unemployment insurance.

The government tells us: "Get ready to tighten your belts further." We will see that happen at the beginning of 1970.

When 1970 rolls around, we shall ask our poor people to accept worse poverty, while we shall continue paying tribute to financiers without grumbling and without objection to the shameless exploitation of the Canadian people by financiers who have government authorities under their thumb.

Mr. Speaker, in 1968, the federal debt reached $32,126 million. This year the Canadian government will pay $1,600 million in interests only for the service of that debt, that is over 10 per cent of the total national budget.

In 1965, the debts of the provinces amounted to $12,642 million, the municipal debts added up to $6,597,437,000. The debts at the three governmental levels totalled $52,165,437,000 and on that aggregate, in interests only, we had to pay the sum of $2,009,240,000 in 1965-1966.

We do not ask those people to tighten their belt. No sacrifices are demanded of them, but rather of mothers, fathers, workers, farmers, producers. We are sacrificing the low-income workers. We crush them with taxes, while with a stupid complacency we bow to this system of national banditry which plagues the population.

Mr. Speaker, we sincerely believe—and we say so in this house—that it all boils down to purchasing power. Let me read an excerpt from "America's Capacity to Consume" by the same author:

[*English*]

The unfulfilled consumptive desires of the American people are large enough to absorb a productive output many times that achieved in the peak year 1929. Even in lines of basic necessities great wants among the masses of the people still go unsatisfied. The trouble is clearly not lack of desire but lack of purchasing power.

[*Translation*]

That is the problem, and the government is afraid to face it. In the conclusion of "Increase in salaries or decrease in prices", Moulton confirms his diagnosis, and I quote:

So, the fact that the purchasing power of the masses is totally insufficient to absorb, on the basis of existing prices, the production of our national economy is a clear indication that this automatic distribution of wealth has broken down somewhere and, as a result, economic progress is slowed down.

That is exactly what is happening in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Ralliement créditiste are no fools when they suggest that the government should make use of the Bank of Canada to increase the income and the purchasing power of the citizens, so that they may be able to buy the goods of which there is an abundance in this country.

This year, according to forecasts, the national product will be around $70 billion and this will allow Canadians to earn around $52 billion.

There will still be, Mr. Speaker, a difference between Canadian production and Canadians' incomes. It will amount to about $20 billion; the government does not realize that.

When we ask for a distribution of supplementary incomes through national dividends, inflation does not come into the picture. It is not the Social Credit that causes inflation; it is the present system. Today, a dollar borrowed by the government is expected to swell to twice its size, to be worth two dollars; it is mathematically impossible.

One day I gave an example in parliament. According to official data, the building of the Jacques-Cartier bridge in Montreal cost $18 million. We paid $20 million interests on that bridge and we still owe $14 million. That is inflation.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) gave me this answer on television: "Yes, but see how useful the bridge is". The trucks can cross the bridge, carry heavy boxes, filled

with goods, etc. A very subtle way of bringing us around to paying three times what the bridge is worth.

I told the Secretary of State that the $20 million paid in interest could have paid for another Jacques-Cartier bridge, beside the present one, so that we could have offered the population a better service. Through sophistry, they try to save face and to justify themselves before the public.

As I said Canadians lack purchasing power under the present system. That is what the Créditistes have said all along. Some people do not have enough revenue; the hon. minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) and the hon. minister of Regional Economic Expansion are aware of that.

For others, income is eroded by taxes, thus weakened further. As to the unemployed, they have no income at all. Such is the situation in which a vast number of Canadians find themselves.

What do we propose? Many times in this house we have memtioned an increase in family allowances. We will ask again for family allowances, not taken from some and given to others in need, for that would be state socialism, which we fight, because we realize, as I said in English last night:

• (3:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

If we keep taking away from the haves to give to the have-nots, eventually we shall reach a point at which we shall have all kinds of have-nots and not many haves in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alfred Rouleau proposed the following:

1. Increase family allowances.
2. Guaranteed annual income.

At the time the chairman of the Co-operative Board was saying that family allowances should be increased, there are rumors in Canada that the government is about to cut back family allowances. They will probably not be taken away from families with yearly incomes of less than $6,000 or $5,000, but they will try to take them away from those with a yearly income of more than $8,000. They will reduce expenditures to be able to pay more interest to those who are now putting Canada into debt and are destroying the country.

Mr. Speaker, that is the solution the Prime Minister and the government will recommand, we are told to be ready to tighten our belt by early 1970.



The chairman of the Co-operative Board said the following:

—to increase family allowances in a substantial way, in order to abolish poverty.

That is one way of doing it. The Ralliement créditiste keeps asking for an increase in the allowances. Besides, Mr. Rouleau is not the only one. The fourth recommendation of the Canadian Welfare Council, in January 1969, runs as follows:

Benefits levels should be increased substantially in the federal family and youth allowances programs, and youth allowances should be expanded to include student allowances.

They also recommend the following:

Higher benefit levels in family and youth allowances programs offer a most effective and equitable method of recognizing family size among lower income families. As social security benefits, they should be taxable, but again only if recommendation 4 is satisfactorily implemented.

—to increase allowances.

The rate of recovery from higher income families will depend upon the manner and degree of recognition of family composition in the income tax structure.

Mr. Speaker, those are recommendations in the Canadian Welfare Council report published in January. Another recommendation of the same report reads as follows:

A non-contributory program or programs should be developed providing for the payment of flat-rate benefits to all permanently disabled persons and dependent survivors.

In his book entitled "Free Men and Free Market", the American economist Robert Tho. Banan makes the following suggestion about a minimum annual income, and I quote:

[*English*]

We shall need to adopt the concept of an absolute constitutional right to an income. This would guarantee to every citizen of the United States, and to every person who has resided within the United States for a period of five consecutive years, the right to an income from the federal government sufficient to enable him to live with dignity. No government agency, judicial body or other organization whatsoever should have the power to suspend or limit any payments assured by these guarantees.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, those are findings and suggestions made by economists.

We appeal to the good sense of the government. We are not trying to play politics by proposing the motion now under consideration. We have only been suggesting to the government some Creditiste solutions for many years.

The Prime Minister told me the other day that this would lead to inflation. Mr. Speaker, it cannot lead to inflation, because we are already suffering from it, but the Ralliement créditiste has never suggested that money should be printed inconsiderately. The Ralliement créditiste has always advocated a perfect balance between purchasing power and the goods and services available; this means that the money in circulation should be exactly proportionate to production.

Today, in Canada, we are not experiencing inflation, but deflation. I see the minister shaking his head—

When citizens from the constituency of Langelier do not have a cent in their pockets, is it inflation or deflation? When those people are unable to buy goods to be found in stores like Pollack or Le Syndicat de Québec, is it inflation or deflation? In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, inflation means having purchasing power without production. The money is therefore worthless, because nothing can be bought with it. The opposite is happening. Stores are filled with goods and the people are penniless. What do you call that? Inflation or deflation?

We are told about inflation because the government is looking for reasons to justify the poverty that prevails in Canada. Poverty is tolerated with an inconceivable and even shocking callousness, Mr. Speaker. For instance, some people lack the necessaries of life and some responsible people here tell us that inflation exists and that people must starve to death because our granaries are overflowing, and must be poorly dressed because there is a surplus of clothes.

Mr. Speaker, I knew the government in office in 1946, the same as in 1940.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I remember the recession when the Right Hon. Mackenzie King was prime minister and when the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett succeeded him in 1930. Mr. King came back in 1935, singing the same old song: We are faced with a recession. At that time, thousands of people, young and old, were lacking the necessities of life and were literally starving in Canada.

And suddenly in 1939, by a miracle, thousands of dollars were found for purposes of international slaughter, and money was never lacking to make destructive weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that if the government of Canada is able to find billions of dollars for killing purposes, it should also be able to find billions to guarantee the security and the freedom of the citizens of Canada.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time is expired.

**Some hon. Members:** More, more.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Has the hon. member the unanimous consent of the house to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Témiscamingue.

**Mr. Caouette:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank all my colleagues for giving me the opportunity to conclude my remarks and I shall not misuse the extra time granted to me.

If we can find billions of dollars for killing purposes as I said earlier, why could we not find some to live, to ensure security and freedom to those who clamour for them? Is the minister trying to tell me today that a family of four or five persons receiving welfare allowances of $135 per month in Montreal, Rouyn-Noranda, in the constituency of Langelier, in Quebec City or in my hon. friend's constituency of Mercier can live on such a low income?

Every day, I receive letters that should be forwarded to the provincial government but the federal government provides 50 per cent of welfare allowances. Mothers who are deprived of the bare necessities at home ask for an extra $10, $15 or $20 per month.

They write: "Mr. Caouette, one of my children is ill, but I cannot pay the doctor, because I have no medical assistance card. Since I need some extra money, could you write to the Quebec government to get it for me?

All day long I have to dictate letters addressed to the Quebec government, asking for pension adjustments for destitute people in the province of Quebec. And if we must do it, it is because governments do not take their responsibilities.

I am convinced that the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and the other government members receive letters like that. Therefore, they know the problem as well as I do. We know that there is no lack of products, because we have a very large quantities of everything in Canada. But we all know that it is the purchasing power which is lacking and even if we are called idiots or what

have you, this is the whole problem. We manage to solve it in time of war, but we cannot do so in time of peace. What do we want? To guarantee the vital minimum by way of a national dividend based on the gap between the production and the national income of Canadians. This dividend would not be based on the moon or on some kind of a hoax, as some people suggest from time to time but on realities, that is on the products and on the affluence that exist. This dividend would be available to everybody, to children as well as adults, regardless of income, because if we cause inspectors to intervene, they will eat up all the dividend, and there will be nothing left for the private citizen. We should have as little bureaucracy as possible.

It is recognized that large companies pay dividends to their shareholders, and the largest company in the country is Canada. Why should this company, which produces more than it earns, not be entitled to a dividend for each of its members, while this right is recognized for the big corporations. According to Canadian statistics, whenever there are production surpluses people could receive a dividend to enable them to purchase such products. That would not create inflation but would balance the Canadian economy. That would contribute to a more rational system. We would no longer have to see people starving to death in front of loads of products.

What do we suggest? That real costs be reduced through compensated discount. It was done during the war. I remember the compensated discount allowed on milk for instance. The producer was receiving the full amount for his quart of milk, while the government was paying two cents which represented a benefit for the consumer. During the war, the compensated discount policy was applied but once peace was restored, it was no longer possible. Compensated discount can no longer be allowed.

We believe that those two methods would restore financial order in Canada. For the application of these two systems we must use the Bank of Canada if the latter is to serve Canadian interests instead of scheming with the other banks in order to cover up the misdeeds of the present banking system, of those who really steal the national heritage.

Mr. Speaker, the Bank of Canada is called upon to play quite a different role if government and parliament decide to use it. For instance, what prevents the Bank of Canada from financing without interest the public sector of administration just as we do for some foreign countries?



The federal government has started using this policy of interest free loan to get the city of Montreal out of trouble; the government agreed to a $5 million loan—fancy, Mr. Speaker, $5 million—without interest, for the first time in the history of Canada. The government is improving.

I hope that thanks to enlightened men such as the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, we will succeed in obtaining loans without interest for the economic development of municipalities and provinces, leaving the private sector free to borrow from chartered banks as they do at this time.

That will not deprive the chartered banks of their lending power. However, that prevents bankers from ruining Canadians through a government which keeps taxing us, instead of giving us what belongs to us, fairly and rightfully.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we suggest that we should use the Bank of Canada. We do not mention it in our motion. The motion says:

> That, in the opinion of the house, the government has failed to take adequate measures in order to give Canadians the benefit of a policy of distribution of goods and services which would allow each citizen to obtain his share of Canadian abundance.

In my opinion, that motion deserves the confidence of hon. members. The government should take positive and progressive steps instead of backward steps, while saying to the citizens of Canada to be ready to tighten their belts in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, we have had enough belt tightening. We had plenty of that in the past, and we do not want it any more. We want more freedom and real security, we what ministers who act positively, not ministers who follow the American astronauts in their trip to the moon. We want people who are standing on both feet right here in Canada, who can see affluence but also hardship.

If we want to fight poverty, the time has come for us, as responsible Canadian parliamentarians, to take efficient steps that will insure security and freedom for everyone.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

• (4:00 p.m.)

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, I be-

lieve that the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) will go down in history, and rightly so, for his well-known talent and probably because he is the only politician I know who has spent his life successfully repeating more or less the same speech.

That is a feat of which no politician has shown himself capable, and is very likely due to his personal qualities as a speaker. He is so colorful that we listen to him, even when we know beforehand everything he is going to say.

Naturally, when guilelessly or guilefully a man starts making capital of peoples misery, he soon knows the sweet taste of success. Whether he is a Socialist, a Communist or a Créditiste, when he addresses a crowd, a group of people who are hungry, of people who are poor and when he tells them: "They should solve your problem, give you more money," I know of no speaker with a modicum of talent who will not be applauded.

People applaud, and rightly so, because it is their way of expressing themselves, of making their problems known. And when these problems are publicly recognized, I think that in a democratic country that is a sound reaction.

But the hon. member for Témiscamingue and his group must not be led to think, because they are applauded when they denounce the present state of affairs, that people approve of their ideas; indeed, the same applause would probably be given to anyone, with totally different tenets, who would mouth the same strictures. Of course, we are not all economists. I am not, and neither is the member for Témiscamingue. Just by reading his speech, we can see that economics are not really up his alley and that he lacks the required technical knowledge.

I would imagine that it seems at first to make sense when you tell people: "You lack purchasing power, there are enough goods in Canada to satisfy everybody's need. Give us the money and we will get our economy going by buying goods". This seems like a simple solution and apparently it makes sense; but when the hon. member says that all which is produced could easily be bought if we gave money to the people, we might run into a snag.

For instance, we export about 90 per cent of our asbestos. If tomorrow, for any reason the world asbestos markets were closed I wonder how we could sell all our asbestos and who would use it.

I wonder who will consume the wheat surplus, if we have one. Will people be expected to eat bread even without being hungry, just because there is a surplus of wheat?

And if, tomorrow, there is no foreign market for the paper industry, even if our people were crammed with purchasing power, they will not be expected, of course, to purchase the surplus paper.

That is an over-simplified solution, as for the national debt which I would like to be lower, of course, as I would like less interest to be paid. But all that is at variance with what the hon. member said, because interest on the federal debt was paid to Canadians. It did not disappear. In fact, the hon. member does not care a rap about the truth concerning the federal tax.

Here are the facts: We pay the interest to Canadians. The problem about our economy is not really that of the purchasing power compared with the over-all production, but it is the distribution of wealth in our country, where some have more than their share while others have not enough; that is exactly the opposite of what the hon. member said, but obviously, he wants to have it both ways.

He says that we should give to everyone, but without taking away from the "haves", as if we had entered an endless course. Even if some people abuse and take more than their share, let us not touch them; that is consistent with his ideas. That is why he is generally against trade-unionism which precisely seeks to ensure a better distribution of wealth.

Anyway, I am not going to discuss the Social Credit theory, because if it had any sound basis, Mr. Speaker, it would have been adopted by at least one responsible political party in the world. I know there are missionaries, but, I also know that there are people who have not understood and who continue to fight for illusions unfortunately.

I once knew someone who was working at our place and who wore a piece of wire around his foot because he was sure it would cure his arthritis. He had faith, he was sincere, and it was very touching to see the confidence he had in this piece of wire. One day, I advised him to see a doctor, someone who knew about those things and since then, he is feeling much better. But it took longer than it should have to cure him. Of course, the miracle he was expecting did not happen, but maybe this was the only realistic means.

So, in any case, that theory that nobody accepted and justifiably so, I do not intend to start demolishing it all over again, since this has already been done many times by persons both sincere and qualified. And even if it were completely demolished, the hon. member and his group would still believe in it, just like the guy with the piece of wire around his foot.

**An hon. Member:** That is a good one.

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** At any rate, governments have constantly, with more or less success, made an effort to settle the problem of the bad distribution of wealth in the country. This has been done with more or less sincerity, sometimes more or less competently, but all objectives have not been reached, far from it. However, to say that nothing was ever done in Canada for the poor, for the low income group, smacks of demagoguery. You have only to look at the record of our social legislation to see an effort has been made, in good faith always, in order to fill the basic needs of the population as a whole.

This has been done through social security legislation, whether it be the workmen's compensation acts at the provincial level, old age security pensions, family allowances, unemployment insurance benefits, aid to the needy, assistance to the blind, etc. All those legislations of a social character are meant to help the poor.

I agree this is not enough. We have tried to protect people against the risk of illness; hospital insurance has been established to allow people to get medical care; since then, more people go to hospital for treatment. Last year, medicare was established. Of course, the Ralliement Créditiste objected to it. In fact medicare is designed to allow people without the means to do so to call on doctors nonetheless. We believe that citizens have basic rights in that respect. People cannot say that we did not deal with that problem. The government did.

Of course, it is very easy to make jokes about homosexuality and abortion. However, there are values much greater than those upheld by our hon. friends. We have constantly been concerned by the problems of the people.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of this government for three years. I have devoted all my energy and whatever talent I have to try and understand the economic problems of the people and see whether a solution could be found.



First of all, I endeavoured to help the workers who had to face the drawbacks of technological developments. The government has substantially increased allowances in aid to workers. It has done away with discrimination. It has raised the mobility allowances. All in all, the manpower branch has been established to assist people facing difficulties.

I have taken over a new department and indeed my concern is to provide assistance for the underdeveloped and poor areas, and for the past year I have been having legislation drafted to that end.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Will miracles happen? I am sure that the problem will not be settled once and for all. However, I know that there will be less people in hardship conditions. How many? I do not know. I am not a magician like the people of the Ralliement créditiste. I did not find the philosophers' stone nor any magic formula, I have no direct communication with the Holy Ghost. I am trying simply within the economic, social and political structures which I know to help the people whom I represent. I think that I can help them more in this way than by simply making speeches.

Anyway, we will, through regional development, help the areas which are in an advanced state of poverty. The legislation will be tabled next week. The department is already created and we will try to have the richer provinces contribute a little more in order to help the poorer ones.

As all political parties in the world—except that inspired group that has found truth and is really in communication with the Holy Ghost—either from the left, the right or the centre, or saints as Gandhi or his successor, we believe that there is a limit in the distribution or the production of money and the failure is not in the total amount in existence but in the distribution of goods.

Mr. Speaker, this situation also exists in Canada and it is far more complex than has been suggested by the hon. member for Témiscamingue. In fact, there is at the present time in Canada certain areas where inflationist pressures are felt and others where there is a deflation.

It is far from easy to find a policy which would eradicate inflation in some parts of the country without at the same time making

people of the underdeveloped regions poorer than they are. That is one of the difficulties with which we are faced and that is why we absolutely need a regional development policy because the phenomenon is real, since this is the way Canada is made.

While the unemployment level is rather low in Ontario, it is very high in the Maritimes and in the eastern part of Quebec.

In Ontario, price pressures are very strong but almost inexistent in Maritimes.

But changing the fiscal system for the sake of the Maritime provinces, would result in more inflation in Ontario and in the provinces who now enjoy real affluence. The balance is a delicate one to establish.

Naturally, it would be simpler to say to the Bank of Canada: Print two billions, worth of dollar bills tomorrow and give them to the poor. The problem would then be solved. How happy I would be, as would be everyone else! How happy the capitalists would be! But what can we do? We know that even the parties closest to the people have never considered it possible. Even those who were prepared to die for a political ideal never believed it possible.

As for us, we are humans looking for truth in the darkness. We are not privileged enough to be in the paradise of light and evidence, and with all our imperfections, we try to help people who need it.

What I do not accept is people saying that the government has not acted promptly enough. Some may say to the government that there is a lot more to do. I find that quite normal, because I spent my life repeating it, and I do not blame those who say so, nor those who are putting the pressure on. It is part of the internal mechanism of our democracy, and from the moment these mechanisms cease to work, we will be in an extremely serious situation.

Therefore, I quite understand that. But telling the people, in high-soaring flights of demagogic eloquence that nothing is done for the poor, the small ones, for the economic problems of this country, smacks of demagogy, I am sorry to say. As a matter of fact, some things are being done and we can take as witnesses the old age pensioners. Of course, they do not go and spend the winter in Florida with their pension. I admit it. Such remarks can make anybody laugh.

However, when two elderly persons in a family each receive now $109 a month, they can at least get the bare necessities, go to the hospital and be treated free. If there is a blind person in the family, he is entitled to an allowance. It therefore means that in this country, there is a social security system which, in spite of its shortcomings, is complete enough, at least to provide for all cases of extreme hardship.

We also have an assistance plan of which the federal government shares 50 per cent of the costs. Of course, it is no great catch.

Besides, I can remember the time when the workers at my hon. friend's garage, the hon. member for Témiscamingue, went on strike. They felt they were not highly paid, but the garage owner told them: All the same, I cannot give you more than you produce in the garage. I do not know whether he was right or wrong, but his argument could surely be justified.

But what are we expected to do? I, for one, have no financial interest anywhere, not even in a garage. I hold no interest in any bank, in any system in the world. If I were convinced that by printing two billion dollars tomorrow morning, I could settle the political problem of Canada, you can be sure that, being in a better position than the hon. member for Témiscamingue, I would surely steal his formula.

It is really easy to accuse others of bad faith, and of gerrymandering with electoral funds.

I was never deterred from doing anything because of electoral funds. If the time should ever come when that is the case, you may be sure of one thing and that is that I shall no longer be here, because I have no interest in such things.

I am not saying that our friends are dishonest. On the contrary, they have the same good faith as the man who came to our place wearing a piece of wire on his foot and I admire that, because it is a matter of faith, and I respect those who have faith, even if it is not the same as mine.

At any rate, the federal government has always tried ever since confederation to equalize income, with more or less success.

First of all a railroad was built, in the belief that this would help to create a common market, that all regions of the country would benefit by it and develop harmoniously. It was found to be untrue.

At the same time, the Maritimes shipyards were ruined; the Maritimes became poor, while eastern Quebec and Ontario prospered.

For a long time the western provinces could not subsist due to the economic conditions of the wheat market. In the face of all sorts of difficulties, another formula was sought. And, following the Rowell-Sirois inquiry, the equalization payments formula was found, and money was taken from the richer provinces and given to the poorer ones to enable them to provide the same quality of service to their citizens, thus creating equality in Canada. After a few years of this system, one cannot say perhaps that the situation has been corrected but an effort was made to prevent the economic differences from widening between the rich and the poor provinces. However, those differences have not really been eliminated and are still too pronounced.

In the face of such facts—and the Liberal government was not necessarily the first to resort to such an innovation—special programs were sought in order to help underprivileged areas. As early as 1930 what is called in the West the PFRA was created. Then, late in 1950, ARDA and FRED were established. A little later, about 1963, 1964, 1965—I cannot recall the exact dates—an assistance plan was provided for the areas designated as underdeveloped.

When the hon. member for Témiscamingue says that we have set up commissions, this is a strange thing to say in a meeting. Only it is not true because ARDA—though this may be denied in the Lower St. Lawrence region—is more than a commission because an amount of $250 million has been voted for this single item. Maybe this program was not the one needed but to say that it was merely a commission is not true. ARDA may be considered inadequate and I, for one, think it is.

• (4:20 p.m.)

An agreement was made with Prince Edward Island. The assistance provided to that province will amount to $250 million. It may not be enough. It may not be the right way. It is a sincere and honest effort. We believe in it. However, no one should tell us that it is a case where a commission will bring down a report. It is not true. It is irresponsible, Mr. Speaker, to say things like that.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** I do like to laugh in the House of Commons, and the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) makes us laugh. However, I do not think that such remarks will contribute to enhance politics. Why should we systematically depreciate what is being done?

I am not in favour of the Progressive Conservatives' policy but I feel that they really did something worthwhile when they instituted professional training programs which promoted the development of vocational schools. I am convinced that they did not go far enough. However this is another problem. But to say that nothing is being done to help anyone, is to repeat exactly the same thing as Mr. Chartrand, and I say that for the benefit of the hon. member for Témiscamingue.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** Nothing sounds more like a speech by the hon. member for Témiscamingue, than a speech by Mr. Chartrand. They have the same substance, the same depth.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that in the field of social security, great progress has been made in the last few years—the opposition party need not praise us for it because we are not here for that. What we do is being done with public funds and there is no need for praise. In my opinion, health insurance is a basic measure.

I fought for health insurance. I believe in it because people who are sick—I have been sick in the past and perhaps it has happened to the hon. member too—and who cannot afford to get medical care, are in a very great distress. We fought to set up health insurance. That does not mean that we should be canonized. It has been done in some provinces—the hon. member who leads the New Democratic party here did it in his own province before it was done here.

It is not a matter for mutual praise. We just have to say that governments, in our country, can make mistakes. They may not go fast enough, they may not go far enough. As for all those who systematically, enjoy—especially at this time when Canada, faces real difficulties, not only from the linguistic and racial viewpoint, but also from the economic viewpoint—making irresponsible speeches, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that they are depreciating politics and doing nothing useful.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** There are people, even in my own party, with whom I fundamentally disagree on ideological grounds. I do not regard them as less honest for that. They try, according to their conception, to

solve the problems, but I do not see them in the same light. I am convinced that the very great majority of the Créditiste members, if not all of them—I would have to ask the leader to tell me that—want to help the Canadians.

I am convinced that the Ralliement créditiste wants to help the Canadians and their constituents. I do not question their sincerity. They have worked. Moreover, they have been useful, generally speaking, since they have stimulated us. Their theory, of course, will become a historical fact, as it happened with "Poujadisme" in France. People will say that a certain philosophy existed.

And that will be all. It will be forgotten. There will be something left of their action, and far from me the idea of attacking them mercilessly, to blame them for everything they did. On the contrary. However, I believe that when the government is attacked as it is now, this is somewhat unfair for the democratic system in which we live.

We have established special programs and their scope will be extended. We will try to make a more general attack against the so-called regional disparities. Of course, this is difficult, because there is only a certain amount of money at our disposal, and we must try to satisfy the main needs.

It is not possible, at the same time, during the same year, to buy a car, to go to Europe, to get one's wife a new fur coat, etc. This is not possible. The same principle applies on the national scale.

Those who believe that the Créditiste doctrine can solve the problems should go to India at the present time and they should try just by using the machine to print money, to solve all the problems which they have in that country.

Then, they will realize their arguments do not hold water. Anyway, we have tried to correct the discrepancies by equalizing taxes and by granting tax rebates to the provinces.

At present, all levels of government in Canada are paying $7,300 million in social benefits to help the poor.

Of course, it is not an extravagant amount. What are $7 billion? It all depends on the number of people sharing it. All the same, it is 10.6 per cent of the general gross income of Canada. It may not be enough and may not solve all the problems, yet, it is a help in our fight against poverty.

We shall now have to do our best to solve the problem of regional disparities. And we do intend to do so. There has been much talk about guaranteed annual income. This is not an idea to be discarded out of hand. Besides, we are now, in the government, in the process of revising the whole system of social welfare.

What will be the outcome? I do not know but our efforts should be coordinated. We shall have to find a simpler formula, so as to help those who are the most deprived.

Yet, we must manage to keep Canadian production growing and to allow our industrial technology to compete with its foreign counterpart because whatever may be said or done, if we do not produce globally the necessary wealth, we shall be unable to distribute it.

Once it is there, there will be another problem, that of distributing it equitably between all the groups of society. We have already tried to do that. Not that we boast in the least of having found the answer but we do believe that we have been doing our best, often in spite of the opposition and sometimes also with the co-operation of a fraction of it.

That is all I wanted to say this afternoon, about the Social Credit motion. Practically speaking, this motion aims at telling Canadians that we still have problems in Canada. Unfortunately we know it only too well; we know that some of our people are hungry. That is true. We know that many people are poor. We are eager to fight poverty but as a human institution, we are, unfortunately, no match for angels.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pity the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), who brought in the motion, has left the house—temporarily, I hope—because it goes without saying that we would want to hear the comments from both sides, and especially those on the proposals he did not put forth this afternoon.

On studying the motion before the house, where we are told that the government has failed to put forth adequate measures to give benefits to Canadians, I gathered that what was meant was an adequate policy on the distribution of goods and services which would enable every Canadian citizen to share equitably in Canadian abundance.

This is a very free translation of the English version which I have in front of me. I should have thought that the member for Témiscamingue would have told us what adequate measure he would like the government to adopt. I was hoping that we would be given an inkling of what these solutions

would be. It may be, however, that the colleagues of the hon. member for Témiscamingue will give us a few examples of what they mean.

After all, I had the advantage, for the guidance of the Créditiste members, when I was a young man in Alberta, of studying closely the theories of that Moses, perhaps, that Mr. William Aberhart was in Canada, as the founder, the great advocate of the Social Credit movement.

And what the Ralliement créditiste has just discovered goes back to the thirties in Alberta.

It is too bad I had to speak just after the minister because he swiped the first ten minutes of my speech. In fact, my reaction was the same as his. I have been here a little longer than the minister and I can tell him that for every time he has heard a speech by the hon. member for Témiscamingue, I have listened to him three times because, as the minister said, we may have heard the same twice; one day on the violin, another day on the piano, but it was always the same tune. There may be a little go-go beat to it now, I do not know, but the same principles are still expressed in an over-simplified way.

What did the hon. member mean by these words:

—a policy of distribution of goods and services.

[*English*]

And here, Mr. Speaker, I reflect what the minister has said. After all, Canada is not a stranger to the philosophy of Social Credit. It was in the mid-thirties the reason why we got the "A plus B" theory. It was the reason we got scrip money; it was the reason we got non-transferrable funds into special bank accounts, into treasury branches. It was the reason for, shall we say, the same blessed arguments, but none of the solutions then advanced has amounted to a hill of beans. As a matter of fact, many of them, such as scrip money, were colossal failures and a charge on the public.

• (4:30 p.m.)

It was only certain traditional events which in actual fact brought about the change in the Social Credit philosophy as put forward by the government of the province of Alberta. I do not know, but today it seems to me that all those financial sharks, those enemies of the people, have now become very respectable. I recall when a former premier of the province of Alberta, along with his mentor, was running about the province and subsequently in Saskatchewan damning these financial institutions, these enemies of the people, with the perdition of brimstone and hellfire. He always referred to them as "THEY".

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Now they are "THEY".

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** But with power, with wealth and responsibility there has been a change. As an hon. member has said, they have joined "THEY".

The hon. member for Temiscamingue, when talking about the national debt, referred to the amount owed to the so-called financial sharks. I do not know, but it seems to me that there are many trust funds on behalf of widows and children, many institutions and educational funds, which are holders of government bonds. Even hon. members may have Canada Savings Bonds or other government of Canada bonds tucked away somewhere.

In any event, let us look at the distribution of the national debt. As of the week of May 14 the national debt totalled some $23,218 million. How is this made up? Some $2,840 million is held in treasury bills, $6,070 million in Canada Savings Bonds, and all other direct and guaranteed. How are these securities to a total of $14,380 million held? The Bank of Canada holds some $3,895 million and the chartered banks hold a total of $5,316 million. Various government accounts hold $942 million, and the general public holds the residual, for a total of just under $13 billion. Therefore the general public, among whom will be found those financial agents, those enemies of the people, holds about half the national debt, and among them are all of the financial institutions, those so-called manipulators.

The argument of the hon. member is of the same stock as

[*Translation*]

—a bogey-man, to which people resort to frighten small children. No. Listen, that will not do. It is demagoguery at its worst.

[*English*]

Certainly this government has failed to take adequate measures in so far as Canada and Canadians are concerned. It has failed to take adequate measures as far as inflation is concerned, and it has failed to take adequate measures in respect of regional disparity. We also have growing unemployment.

The minister is not a lawyer, but it seems he has learned some of the skills of a lawyer

from his former negotiations as a labour leader. There are two tactics a lawyer will accept; one is to confess and avoid and the other is simply to traverse. The minister did not traverse this afternoon because he indicated there were problems. In other words, what he did was confess and avoid.

[*Translation*]

He ignored the attack. He did not reply to the attack from the hon. member for Témiscamingue. He confessed, then ignored the attack: such are the tactics of a good lawyer. I pay him that compliment. After all, it is the last good thing I will say about the government—

[*English*]

The hon. member for Temiscamingue said that to live decently is a problem of distribution, that the cause is simply a lack of purchasing power. I am not going to indulge in any dialogue on Social Credit theories, but it seems to me that in his simplistic way the hon. member simply glossed over these problems and made the solution look terribly easy. How do you cure the lack of purchasing power? He did not tell us.

First of all, is it by taxation, by transfer payments? Let us consider the extent of the transfer payments. Do you know that in 1967, according to the statistics compiled by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and a commentary by the Canadian Tax Foundation, out of total disbursements by the governments of Canada in the fiscal year 1967, amounting to some $21,200 million, about 41 per cent was in the form of transfer payments and subsidies from governments to individuals and groups? In other words, a little over $8 billion was in the form of transfer payments and subsidies.

The proposer of the motion said that you cannot simply tax the haves and give to the have-nots, because soon you will have all have-nots and no haves, and this is the end. But are we going to tax everybody and to what level should we tax? This is the question. To what level are we going to reduce taxes?

• (4:40 p.m.)

I have heard some advocates among social workers who talk blithely about a guaranteed annual income and who say that no man is entitled to an income more than five times greater than that received by the poorest man in the world—in other words, an arbitary figure. Is that what this policy would be based on? Is it going to be based simply on the fact that each of us should receive according to his needs regardless of his production? If so, a married man with three children says, "I need so much" and every Monday, every second Monday or every first of the month there is placed to his credit in some form of account so many hundreds of dollars. By whom? By the government. How do you determine that he is entitled to this and that his neighbour, who may work twice as hard and have a greater income, is not entitled to the same payment? Are you going to take everything away from everyone and then say, "You need so much, we will give you so much"? We have to speculate on precisely what was meant because nothing was indicated. The point is, how does one achieve this distribution?

In my opinion one of the greatest obstacles to proper distribution is the excessive taxation practised by this government which keeps piling on taxes. It is possible that on the evening of June 3 we shall hear more about this question. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), who is listening to this debate, in 1967 brought forward a budget containing tax increases. We are being taxed to the level of government expenditures. Why? The reason given was that we were going to balance the budget in 1968 by virtue of certain cut-backs in expenditures. Those cut-backs were as phony as a $7 bill; they were merely paper exercises. We heard about cut-backs which would save several billions of dollars. This figure was reduced to $1.5 billion, and expenditures were eventually brought down to a figure in the neighbourhood of $10 billion when the figure was always going to be under $10 billion. This exercise of blue-pencilling figures on a sheet of paper makes good copy.

Then we had an increase in taxation, the 3 per cent surtax. The chief whip on the government side will always remember with embarrassment that we were told the government was going to balance the budget. What happened? By last October we had a budgetary deficit of over $700 million. The government is spending a great deal of money, and these were primarily transfer payments. Then the estimates were introduced, and instead of cutting back or even maintaining the level of expenditures of the government we found there was an increase of $880 million in expenditures over the previous year. What will we be told on June 3? Will there be further taxation to take us up to the level of

government expenditures? This is the difficulty. The government is taxing the people of Canada more heavily because of its reckless spending. We experienced in the first quarter of this year an increase in the cost of living of more than half the average over the past few years.

I refer now to the quarterly report of the Bank of Canada. I am sure my hon. friends in the Créditiste party consider a publication of the Bank of Canada tantamount to one of the books of the Bible, because to them the Bank of Canada is the cure-all for all our ills. I ask hon. members to my left to study this report of last April, especially page 306. There one sees what has happened with regard to inflation. Let us talk about those people on low incomes, fixed incomes, small pensions and those with limited savings. How have these people been affected since 1963, which I suppose was a banner year in Canadian history in so far as the government is concerned because that is the year in which they assumed office.

On the basis of the readjusted statistics the total index was 103 in 1963. This was an increase from 100 in 1961, the last year. The best year was 1963 with a total index of 103. By the month of March, 1969, the total index had risen to 123.2 In other words, there had been a loss of a further 20 cents. A person with a monthly pension of $100, on the basis of an annuity, now finds he can purchase less than $80 worth of goods and services compared with the purchasing power of $100 in 1961. This is the problem that lies at the root of the motion we are considering. This is where the blame should be laid. It is not a question of distribution; it is a question of controlling inflation and expenditures.

I could discuss this subject at length, Mr. Speaker, but my time is limited. I believe the government should concentrate more on productivity. The hon. member for Témiscamingue says that we should not worry about productivity. Why not? The greater our productivity, the lower the cost per unit, and the greater the opportunity for sales and the greater the opportunity for individuals to earn more money. With regard to inflation, there must be at all times that climate that will maintain economic growth and there must be in the public sector a reduction of the percentage take of the gross national product. I now refer to Chapter 1 of The National Finances 1968-69. This chapter reads in part:

On a national accounts basis, receipts of all governments exceeded their expenditures in calendar 1967. The Canada and Quebec Pension Plans were responsible for maintaining an overall surplus position of $157 million, about $190 million below the 1966 surplus of $348 million. Excluding the $886 million of collections for these plans, all governments had a deficit in 1967 of $729 million. Including Canada and Quebec Pension Plans total receipts were $21.3 billion while disbursements were $21.2 billion. On the income side this amounted to some 34.4 per cent of GNP—about 1.6 percentage points above the previous year—while on the expenditure side it was 34.1 per cent of GNP or 1.9 percentage points greater than 1966.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

**An hon. Member:** Go on.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Could I have a few more minutes Mr. Speaker?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is there unanimous consent to let the hon. member continue his speech?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bechard):** The hon. member for Edmonton West.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** I thank you, Mr. Speaker, as well as my colleagues in this house.

[*English*]

The federal government's share of total tax revenue in 1967 declined to 53 per cent as did non-tax revenue, which fell to 36 per cent. The federal share of total revenue was 50 per cent, contrasted with 52 per cent in 1966. Its expenditure on goods and services amounted to over 34 per cent of total government outlays for these items and its proportion of the transfer and subsidy payment total was 53 per cent. Federal government spending (excluding intergovernmental payments) accounted for about 42 per cent of overall government expenditure. The provinces and the municipalities split the balance 32 per cent-26 per cent.

Therein lies the key. Federal government spending, excluding intergovernmental payments, accounted for a little over 40 per cent of over-all government expenditure and the other two levels of government accounted for a little less than 60 per cent. But their proportion is increasing. In my opinion it is not only a question of the federal government taking the necessary action in order to ensure that there is a climate conducive to the maintenance and expansion of economic growth. It behooves all levels of government to reduce their percentage of the take of the gross national product so that individuals may save and may be able to invest and

provide the capital that we so urgently need in Canada. The insufficiency of capital invites outsiders to walk in, to fill the vacuum and to take over more and more of Canadian industry, something about which there was a great deal of complaint in the house today and during the past weeks.

• (4:50 p.m.)

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, if I may take the liberty of putting the motion of the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) in my own words, it says that there is too much poverty in Canada, and too many of our people do not get their share of the abundance that we in Canada are able to produce. I agree with that statement. The only thing wrong with it is that it is an understatement, in fact the understatement of the year.

Before I go further perhaps I should do the usual thing and make it clear that I do not agree with the theories and solutions that are proposed by the hon. member for Témiscamingue, but I think that is beside the point so far as today's debate is concerned. Whether we agree or not with the political theories of our friends to our geographical left, I think they are to be commended for calling upon us today to consider the disgrace of the poverty and the inequalities that exist in Canada in 1969.

I listened with interest to the speech of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). I was hoping that he might say something by way of an answer to the problems set out by the hon. member for Témiscamingue, but about all he did was to characterize the hon. member as a demagogic orator. Having said that, he followed in the same pattern. Talk about demagoguery attacking demagoguery—we had it this afternoon. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion described the hon. member for Témiscamingue as one who was apparently making a speech before an audience rather than a speech in the House of Commons, and then he himself did the same thing. He said that it is easy to talk about poverty and to get the poor to agree with you, but I suggest to the minister that one cannot dismiss the problem of poverty by calling it demagoguery to talk about it.

There are times when it seems to me that we who operate in the beautiful surroundings of Parliament Hill and enjoy the comfort of living in certain parts of Ottawa get a little too far removed from the reality of poverty as it is experienced by far too many Canadians. If you start to think of Canadian poverty, I am not quite sure where you begin. There is life as some Canadians have to live it in the outports of Newfoundland or in the fishing villages on the south shore of Nova Scotia. There is life in Campbellton, New Brunswick, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) saw it over the weekend, or at least he was photographed in its midst. There is the life that families live in tarpaper shacks in parts of Quebec and Ontario with the result that every winter we learn of many of them losing their lives by fire. There is the life in poverty or close to it that many of our 250,000 Indians experience in Canada. There is the problem of people who live in the blighted or slum areas of our cities from one end of Canada to the other. There is the poverty of children who receive education, particularly in some of our rural areas, far below the standard available in some other areas and far below the requirements of life today. There is the plight of our pensioners, and in a moment or two I shall come around to that matter again because a good deal of what I want to say on this motion revolves around the plight of our pensioners. There is the situation faced by many of our veterans, particularly those who are struggling to get by on the war veterans allowance while we wait for the Woods report, which does not even touch the war veterans allowance, to be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

But even after one has tried to face up to the poverty that exists in this country which we associate with people on welfare of various kinds, I think we need to remind ourselves that perhaps the greatest area of poverty is amongst what are known as the working poor. The Economic Council of Canada has done some studies in this area. As a matter of fact, the council has been making representations to one of the committees of the other place where it has been brought out in recent days that there are over 900,000 and perhaps one million families in Canada whose economic condition is below the poverty line. The poverty line as defined varies between families of several people and families of only two or three people, while another figure altogether is given for individuals. At any rate, the estimate of the Economic Council of Canada is that there are nearly one million families, perhaps four million or five million people in Canada, who are existing below today's poverty line.

*Distribution of Goods and Services*

The figures that the Economic Council of Canada has produced show that well over half of the heads of those families that are living below the poverty line are members of the working force who work part or all of the year. Poverty is not confined just to those who are old or unable to work, just to those who are on unemployment insurance, welfare or relief of some kind. For far too many of our people life goes on in a very humdrum fashion because although they are working, although they have the conventional means of livelihood in the form of wages that they receive, the amount is inadequate to maintain a decent standard of living. Many of these people are poor from the cradle to the grave, poor not only economically but in any opportunity to enjoy the so-called better things of life. It is all right for us who are here in this place to indulge in the making of fine speeches about the greatness of our culture and our tradition. It is all right for us to boast about the progress that our country has made. It is all right for us to be excited, as we are today, about adventures in the field of science, even if they are being carried on by people from another country. But for far too many of our people in this latter part of the 20th century life is too much a story of poverty.

I say to the hon. member for Témiscamingue that this is no day for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion or for the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) to spend their speaking time castigating him for his particular political philosophies. This is a day for us to face up to the facts of poverty and somehow to get to the point where we realize that it is our responsibility to do something about these facts.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Later in this debate one or more of my hon. friends, depending upon how much time is available, will have something to say about some of the specific things we think should be done to provide a greater quantity of goods and services. There is the whole question of the priorities to be established between the private and the public sector; there is the question whether the role of the government when times are tough is to curtail expenditure or increase it.

We admit that if we are to provide a decent standard of living for all our people there has to be production of goods and services in even greater abundance than we are managing today, and we believe there are policies which governments can pursue to increase the quantity of goods and services we produce. But along with the production of goods and services in abundance it is also of extreme importance that we follow policies of a kind which will get those goods and services distributed among our people on a fair basis. Some day it will be argued politically—and I hope the argument will prevail—that goods ought to be distributed on a basis of equality.

This is a word we seem to avoid. The hon. member for Edmonton West thought it was ridiculous for somebody to be saying that the richest person in the country should not receive more than five times as much as the poorest. That attitude will be laughed at some day; in fact, some of us laugh at it today. But if we are not yet ready for the distribution of goods and services on the basis of equality it is time for us to do it on a basis that is fair, and if it is to be fair there will have to be minimum standards that mean something; there will have to be guarantees of sufficient income to provide a decent standard of living applicable to all our people.

We say therefore that the social legislation which has been placed on the statute books of this country in the last 50 years—I say 50 years because certain things got started in 1919—should not be subject to ruination—and I see the possibility of this happening when the government talks about doing away with family allowances and putting old age pensions back on some kind of means or income test. I believe that if we are really concerned about maldistribution we must increase the amounts which get into the pockets of our people through programs which aim at distribution. We ought not to cut back these programs.

We have been asked to point to specific programs and proposals. Well, we say that family allowances should be increased. We say that old age security pensions should be increased. We say that war veterans allowances should be increased. We say that the federal government should really put money into education, that it should really put money into housing on a basis which would provide housing for the people who need it. These are proposals which are specific. They could and must be carried out.

Certainly there is a need for policies which will increase the amount of goods and services we produce. We also say it is essential to have policies leading to the effective distribution of goods and services to our people. This is not done by way of free competition in the marketplace. It can only be done when the government in the name of all the people

steps in to say: There shall be such things as housing, education, health care, family allowances, old age pensions and, yes, a guaranteed annual income distributed by the state to all our people.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I can hardly advance more than a paragraph or so in a speech of this kind without making a particular reference to pensioners, and I should like to say a few words on this phase of the matter at this point. When we say there is too much inequality in this country, too much poverty, I point out that one of the areas in which inequality is most sharply felt is during the period of retirement. There is a general notion that because we have built up private and public pension plans over the past number of years this problem has been solved. When our fathers and grandfathers left industry or their employment there were no pensions for most of them. Today there is some kind of pension for just about everybody. But this does not solve the problem, particularly when no serious attention is paid to the rights and needs of retired people after they have gone on pension. The times I have said this in the House of Commons cannot be counted, I suppose. But it will have to be said again and again until something is done about the matter. It is completely unfair. It is a disgrace to permit everybody else, particularly those in the working period of life, to have ways and means of improving their incomes and thus their standard of living while saying to the older people: Once you have retired here is an income of X dollars; this is what you must live on for life.

As the years go by, the cost of living goes up, the standard of living goes up, wages and salaries go up. But the position of those who have retired deteriorates. If there is anything which is completely contrary to all the concepts of humanity I say it is the notion that somehow or other once a person has retired and been put on a pension he can fend for himself, watching his position deteriorate until at last he dies because he cannot take it any longer.

We insist that one thing which should be done in any set of policies designed to deal with inequality of this kind is to begin building into all our pension programs escalation provisions so that those who retire will be able to maintain a standard of living which improves—not just stays where it is—as does the standard of living of those who are working in Canada. This is not a new idea. Some companies have adopted it in years gone by. More recently, a couple of well known companies such as the International Nickel Company of Canada and Imperial Oil Limited have made provision for the pensions of their former employees to be improved. A few other companies have done this on their own. A number have done it as a result of collective bargaining arrangements. I was pleased to read a report of a meeting a while ago under the auspices of the Public Service Alliance of Canada to the effect that that organization intends to work toward a certain goal, namely, that there must be incorporated into the Public Service Superannuation Act a provision ensuring that pensions, once put in pay, will escalate as wages and salaries increase.

The same applies to old age security pensions. We have established the principle that there shall be escalation but we have set a ceiling which means that the most a pensioner can get by way of increase is $1.50 a month each year if the cost of living increases by more than 2 per cent. The cost of living goes up far more than that, but $1.50 is the limit. Suppose you retire and get $78 by way of pension and have only the possibility of a $1.50 increase per year. Face the fact that in five or ten years your position will have worsened. A pension system will not be worthy of the name five, ten, fifteen years from now unless an escalation provision has been built into it.

Mr. Speaker, I see, if you do not, that my time is just about up. I shall wind this up in one sentence, though it may be a sentence with one or two commas in it. I do not think we should castigate the hon. member for Temiscamingue for his own particular political philosophy. I think we should face head on the problem of poverty and equality, as he put it, before the house today, and in facing it let us do something to meet the needs of those who require housing, jobs or education. Let us meet the problems of our Indians and of our war veterans. Let us pick out those particular groups for whom we can do something and see to it that their position is improved. This is why, because of my own life-long concern about these groups, I have spent part of my time talking about pensioners; and if we are concerned about eliminating poverty this is an awfully good place to begin. Let us do it, without any further delay.

*Distribution of Goods and Services*

• (5:10 p.m.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Prior to recognizing the hon. member for Frontenac I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate informing this house that the Senate have agreed to the amendments made by the House of Commons to Bill S-15, an act to amend the Food and Drugs Act and the Narcotic Control Act and to make a certain consequential amendment to the Criminal Code.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy 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 Simcoe North (Mr. Rynard), Income Tax; l'hon. député de l'Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), l'Expansion Économique Regionale; the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart), Company of Young Canadians.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—FAILURE TO SHARE THE ABUNDANCE OF GOODS AND SERVICES AVAILABLE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Caouette.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I should like first of all to congratulate the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) on the humane way in which he dealt with the problem of poverty or the difficulty of obtaining purchasing power in Canada. If it were not that he has socialist ideas, we could accept him in our ranks because we know the representative for Winnipeg North Centre was not elected through electoral funds. The representatives of his party only have union funds with which to run honest elections.

I should also like to make a few comments on the statements of the member for

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand).

I am sorry the minister is not here, so that we could give him viva voce a few replies to his criticism of the member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette). However, in his remarks, I did not hear the Minister of the Regional Economic Expansion explain how $13 billion could be found in 1939 to wage that war which killed so many people and caused so much unhappiness.

And besides, in my opinion, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion thought quite differently when he was a labour leader from the way he did this afternoon in this house. It seems to me that instead of trying to make fun of the Social Credit, he should try to understand it.

This morning, he was telling me that he had studied more books on Social Credit than we have ourselves. He makes me think of someone who would look into a matter fully to be able to destroy it better, and we often meet people who victimize others and say; I love you sincerely, smothering them to death at the same time.

It is in the same manner that he studied Social Credit and that he has no doubt tried to make fun of it, because he did not understand a thing of the explanation of the member for Témiscamingue.

Besides, when he told us that he did not believe in new formulas, I might tell him that he is certainly not as daring as the pioneers who founded Canada. I could hold Jacques Cartier up as an example, who did not ask himself whether his father had come to Canada. He made for Canada and he founded our beautiful Canada. He had the guts to do so.

One may also give the example of Karl Marx who was not afraid to set forth the bad doctrine of communism, who was not afraid to go and setup a new regime which has conquered half the world today.

The member for Langelier and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, is not so daring, and I would like to see him tackle the problems of the Canadian Vickers and of Davie Shipbuilding, because their workers lack the purchasing power required to buy Canada's production.

We proposed a motion this afternoon because of this lack of purchasing power. I would like to see the minister go and meet with those workers out of work or on strike,

because they see their livelihood and their purchasing power disappear; let him go and tell them exactly what he told us here this afternoon.

Moreover, when he tells a story about the wire worn on a foot, he can say that again, because it happens that the Liberal Party has gone haywire. That is why he went haywire this afternoon when he told us that story.

The minister reminds me of this patient who went to see this doctor because he had hurt his leg, and he was told to apply a poultice on it, since there was no improvement, the doctor went to the minister's home to find out what was wrong. He saw that the minister had applied the poultice right on the spot where he got hurt, namely the railing of the stairs leading to the second floor!

So the minister does exactly the same thing in today's economic system. He puts a poultice where it hurts, on the railing, and he is unable to find a solution to our problem. That is why I even received a letter from a woman of the constituency of Langelier, who wrote: Would you ask the Bank of Canada to make a loan, interests free, to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, so that he can buy three dozen combs.

This afternoon, nobody gave a more serious and logical answer to the logical and serious statement made by the hon. member for Témiscamingue. I merely say that the minister then will certainly not find any solution with his new department, because that reminds me, much more of something we have seen in the past, and which may still be seen: the chap who tries to get hold of a horse by attracting it with a bowl of oats. The horse represents us, the consumers, and with his Department of Regional Economic Expansion, the minister presents us with a small bowl of oats, saying: Wait, be patient.

As for us, of the Ralliement Créditiste, we want to build a country, rather than merely mend fences.

• (5:20 p.m.)

We introduced this motion, which reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of the house, the government has failed to take adequate measures in order to give Canadians the benefit of a policy of distribution of goods and services which would allow each citizen to obtain his share of Canadian abundance.

I feel that with production, minus consumption, through a good accounting system, any amount of surplus in a country could be distributed as dividends, as the hon. member for Edmonton West asked us a while ago, to allow the Canadians who need it to purchase this Canadian production. When those problems are settled in Canada, then we can help other needy countries to solve their problems.

I would like to speak about a class of people who have reduced purchasing power at the present time. Progressive Conservatives or Liberals, as we noticed this afternoon, do not agree with us. The hon. member for Edmonton West and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand)—who said that they were reading the same books—they reminded me of pupils cribbing from others at school—are of the same opinion. So, whether they are Conservatives or Liberals, they are exactly the same; they are elected thanks to the same electoral funds, and I will be in a position to prove that later on with statements I made in this house, when I was elected in 1962 and the Progressive Conservatives were in office.

For the time being, I would like to deal with that class of people who do not have enough purchasing power, the Canadian farmers. I have seen farmers in western Canada glutted with produce. People told us: We would like to be the granary of the world. They are ready to produce enough to feed the whole human race.

But because the system is faulty, because there is enough money to go to the moon or to wage wars, but not enough to distribute the abundance that exists, these people are faced with economic problems.

Any economic problem can be settled by men because it was generated by men. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion may tell us that the Social Credit does not propose solutions; I tell him that we find solutions and that we are willing to support him if he brings about measures to put an end to poverty amid abundance.

This is what we want to do but through equitable measures. I said earlier that in 1962, I had noticed the statements of the government in office. I shall quote from an article published in *La Presse* of November 1962, in order to show you that, red or blue, we are changing our horse, but the driver is still the same, i.e. the financiers who contribute to the electoral fund.

During the discussion of those agricultural problems, I introduced in the house a bill which would have had the effect of increasing the income of farmers, since it provided for the construction of grain elevators in order to reduce the price of feed grains.

This is what they said in November 1962:

It was to a Liberal, Mr. Whelan, of Essex South, that the task of killing the Dumont motion was entrusted.

A Conservative from Saskatchewan, Mr. Nasserden, tried unsuccessfully to perform that task, but he was out of breath two minutes before the private members' hour expired.

Mr. Whelan had therefore to take up where he left off in order to prevent the vote on the motion which, had it been passed, would have put western farmers on the same footing as eastern farmers.

Then, in 1962, the Conservatives were in office. We were asking an increased purchasing power for our farmers who, in Canada, are the very basis of society, and because in the East, we wanted to be put on the same footing. A Liberal member and a Conservative member joined forces to kill the motion I was presenting. Later, they tried to bury this bill which would have done justice to our people.

When election platforms were being prepared, we heard statements like the following, and I quote:

—the only condemnation of his project came from a Conservative member, Mr. Nasserden from Saskatchewan, a Conservative, I repeat, therefore, a member of the party that Créditistes support wholeheartedly—

So said the press at that time, in spite of the fact that we were telling them to take action—

According to Mr. Nasserden, the project is immature. Except the latter, all those who spoke during the private member's hour on this project found some justification for it, even Mr. Arnold Peters, of the New party.

While he declared himself opposed to the ultimate end sought by Mr. Dumont, he voted like him in favour of equality of prices for farm products across the country—

Then, we can say publicly that as long as a government does not have a majority, he is trying to win us over in order to be able to say: "We know the answer". And, it is exactly the portion of oats, to which I referred a moment ago, that is offered to the horse, that is the consumer they want to win over, to make him wait that much longer.

And as for the statements on farm policy made around election time, what do they say?

A Liberal spokesman said the members of parliament from the east are working on this problem.

[Mr. Dumont.]

Both parties gave the highest priority to this matter, believing that a general election can happen anytime and that they must make their policy known in the house as soon as possible—

The reason why it is hard for the old parties to establish a general policy in the field of agriculture, which would be interesting, lies in the absence of support in the house of a large number of members from agricultural districts, as is the case for western Canada—

So much for that group of people who are neglected, who are forgotten. I do not object to a discussion of the agricultural problems of western Canada, I even welcome it. I want those people to be happy, but when the subject is Eastern Canada, nothing is said about those problems.

And if, even occasionally, as has been said since September last, because apparently the West is experiencing what has been too often called "the fatal rising tide of wheat" because of over production, we should be punished, would it not be ridiculous, Mr. Speaker? Would it not be illogical as long as there are under-fed human beings? If, as the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion suggested a while ago, we fail to find people able to change an economic system if it proves defective, it is high time that incompetent people should make room for others.

And in the explanation for the fatal rising tide of wheat, here is what one could read. The situation is the same in the United States and a newspaper headline described it as serious. Had they read the news, our grandparents would have normally concluded that North America was threatened with famine. How mistaken they would have been, for the meaning is exactly the reverse of what it might have been fifty years ago. For if in the United States as in Canada the wheat situation is serious, the reason is that there is too much wheat, as is the case with other farm commodities; what to do with it has become a problem. The dreadful fact is that the 1968 crop was a bumper crop.

The most striking feature in any village scenery is a string of huge metal elevators overflowing with wheat harvested these last years. Despite that enormous reserve, the government still guarantees it will buy at extravagant prices all that the farmers can produce, with the sole exception of the quota applying in some places.

There is even something funnier. To fight such a large productivity, especially in the United States, the government follows a diametrically opposite policy, under its land bank project, and guarantees a large income

to any farmer agreeing not to farm. The farmers who want to be partially unemployed, for they are nevertheless entitled to till their fertile land, draw $3,000 per annum. It so happens that, little by little, the validity of some Créditiste theories is recognized by allowing some people to get a guaranteed income of $3,000 per annum; but it is permitted to chartered banks that finance even the government of Canada, and to which a payment of $1,600 million must be paid in interest.

We are protesting against that, against the people here who are serving finance and who have been elected with electoral funds. They are mere puppets, blue or red, and they know that those people will say exactly what investors want them to say.

Furthermore, this wealth which exists and which would permit, should money be based on production, the granting of a dividend to every citizen because money distributed more lavishly could bring inflation, and also the so-called compensated discount, advocated by the Ralliement créditistes and by Social Credit, would reduce the cost of living and prevent all strikes, the great strikes which are causing disaster throughout Canada.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Well, this surplus, as it exists in Canada, that is 1.3 billion bushels of wheat, has been accumulating for three years, which adds up to more than 4 billion bushels. The average yearly production in Canada is 650 million bushels. On a world scale, it is 10.8 billion bushels.

Those great exporters, who are also afflicted by an enormous surplus of wheat, made even greater by record crops, had decided simultaneously, although without previous consultation, to cut down prices in order to try and sell their wheat, so much so that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) was heard to say that the fate of western farmers is in the hands of Moscow and Peking. Peking where, yesterday, people were dying of hunger in the streets, Peking which, through a bad communist regime, managed to establish a better standard of living.

Why, with Social Credit, could we not solve, thanks to a distribution of purchasing power, all the economic problems of Canada and then fight Communism efficiently in the whole world, because I do not want Communism. It makes me think of a herd in a stable. It provides security, but it also puts a yoke on around one's neck.

Such are, besides, the recent tendencies towards another production which seems to become abundant in Canada, and this affects particularly the eastern farmers.

In the field of the dairy industry, recent figures show a tendency towards overproduction of milk in Canada. In the last few months, there has been an 8 per cent increase in the production of dairy products, and the factories, for every month since October 1968, have been reporting an increase of 14 per cent over the same month of the previous year.

This is proof that the present farm policies of the government have been boosted by subsidies and by production. However, when production is achieved and the experts have done their job, the government seems unable to find any economic system to distribute this wealth. In the face of such poor logic, what do our farming organizations demand? What answer do they suggest to the problem?

Just last week, the Catholic Farmers' Union issued a brief asking the government of the so-called just society to review its dairy policy for 1969-70 by maintaining the subsidy actually paid to producers at the same level as it was in 1968-69. Indeed, they also need to have an income that will enable them to stay on their farms and to balance their buying power. But they talk about revising the farmers' industrial milk policy, but they want to revise it downwards not upwards.

In view of such ridiculous situations, I say that the purchasing power of our people keeps on decreasing and that it is indeed logical for use to be able to introduce the opposite, a policy that would distribute such abundance.

I should like here to read to you a poem in French that was sent to me by a 17-year old Canadian girl, since it is, in my opinion, the feeling of a young person who is asking for more seriousness in this parliament and with it I will end my speech because I know time goes so swiftly. The poem is entitled: "L'Appel aux Canadiens" and it goes like this:

Amitié, Fraternité,
De quoi êtes-vous les symboles?
De cet univers plein de cruauté,
Êtes-vous bien l'auréole?

Des hommes meurent par milliers
Là-bas, dans ce pays du Biafra.
Personne ne bouge et, tel des piliers,
Chacun se dit: «Ce n'est pas le Canada»...

Le Gouvernement se meurt d'insolence
Tandis que d'autres expirent de souffrance
Notre premier ministre fait la bise
Les autres subissent la crise.

D'innocentes victimes s'éteignent tous les jours
Et ce doit être un peu de chaque Canadien qui part aussi
Pourquoi alors, dans le dédale de notre vie,
Employer ces deux mots: Amitié, Amour?
Disons plutôt: Égoïsme, Injustice
On atteindra alors la vérité
Et cette vérité régnera sous d'heureux auspices
Dans notre fausse et futile cité.
Canadiens, écoutez le cri de ces malheureux
Au nom de l'amitié, de la fraternité,
Cessez votre double jeu
Délivrez votre conscience de ses faux atouts
Afin que dans le monde et partout,
Règle la «Paix» et la «Bonté».

[*English*]

**Mr. Ross Whicher (Bruce):** Mr. Speaker, it does not appear that there are many sinners who will have the opportunity of hearing my sermon this afternoon. This is because of the fact so many committee meetings are being held in various parts of the building, and outside it, and also because many hon. members do not believe in the motion put forward by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette).

I listened with great interest to the members who have spoken in this debate, particularly to the hon. member in whose name the motion stands. I would agree with the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) who said it was the same old speech but, on the other hand, that the hon. member was a great orator.

How we can cure the troubles that beset Canada today by printing money is simply beyond me, but this is what our friends the Creditistes wish to do. This method has not been successful in any country in the world that has tried it. All have had to retreat from this path. This Social Credit idea started in the province of Alberta where serious-minded leaders adopted it, but even there it did not work. Indeed, as one of the Conservative party members has said, it cost the taxpayers of Alberta a considerable amount of money. If we printed more money and gave everybody in Canada a dividend, as suggested by the hon. member, what would the other countries of the world think? The Canadian dollar would decline in value and we would find ourselves in great difficulty in the money markets of the world.

The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion pointed out that much had been done to alleviate poverty by taxing the affluent and giving money to the poor in the form of old age pensions, which we all agree are probably not as high as they should be; in the form of family allowances, disability pensions, unemployment insurance funds, and so on. The minister was quite frank when he said much more remains to be done, and he mentioned such great social undertakings as medicare and hospital insurance. So much has been done in Canada that we have one of the highest living standards in the world. As the minister said, however, we can do better, and there is much still to be done. I would like to dwell on some of the things that worry me when I look at what is taking place in our country, things that I am sure worry all members of this great House of Commons and indeed worry people right across Canada. The word "inflation" is on the lips of everybody in Canada, and the question asked is, where is it all going to end?

Just this week, through the efforts of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) who has been doing an exceptional job settling strikes across the country, we had another strike settlement which resulted in a 16 per cent wage increase over the next 26 months for Air Canada workers. I do not blame those workers for trying to get all they can because all workers, and professional people, are attempting to get everything they can. I mention Air Canada workers because they happen to have been involved in the last strike that was settled. One thing that is as sure as you are sitting here, Mr. Speaker, is that two years from today the Air Canada workers will be back looking for more money. If the settlement at that time covers just a two-year term, two years later they will be back again. If these settlements proceed on the basis of the one reached this week, 16 per cent over a 26 month period, then ten years from today the workers of Air Canada will be getting exactly twice as much money as they are now.

I give another example. A high school teacher in Montreal or Toronto today makes about $15,000 a year. Not all of them do, and I realize many get less, but ten years from today on the basis of a continuing 15 per cent increase over a two-year period, that high school teacher will be getting $30,000 a year. To go a little further, may I say that in a 20 year period, during the lifetime of many members of this House of Commons, a teacher in Ottawa, Hamilton, Toronto, Vancouver, or wherever it may be who today is earning $15,000 will be earning $60,000. Somebody must say no. Do we want the price of bread, for example, to be $1 a loaf? Is there any feeling that we are doing the right thing by continually keeping this old ball game going,

this spiralling inflation; somebody will have to say no.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Let us mention the electricians here in Ottawa who are on strike. I am not blaming the electricians; I am talking about society as a whole. I suppose at the present time they are earning about $5 an hour in Ottawa. Ten years from today, at the present rate of increase, they will be earning $10 an hour and in 20 years they will be earning $20 an hour. I most respectfully ask the government what the plans are for the future so far as the wages and salaries of the citizens of Canada are concerned. Surely, as members of this House of Commons and as citizens of Canada, we have the right to ask our leaders what they intend to do about this. If we do not ask this question, it will be evident that we are satisfied with the way the ball game is being played.

I am taking part in this debate in order to let you know that I am not satisfied with the way the ball game is being played. I say that somebody must sit down and plan for the future of Canada, not ten years from now but rather two years or two months from now; that is just how serious the situation is. The word "controls" is one which is absolutely contrary to my way of life. While I respect my socialist friends to my left for the sincerity with which they present their beliefs, nevertheless, as I said before in this chamber, all we need do is look at little England which is drowning in a sea of socialism. I am against controls and socialism and am for free enterprise; but when we come to a chaotic financial situation, then something must be done. For example, during the war years we had wage and salary controls and controls on prices and profits.

Most respectfully I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the financial condition of the ordinary citizen and the various governments of Canada, municipal, provincial and federal, is worse today than it was in 1939 when the war started. I would be the last person to suggest that the government should place controls on wages, salaries, prices and profits; but I say to you, sir, that if they do not have any other solution they had better do that. If something does not happen, then 25 years from today the little corner grocery store proprietor, the big supermarket proprietor or the doctor—probably not the politician—and the school teacher, or whoever it might be, will have to take his money to the bank in a wheelbarrow because money will have so little value by that time.

This is the reason I very respectfully, through you, Mr. Speaker, ask the government what it intends to do. I believe we should be given an answer. In many instances the poverty in Canada today is caused by inflation. I might ask what about the agricultural workers in Canada, the people about whom my hon. friend of the Ralliement Créditiste spoke a few moments ago? When I think of the 16 per cent wage increase granted by Air Canada last week, I think of the farmers of eastern Canada and western Canada. What has the government done for the agricultural economy? There has been a cutback of $5 million in the subsidy to the dairy producers and $4 million has been cut back in the premium to hog producers. The income of the agricultural workers decreases while the income of all others in society increases. This is not right at all. It is up to the leaders of our country to tell us what plans they have, not only for the so-called affluent but also for the people engaged in the agricultural industry and other small industries in Canada who are not enjoying financial success at the present time.

Most respectfully I say that I think I would be fair were I to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) what they intend to do in respect of wheat next fall if western Canada should have a bumper crop. Perhaps that is a rhetorical question. The practical answer is that it will be piled out in the fields in western Canada because there will be no other place to put it. These are some of the questions to which I believe the government should give us some answers.

There is so much in Canada that is good. We have one of the highest standards of living in the world. We see large chauffeur driven cars around the Chateau Laurier and around the parliament buildings. We see many automobiles. I understand that in the city of Calgary there are more automobiles per population than there are anywhere else in the world. But what about the people who cannot afford cars, the poor people of Canada?

Much planning must be done. I feel one reason we have so many poor people in the midst of plenty is that we have so few people here in Canada. Can we be proud of the fact that we are the most sparsely populated country in the whole world? As I think I said once before in this chamber I do not believe

the Grits and Tories can be proud of the results of their immigration policies during the last 100 years. Twenty one million people from Newfoundland to Vancouver represents a ridiculous situation. What we need is a plan for the development of Canada which would include inducements for skilled workers who would make good citizens. Of course, in the past we have brought in millions of people but in my opinion we have not brought enough. There are those who say that we cannot find employment for the people we have now. Most respectfully I say that if we had 40 million people instead of 20 million people we would use twice as many neckties, eyeglasses, suits, shirts, automobiles, gasoline, cigarettes and so on. Consumer demand is what makes the world go around.

It is what made the United States a great country. With ten times our population, the United States has 14 times our gross national product. People create money, and we need more people here in Canada. I intend to say something, even if I am the only Liberal member in this House of Commons who makes statements of this type. This afternoon the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) announced a policy which would permit deserters from any army in the world to come to Ottawa and have the opportunity of Canadian citizenship. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am absolutely opposed to that policy. I am opposed to it right down the line. Do you know that in Canada today we do not have capital punishment? This law was passed in this chamber. The situation in the armed forces of Canada is different. Do you know that today a member of the Canadian armed forces can be shot for desertion? In Italy during the last world war I found myself in a terrible position. Three fellows from a certain regiment ran rather than face the enemy. It was desertion; they were deserters. A Major grabbed me and said: "We are going to try these men right now because they ran rather than face the enemy. We are going to hold a field general court martial." These three fellows were frightened and I felt sorry for them. We had the opportunity of shooting these fellows. I suppose it was not really an opportunity, but the law was such it would allow us to shoot them. The least they could get if they were convicted of desertion was two years at hard labour. For your benefit, Mr. Speaker, I may say they were given two years and shipped off to Africa in chains. That is what we, as Canadians, did to our deserters during the last world war.



• (5:50 p.m.)

I have no use for any man who will take advantage of the standard of living in his country and then desert that country when, as a result of the democratic process, he is called upon to serve that country. I make a distinction between the so-called draft dodgers and deserters. I have in mind those draft dodgers who know two months in advance they are going to be called up by United States authorities.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I did not want to interrupt the hon. member because I know how strongly he feels about this matter, but I have great misgivings about this line of argument in light of the motion before us. If I allow him to continue at length in this way, I will have no option but to allow other hon. members to do the same. These remarks have nothing to do with the motion before us.

**Mr. Whicher:** Mr. Speaker, I will try to control myself. I was mentioning the fact that we need more people in this country, but not more of this type. We need more people to develop Canada. I have only one or two things to say before I conclude.

The minister has been listening to those of the younger generation who attend college. This is a small minority of our population, many of whom wish to tear down our universities rather than build them. Some of them think that we should let deserters from various countries come into this country and take out citizenship. We had a word during the last war which described this kind of action, and I am sure this word has been used in many other countries. That word was "yellow". Perhaps I will be the only Liberal member to stand in this house and speak in this way, but that is the way I think about these things. I will be able to go back home to my riding and look members of the Canadian Legion in the eye. I know they will not appreciate the action proposed in this house today.

I do not appreciate people of this type, but we do need more people in Canada. If we had more people we could develop this nation. We could consume more of the products produced here. The people in the United States consume 80 per cent of the wheat grown there, but we export 80 per cent of our wheat. There is no point in having a gold mine unless you have someone to do a little bit of digging. We need more diggers, more artisans, more professional people, doctors and

dentists. We need more of almost every kind of individual except politicians.

**An hon. Member:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Whicher:** I think perhaps we have enough politicians to govern the country, regardless of how many additional millions of people come here.

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** In rising to speak on this motion, I must say at the outset that on reading it I realized there must be a vast difference in the standard of living enjoyed by Canadians. I listened with interest to the comments of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) in respect of the ineptitude of the government and its actions in curtailing expenditures in the field of agriculture. I could not do anything but agree with practically all he said, and I compliment him for being as frank and as honest as he was. Canadians would be much better off if all politicians were as frank and as honest as the hon. member in his approach to government legislation and action.

This motion requires the government to take action and to give consideration to policies involving the distribution of Canadian produced goods and services among Canadian people. This reminds me of the old Social Credit principle expounded by Mr. Aberhart, a former Premier of Alberta. I would be interested to hear the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) expound his theories concerning the distribution of goods and services. I should like to hear him tell us how Canadians could enjoy to a greater extent this abundance of Canadian production as the result of this government assuming a greater part in manipulating or handling these goods and services.

I do not disagree with the suggestion that the government should keep a watchful eye on the distribution of these goods throughout Canada, and to see that we meet our commitments in respect of overseas trade. The government should make every attempt to see that everyone has an equal opportunity to purchase these Canadian goods and services.

Recently this government set up a Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I am surprised that the minister of that department is not taking a more keen interest in this distribution of goods and services. Certainly, this government has concerned itself with the purchase of services, and it has initiated increased taxation. Last March this government imposed a 3 per cent surcharge tax. This was followed by a 2 per cent social development tax, a tax on some insurance companies and an increase in estate taxes. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) has estimated that these increases in taxation will yield an additional $845 million. The Encyclopaedia Britannica, in its annual report states, that this is the largest, new increase in taxes ever imposed by a federal government of Canada. This is an amazing thing. No wonder the government is able to suggest it hopes to balance its budget. There is no trick in balancing a budget if you keep a hand as deep in the pockets of the Canadian taxpayers as this government has done. A member of this government has suggested that there is no place for the government in the bedrooms of the nation, but this government certainly believes in keeping a hand very deeply in the pockets of the taxpayers of this nation.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. It being six o'clock this house stands adjourned until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. Horner:** Mr. Speaker, on resuming my remarks on this resolution it might be in order to summarize what I said before the supper adjournment. Because of the short time available to me I shall deal with these matters rather briefly. The motion encompasses the whole economy of our country. I said before the supper adjournment that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had stated the government has no business in the bedrooms of the nation. However, the same Prime Minister is delving deeply into the pockets of the taxpayers. Before the supper adjournment I quoted from the Encyclopaedia Britannica which deals with this question. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) stated that a number of tax increases, including the 3 per cent surcharge tax, the 2 per cent social development tax and others, increased the revenue obtained from taxes last year by $845 million. The Encyclopaedia Britannica stated that this was the largest increase brought about by new taxes in any year in Canada's history. I wish to make it abundantly clear that this is the largest increase as a result of additional taxation in any year in Canada's history. The Prime Minister suggested that the government was prepared to balance the budget. Anybody can balance a budget so long as

there remains in the pockets of our taxpayers money with which to pay additional taxes. The theory is that Canadian taxpayers can dig a little deeper into their pockets and find a little more money with which to pay increased taxes.

However, the government will find that there has been a tremendous drain upon the resources of Canadian taxpayers. Those resources will ultimately be strained to the limit and our taxpayers will not have the money to meet additional taxation. This is the position in which Canada finds itself.

The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) spoke about the money supply in this country. I believe he spoke fairly accurately about the economic facts involved in the government increasing our money supply. The hon. member said that we run into the terrible danger inherent in the old Social Credit theory of Mr. Aberhart in respect of increasing the money supply. He said that putting this theory into practice would increase inflation tremendously. What is the situation today? We have inflation. This government has already tripled the money supply. As evidence of this one has only to study the figures relating to the years 1964 to 1969. The money supply in Canada has tripled, as have interest rates.

What good has the policy of the government achieved in this respect? Old age pensioners in this country pay income tax to the government. This is a shameful thing. Primary producers have to sell their products in the world markets at a desperately low price because of the inflation in this country. Inflation has not helped these people. In addition, as the hon. member for Bruce so aptly pointed out, this government has reduced subsidies paid to our primary producers in the field of agriculture. I emphasize that the government has reduced the support provided to these primary producers. This is a shameful act on the part of the government.

• (8:10 p.m.)

The government has now reduced its assistance to those very producers, another shameful act. Mention was made by a member of the New Democratic Party of that party's dreams and ideas concerning the way in which Canada should develop. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said that in his belief at no time in Canada's history should the richest man ever receive more than five times what the poorest man is receiving. This is an interesting solution to the problem of poverty. If the poorest man receives a lot of money, I suppose the richest man might well receive a great deal also. However, we must remember—and note of this should be taken especially by those who project the social credit philosophy—that trade barriers throughout the world are continuing to break down and that the economy of Canada must always bear a close relationship to the economy of the world. Whether or not the ideas of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre will ever come true, I am not prepared to say at this time.

I can well remember the idea put forward by Khrushchev that some day and some place capitalism would fail and socialism would take over. Perhaps the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre would agree with this. However, I do not. I think we have reached a period in Canadian history in which the taxpayers of our country are saying that the tax load is too heavy and we must take some steps to reduce it. We have just seen Air Canada go through a severe strike which, to some extent at least, tied up the economy of the country. A settlement was reached according to which wage earners were granted an increase of around 16 per cent over two years in the actual cash received. However, if we take into account all the other advantages thrown in, the increase is nearer 22 per cent over two years, which is very substantial. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) spoke about it.

Let us go back to the time some years ago when the government gave the St. Lawrence Seaway workers an increase which amounted to 32 or 33 per cent. This increase started an inflationary cycle which has not stopped yet. Inflation is the result of such increases being given to wage earners. Wage earners cannot be blamed for demanding high wages. They, too, are caught in an inflationary cycle. What is the real problem? The real problem is the take home pay received by the wage earner, the farmer and the person who is trying to purchase a house, a car and all the things we consider to be necessities in our society today.

Before the supper break I voiced my disappointment at the fact that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) did not oblige the house by being present during this debate which deals with the distribution of goods and services. It is, after all, the consumers who will gain from any reduction in the cost of goods and services. I would have liked to hear the minister's comments on this.

I should like to quote from an article which appeared in the Winnipeg *Tribune* of May 17, 1969. It reads:

> Ronald Basford, the federal minister of consumer and corporate affairs, has announced 27 regional offices will be established by his department—to be staffed by 600 persons. That's only the start. If this new department proliferates at the same rate as the department of manpower, there'll soon be thousands of righteous snoopers leeched on to the public purse.

That would be well and good if they could earn their pay by bringing about a reduction in the cost of goods and services as well as a better distribution of these goods and services rather than increase the taxpayer's load. But will they really do that? I doubt it. They are too concerned with the problems and complaints of the taxpayers and not sufficiently concerned with the problems that bring about the complaints. This article goes on to say that:

> —during the last nine months of 1968, the federal department of consumer and corporate affairs processed 3,109 complaints. During that same period the Better Business Bureau here—with only a staff of four—processed 16,389 inquiries—

That gives us a basis for comparison and some idea as to what can be done. This article goes on to suggest that the reason for most of those inquiries was lack of information about the product concerned. It said that only 556 of the inquiries represented true complaints, and even those could be cleared up when they were taken up with the companies concerned. I am in full agreement with a paragraph in the article which reads as follows:

> There can be no question that governments have a role to play in the area of retail trade practices—including advertising and selling claims and methods. The vast majority of businessmen here concede that a certain amount of government regulation is not only inevitable but also is desirable, to eliminate unfair competition from unscrupulous businessmen.

There is no question in my mind that the government should watch very closely the amalgamation, the merging and the combining of various companies so that we can keep prices as low as possible and allow all people an equal opportunity to enter into business. In other words, the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission should be more active. If we allow the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to run hither and yon dealing with consumer complaints which stem from lack of education rather than try to solve the problem, we will not get further ahead.

All this may serve as a political base from which the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs may be re-elected and re-appointed to the cabinet after the next election, but it will not bring about any real reduction in prices. What is the real problem? I suggest that the real problem of today's wage earner lies in his take home pay. Recently, a prominent speaker in the city of Edmonton—and I give this as an example—stated that Air Canada had tried to hire a test pilot of some ability who worked for Boeing Aircraft in the United States. At that time he received a salary of $35,000 a year in the United States. Air Canada offered him $3,000 more a year. He asked whether with the $3,000 more a year his take home pay would be larger than he was getting in the United States. The accountants figured it out and said that Air Canada would have to offer him $53,000 in order to equal the pay he took home from his job in the U.S. Naturally, he did not accept Air Canada's offer.

We speak about a brain drain. Is it any wonder that there is a brain drain when we have a Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and a Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) who will increase taxes by $845,000 in one year and who have announced they will bring in another budget this year? I suppose we can expect another tax load and Canadians will again have to dig into their pockets.

I think that the distribution of goods and services would be more efficient if this government took the advice of a former minister responsible for housing who firmly believed that every taxpayer should own his own house and who gave him a chance to do so. He wanted to remove the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials and allow the taxpayer a deduction from his income tax for the payments on his house. I would go one step further. If we go back in history we will see that since 1941 the average wage has doubled. In February of 1969 the average wage earner received $115 a week. But what have we done with the income tax exemptions? We have made no effort whatsoever to increase them. I believe that the income tax exemptions which were established back about 1941 at $1,000 per single person should be increased to at least $1,500 and married couples would then have an exemption of $3,000. I am not asking for pie in the sky when I suggest this. I think we should be moving in this direction. I would go one step further.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Let us now consider the great traffic congestion in the greater Montreal area where two and a half million people live. Get out into the streets of Ottawa when everybody is leaving work. It is the same in every other major city in Canada. The automobile is a necessity. Why does not the government give the city-dweller the same privilege as is given to the farmer when it comes to depreciation allowances applicable to necessary means of transport? We are bound to recognize that the automobile is a necessity if one is to work and live in a modern city.

I think we ought to go a step further and say that education is a necessity. We must give practical recognition to the importance of education by saying that when a boy or girl is attending university and still living at home, the education fee can be claimed as a tax exemption.

I see you are becoming a little nervous, Mr. Speaker, because my time is running out. There are a couple of further points I should like to make. I contend it is wrong to train people and then prevent them from earning all they are capable of earning, to discourage them by the provisions of our tax laws. This, too, is a situation which ought to be dealt with by amendments to the Income Tax Act.

**Mr. Speaker:** I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. He could continue, of course, with the unanimous consent of the house.

Has the hon. member the unanimous consent of the house to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Carry on.

**Mr. Horner:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am short of time. I have tried to speak as fast as I can. I shall make the rest of my remarks as brief as possible.

I was saying that having gone to the extent of providing schools and universities, we ought to allow those who have benefitted from these studies to earn whatever they are capable of earning, instead of imposing a penalty on them. A housewife staying at home most of the day might well be a laboratory technician or a teacher, for instance, but our present taxation policy discourages her from going out to teach or work as a nurse or laboratory technician. We should be prepared to allow such women to claim the cost of employing someone else to look after the house or to discharge other household duties, as an acceptable tax deduction. This would encourage them to undertake work of a kind for which they had been trained or for which they had acquired special skill, very often through assistance from government levels.

I have another point. Doctors are allowed to claim in respect of tools and equipment. Yet garage mechanics and a number of other people with similar technical skills are not allowed to do so. Remember, we undertook an extensive program of building technical and vocational schools so that students might acquire some of these very skills. We built such schools from coast to coast, from Victoria Island to Newfoundland. We acknowledge that tools are necessary in order to follow these trades, yet their cost is not an acceptable deduction for tax purposes. In my view, this is a mistake and I would urge the government to give serious consideration to revising its taxation policy in this regard.

There is one other subject upon which I should like to touch briefly. One of the most desperate poverty pockets in our society is that represented by our native people, Indians and Eskimoes. For the last hundred years society has maintained and kept these people but we have made no real strides in encouraging them to become equal partners in contributing to society generally. I believe greater efforts could be made in this direction.

We must give these people the right to run their own affairs. Our efforts so far have not been particularly successful, and if we acknowledge this fact it might be as well for us if the government used very great caution indeed before moving in on the affairs of society generally. I am one who believes that the least government possible may well be the best government. Consider, in this connection, the effect of setting up the machinery of the consumer affairs department. It will require a staff of 600 people, and this is only a beginning, in order to monkey around in our society without even getting at the root of the problem. This is where our greatest problems lie.

I urge the government to give this resolution serious study. Hon. gentlemen opposite find themselves trapped at present in an administrative policy which perhaps is taking them and, consequently the people of Canada, down the long road toward the further entrenchment of government in every walk of life. This, I feel, is not the answer to our basic needs.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the Social Credit theory provides that credit will be distributed free of charge and will be guaranteed by our country's resources. In other words, our country is overflowing with raw materials and energy resources, and our agricultural potential is tremendous. All those riches serve to guarantee the value of this new money.

That is no longer economics, Mr. Speaker, but sheer madness. As we have learned at our expense, here in Canada, a country is not rich because it has uranium in abundance. A country which has urnium is rich if a demand exists for that product, if there are no other competing producers whose prices are lower, if laboratories do not come up with a product capable of replacing uranium and if the needs for uranium are of a persisting nature which justifies its mining, etc. That is a lesson which both Creditistes and separatists must learn.

Ore does not have a value simply because it is in the earth, because it exists. It has a certain value to the extent that it is scarce, that it is useful and that it can be brought at a low cost to the markets which can use it. As new deposits are discovered and the scarceness element decreases, the number of our resources could very well decrease also; those resources might even lose all value.

The value that social credit or a national dividend will put on depends directly on the decrease in the present property's value.

Free credit, whatever its purpose, will always result in the destruction of property.

**An hon. Member:** That is false.

**Mr. Kierans:** What do we stand to lose? To be exact, everything we possess.

It may be that we will have twice as much money in our pockets as a result of the Social Credit dividends, but if the shoes of our children cost five times as much—

**An hon. Member:** Tell us something about stamps!

**Mr. Kierans:** —what would we gain? We are all affected by inflation, as the value of our dollar, of our deposits in credit unions, of our savings bonds and of our wages, disintegrates under the effect of that cancer.

When prices rise, wages lag behind at first, but after a while, the race begins. But some producers of raw materials cannot insist upon higher prices on foreign markets. That is how inflation can eliminate Canada from many world markets, and that is likely to increase our unemployement which is already quite serious.

This may be a hard fact, but I do want to state it: Even the worker who is unemployed now could find himself in a worse situation; he also would have something to lose if the situation got worse. In fact, as unemployment increases, his opportunities to find a job decrease.

Bertrand de Jouvenel recalls an Armenian proverb which says: "The earth is like a pot and man is like a spoon in that pot." And the hon. member for Témiscaminque (Mr. Caouette) goes further and says: "We will give you bread." Mind you, not work, but bread.

But the earth is not a pot, and we are not spoons. Shall we base all our system of values and our morals on our consuming power, or shall we base it on our power to contribute, to give, to work and to increase the well-being of mankind?

That individual consumption should be the object of human life, of the moral society, never in the history of mankind has such a mortifying proposal been made to a nation. Socialists and Communists are more honest than that; they recognize at least the value of work, and agree that the fundamental principle on which every society must rest must be some sort of reward proportionate to the effort, to the initiative and to the economic contribution of the individual.

All of us would like to receive without giving anything in exchange, yet I feel it is very untimely to promote the philosophy according to which the right of individuals to get their share of available goods and services should depend less and less on their participation in the economic life of the country.

There are some honest and sincere people in the Créditiste party, but they are led, and I should say led astray, by certain persons who simply do not know what they are doing. The rich will see their money lose all its value, the worker will see his purchasing power decline and even the unemployed will see their hopes deceived, as higher costs and inflation rule us out—

**An hon. Member:** This is not true!

**Mr. Kierans:** —of every market, thus bringing about increased unemployment and—

**An hon. Member:** This is not true!

**Mr. Kierans:** —and more closing down of plants.

I wish I could propose to the people of Canada a means of receiving without giving. I regret to say so, but such a policy does not exist. It is a myth: the Social Credit myth.

• (8:30 p.m.)

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, I could hear the speeches which have been delivered since the begining of the debate on the motion moved by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) that says:

That, in the opinion of the house, the government has failed to take adequate measures in order to give Canadians the benefit of a policy of distribution of goods and services which would allow each citizen to obtain his share of Canadian abundance.

This afternoon, we had the oportunity to hear a speech by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) and one by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) who could not do any better than resume the minister's arguments, for Conservatives and Liberals are the same, there is nothing different about them—and we have just heard the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) who is also the hon. member for Duvernay and, has in his turn, just taken the floor and tried to lead people astray.

Mr. Speaker, I will try by all means to be more positive and honest than those who spoke before me on this motion now before us, because we believe this to be a basic problem that must be considered objectively.

This motion is an attempt to get at the root of the problem, the basic evil of the Canadian monetary system. I want the Minister of Communications to listen to the simultaneous translation, because he seems to understand English better than French. I hope that the knowledge we want to impart to him will show the side of the poor people, to him who always lived among the rich when he was with the Stock Exchange.

It is about time for them, Mr. Speaker, to look at the other side of the coin and to find out that 68 per cent of Canadian workers make less than $4,000 per year; those people are in a better position to understand what we mean by saying that the government did not take appropriate measures to allow an honest and equitable distribution of goods.

Those who had an easy life, with campaign funds and high finance, cannot understand what we tell them.

[Mr. Kierans.]

That is why, Mr. Speaker, 68 per cent of all Canadians, whose income is $4,000 or less, according to the answer I got from question No. 636 I had put on the order paper, those people do understand.

They do not necessarily react as the Hon. Minister of Regional Economic Expansion would have us believe this afternoon, when he said that the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) was making a laughing-stock of himself.

Mr. Speaker, we do not make a laughing-stock of ourselves, we tell people the truth, we tell it like it is. This government does not make people laugh, it makes them cry, because it is not open and above-board. It tells people: "Vote for the great and fine Liberal party, vote for a majority government, and you will have a just society." And what do we see: The rich are getting richer and richer and wealth is concentrated in fewer hands, as time goes by; the poor are getting poorer and poorer, and they increase in number. This is what the present government brought about.

Mr. Speaker, through the ages all the great social issues had one question in common: how to distribute the wealth created by production.

Let us define our terms, because many people seem unable to understand them. They have ears and hear not—and they have not heard since the very beginning of this debate. This has to stop, because we want this discussion to be constructive.

First let us consider capital. We can agree on a definition. In our views, it is the amount of money needed to process raw material, to convert it into something else; this is done both by men, workers, farmers or others, and by machine, that is to say through automation.

Then there is work, another term which we must define together. To us, it is an element of production the capital, provided by the worker. Work, either by man or by machine is a capital of sorts and a factor of production, under the impulse of the financial capital provided by the employer.

Therefore, theoretically, those agents which all contribute to production must be given a share in proportion to their cooperation. However, it goes without saying that this distribution is not made between abstract entities, but between real beings, which have obligations to meet, i.e., between human beings.

Therefore, that distribution must be fair and equitable. So, distribution of the profits from capitalization, of the yield from the labour capital, and the financial capital, that is, purchasing power.

I am sorry that the Minister of Communications left the house. Maybe this would have turned on his light that is using only a 60 watt bulb. In the capitalist system, capital, one element of private property, plays a more important part than material and labour.

Those are the real facts. The result is, that inevitably private property is dominated by the undue importance attached to capital compared to labour.

In time, through the incentive provided by this system and with the present governments, we find that capitalism becomes a huge socio-economic organization in which capital, and especially money, plays a leading part and an abusive one. Since this government supports capitalism, labour agreements, salaries, working conditions, private properties themselves come against open competition on the market, while the government takes care not to intervene.

Such a system is abusive because the legislator, being in the pay of capital and high finance, is unable to check that competition, in order to distribute more fairly the fruits of capital and labour.

The government tells us about control and stabilization of costs and prices. Now, its only achievement is to establish commissions. And what will such commissions settle? Absolutely nothing.

The government says, opportunely or not, that we should increase productivity and continue producing, that our production is insufficient. However, on our side, we say that the problem is not one of production.

The problem is that the people do not have enough buying power to use up our production. Should we emphasize the need to produce? Certainly not, Mr. Speaker.

What about the hard work done by the worker or the farmer, the white or the blue collar worker?

The big capitalists, in collusion with the government, be it Grit or Tory, for, in fact, there is nothing to differentiate them from one another, have created that situation and the ordinary people, the poor, and the humble are the ones who are made to suffer.

Capitalism, as it is now viewed, becomes abusive and wrong. Big business, from the increasing omnipotence of its financial means, ends by monopolizing trade and small businesses, by absorbing the production and the sales. Unemployment follows and grows. It becomes a chronic ill, a necessary evil, fostered by the governments. Gradually, big business controls prices and sales for its own advantage. That is why we say that the newly-formed commission can only consider the problems and will bring no solutions.

The result is the subjection of the working class to the joint-stock companies, the fantastic opulence of some, the extreme poverty of a great many, contempt for the dignity of labourers, for work, for the common weal and for the very social aspect of economic activity.

Créditistes contend and rightly so—the situation proves it quite clearly—that there is poverty amidst affluence. That is a fact. It is a race between prices and salaries which is called inflation and which is due to the human, legitimate and deep desire of each individual to get his just share of life, happiness, security, economic, social and political freedom. Everyone is entitled by his birth and as a man to a vital minimum, to a guaranteed minimum income, in other words, to a national dividend, as advocated by the Créditistes.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Unfortunately, the abuses of the capitalist system deprive the individual of that guaranteed minimum income since it fails to ensure it. It is a blow to private property. This is the doing of socialism and it is just the contrary of what was said earlier by the Minister of Communications who is misleading people in that regard.

This is why we are perfectly justified, owing to the situation of Canada and of Canadians, to bring in a motion of censure against this government which has not taken effective measures to stop the abuses of such a system but also has taken steps to worsen the problem: tax increases, removal of ceilings regarding interest rates on agricultural loans, on loans to fishing operations, etc. The bills this government has proposed and passed since the beginning of the session, taking advantage of its arrogant majority, have pushed Canadian families and small enterprises deeper into debt and more quickly still. There again, private property is being attacked.

We are sure, and economic councils and experts agree, that the problem to be dealt with at the present time is not a problem of production, because with technical progress, new machinery, automation, the discovery of new sources of power, an abundance of products is possible. That is not where the problem lies.

The time has come to have society as a whole, each person within society, including the young, share in this abundance. The time has come to distribute this production in a socially-minded way, without prejudice to anyone's rights, without depriving man of his freedom, to protect private enterprise. That to me is the best solution.

Mr. Speaker, because of the present interest of the matter in this country and the controversies to which it has given rise between supporters and opponents, it would be dishonest, to say the least, to ignore this method of distribution of the abundance we do not know what to do about now.

Humanity has a right to life, that is the fundamental principle. To enable it to live, there must be an appropriate distribution of wealth. In our times, the division between capitalists and wage-earners has not always given good results. I do not believe that Communism would do any better, quite the opposite. Nevertheless, capitalism should become more concerned about the community, about society.

Social Credit does not object to capitalism in itself. The Creditiste economy wants instead to improve capitalism by making it, both on the economic and on the social levels, more equitable, more human or in other words, more social.

Social Credit insists on the fact that the present economic life is not organized to distribute goods produced or created by the resources of nature, labour or industry.

It seems indeed, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of people are hungry and destitute, not because there are not enough goods to give them a decent minimum, but because the present economic life or still better, the monetary system is not well organized.

And the small industry is not only unable to subsist, but it experiences difficulties in trying to survive.

In support of that finding from the Creditiste point of view and in order to bring up something new, I would like to refer to a very seldom quoted but quite interesting statement by Daniel-Rops who said:

> What is essential? That man live or that goods sell well? All the academic arguments cannot convince us that human beings must die in order that a certain margin of profit be protected. If work and the value attached up to now to our monetary and economic systems are now conflicting, the only logical solution should be to dissociate them.

Jacques Maritain also, in his book entitled *Les droits de l'homme et la loi naturelle*, stated on page 132:

> And a deeper right still demands that we all, as coheirs of the common good, freely share the basic material and spiritual goods of civilization to the extent that the community or groups can allow their free use to their members, helping them to break free from the necessaries of matter and to progress in the life of reason and virtue.

Major Douglas, founder of the Social Credit proclaimed his belief and conviction as follows, and this proves that the ministers were wrong in what they said this afternoon. He said, and I quote:

> We profess that all goods that are produced by society, through common social effort and which are the results of the division and work of the technique and the machine must first of all serve to meet the needs of society.
>
> We call for social utilization of social production and to this end, there must be a social distribution of the wealth produced from a balanced purchasing power.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that the purpose of any economy is to satisfy the material needs of man.

On the other hand, our present economic system is a huge machinery having three main mechanisms.

Here again, our Liberal and Conservative friends are unable and unwilling to admit the fact, because of their ties and of their masters. On the one hand, we have the production mechanism. On the other, that of consumption, and between the two, that of distribution.

This organization is imposed by the very nature of things. Are not products made to be distributed to consumers?

The capitalist will say that products and their value must be protected to the extent that they should disappear or be destroyed, as was done in the past with butter and so many other products, while mankind is starving to death. The Créditiste will say in turn that society must achieve its goal as a whole as well as in its parts and that we must therefore give the people, the workers, etc.,

not only what is physically possible and morally desirable, but above all the necessary, the guaranteed minimum income, namely the national dividend, their share in the national product and its monerary counterpart, the compensated discount.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Short of that, Mr. Speaker, we are in the situation we know now, and that is poverty in the midst of abundance, then private property, private enterprise, and the individual cannot survive. Capital is the only thing now that survives and prevails.

The individual remains the servant of money, which is nonsense. That is exactly what young people challenge nowadays, because of the unjust things due to the famous dollar symbol, because their elders have to work, to sweat day after day on account of that dollar, to be a slave to it. Young people nowadays are protesting and we shall see that phenomenon, on May 31st, on June 1st in Montreal on the occasion of this great demonstration, "Carrefour 69", organized by the Young Catholic Workers, who are neither Créditiste, nor Liberal, nor Conservative nor NDP followers. More than 10,000 young people will gather there, create committees on unemployment, etc. and try to find a solution, but who will be unable to find anything else than what we say, namely that man should be the master, that money should be at the service of man and that justice must be done in every way in that field.

Since machine is replacing man more and more, man will consequently have to live. Since we are heading more and more towards a civilization of leisure, where working hours are reduced, where union members themselves call for shorter hours, those labourers and workers must nevertheless share the purchasing power, even if their income is reduced because they work less. This is inevitable because of machines, of automation.

But our monetary system is not geared to that type of civilisation. I agree with those who question this seriously, through peaceful means, such as the group "Carrefour 69", because this will mean a new awareness, a new collective soul-searching on the part of our youth. In this, they set the example for some of their elders, parents and many legislators who do not even dare to seek a solution to the problem. The only thing they can do is to run down the Creditistes and say, "All you have is a money machine; that is useless".

Mr. Speaker, our young people are more objective than many of our legislators; they try to find a solution basing themselves on the principle, the idea, that there may be something worthwhile in creditiste doctrine just as there may be in the socialist doctrine or the capitalist doctrine.

It is a matter of keeping one's eyes open, of being objective, and not of saying: The Creditistes are stupid, demagogues, as the minister did, poking fun at them, because that is all they found to say this afternoon. I should like to close my remarks on that.

I am still very perplexed personally, and I do intend to tell all the young people I meet to continue to challenge those who would fool the people and mislead them. Why? On November 1st last, I asked this question...

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I must interrupt the hon. member whose time has expired, unless he has unanimous consent to pursue his remarks.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Fortin:** I shall take one minute. I thank the house, and Your Honour for their kindness towards me.

Mr. Speaker, on November 1st last, I asked—I shall conclude on this hoping that the members will think about this—what steps the government intended to take to check poverty in Canada. The reply was this: Commissions will be appointed. I should like to spare myself the trouble of reading the answer, but I should like to refer the members to question No. 636 asking them to take the time to read the reply. I can supply them with a copy of it. They will then see how many falsehoods we heard today.

I asked, in that same question, how many workers were earning less than $3,000 a year in Canada. You know that the purchasing power $3,000 a year represents is clearly inadequate, the cost of living being what it is. Mr. Speaker, here is the answer given by the government, by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin): 47.9 per cent of Canadian workers earn less than $3,000 a year. As for those who earn between $3,000 and $4,000, about whom I asked the same question, the answer was 20.9 per cent. This, Mr. Speaker, makes a total of 68 per cent of Canadian workers, of Canadian bread-earners getting less than $4,000 and this does not include the unemployed, 450,000 in Canada. If you add the additional unemployed, you will realize that the decisions made by the governments, in this respect, whether now or

before, were nothing else but floundering. They have been endlessly going round in circle without solving the problem. On the contrary, they made things worse.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make of it a political issue but only that we should ponder over it and ask my hon. colleagues in the house to consider the problem, to consider it in earnest for if they do not, one day the young people will no longer be satisfied with gathering at "*Carrefour '69*". They will have to blast up the whole system, to put there some kind of justice and equality for there will be no other answer.

When we have a percentage of 68 per cent of our Canadian workers earning less than $4,000 a year and with more than 450,000 unemployed, we must, in all fairness, question ourselves and stop impeaching others with demagogy, stupidity and so on.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, we in this party do not share belief in the remedies which the party to our left puts forward as being all-corrective for the situation of poverty in Canada. However, we are grateful to the Ralliement Creditiste for having put this motion on the order paper today because it has forced the house to consider a situation which, in my view, is far more important than a number of other situations on which we have spent a lot of time this session. The motion reads:

> That, in the opinion of the house, the government has failed to take adequate measures in order to give Canadians the benefit of a policy of distribution of goods and services which would allow each citizen to obtain his share of Canadian abundance.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Because of committee work today, I found it necessary to miss most of the debate in the house. However, I have heard that statistics have been given by many speakers to show the extent of poverty in Canada. One such statistic has just been cited by my friend to the left. He pointed out that 68 per cent of Canadian workers receive less than $3,000 a year, if I heard the figures correctly. This is about as damaging as any statistic that could be given. The Economic Council points out that one Canadian in five is living below the poverty line. I think it is time that we asked what poverty is in Canada today. Again, I believe the shortest and perhaps the most authoritative way to answer the question might be to quote the Fifth Annual Review of the Economic Council. I shall read from page 104:

> The problem of poverty in developed industrial societies is increasingly viewed not as a sheer lack of essentials to sustain life, but as an insufficient access to certain goods, services, and conditions of life which are available to everyone else and have come to be accepted as basic to a decent, minimum standard of living.

So, it is not whether a person is actually starving to death in the streets which determines whether he belongs in the poverty category. It is the fact that he is condemned, in a society in which we are able to produce a good standard of living for the normal citizen, to exist on a much lower standard. That is poverty in a modern, industrialized society. It is exceedingly widespread in Canada. If we do not do something about it, we will find ourselves in the same condition in which societies which are older and more developed than ours find themselves; that is, we will have many troubles and outbreaks because injustice simply cannot be tolerated longer by the people.

Poverty today is not what it used to be. A good many years ago poverty was limited to a very small proportion of the people. They were people who were unfortunate or in some way badly handicapped. Their problems were taken care of by charitable organizations and later on by government handouts of various kinds. I should like to point out, however, that poverty is not of that nature any more. Those of us who come from the large cities such as Montreal, Vancouver, Toronto, Winnipeg, and perhaps some not so large, know that there are large numbers of people of the third and fourth generation who have never known any other kind of life but poverty. If we look for the reason for the increase in delinquency and crime as the months and years go on, we will find it in these homes because they are the seed bed in which these things grow. When you find large numbers of people in the cities who are in this poverty situation, and have been for three or four generations, you begin to understand what the cancer is today that is spreading from generation to generation.

A child who has never experienced any life other than slum conditions is handicapped before he even leaves for his first experience at school. No amount of tender care, wise direction by the teachers, rehabilitation programs, head starts, or anything else in school will ever make up to him for those years which he spent in a slum environment. He can never overtake it. Now, we are beginning

to have another kind of poverty. We have the type of poverty that is hitting our rural districts. People are being forced off the land because they can no longer earn a living for themselves. This is applicable particularly to the younger people.

We find that no less a person than Andre Saumier, assistant deputy minister in the new Department of Regional Economic Expansion, said there is little point in forcing a farmer to leave the Gaspé to join the ranks of the jobless in Montreal. He said that sweeping plans for redevelopment of poverty stricken rural areas should not be launched unless the people displaced by the program can be absorbed elsewhere in the economy. This is what Mr. Saumier told the Senate Committee on poverty yesterday.

As I say, in our cities we find more and more people living in conditions of poverty. Let me give as an example a situation in our capital city which has been drawn to my attention. This is not my riding, but the report was given to me by a woman whom I know very well. She and her husband are both engaged in real estate work in Ottawa. I shall read her letter because what she has to say is very well put:

Here are some details of a young family which may help you illustrate the desperate need in this city for low rent housing. I shall try to be brief.

Mr. and Mrs. Vincent X have, for the past 3 years or so, been tenants in a property we manage—

Then, she gives the address.

They have 9 children—ages 6 to 15 yrs. All attending school.

As a result of an accident at work (for which he received no compensation) Mr. X's brain was injured and he became an epileptic—very severe seizures. To compound his troubles he developed a stomach ulcer—during a seizure last month it burst and he hemorrhaged fatally.

He had received his notice to vacate in January. Because he could not find a place we gave him another month—no luck—and then he died. Because of the circumstances we allowed Mrs. X another month. She was to have been out yesterday. Despite her efforts she could not get a place to live. We are allowing her this last month but she will have to get out at the end of May. (At the rental today the building is not even producing enough to pay operating expenses, let alone major repairs which must be effected immediately. It is not economically feasible, in fact it is financial disaster, to keep renting the units as single family dwellings unless the rents are doubled—rather than be a party to that we are changing its use and converting to smaller rental units. In the immediate past, before this tight housing situation, and despite the fact that the rents were low—this building was a heartbreak to manage—low income and welfare families were so often dirty and destructive and would not keep the rent paid. At present, in this row there are two families in arrears of rent—one of them for nearly $300).

Even if inadequate accommodation at $175 or $200 was available (it is not because of the 9 children) Mrs. X is allowed $100 rental allowance—anything above that is taken out of their food allowance. Goodness knows, the children are thin enough now.

There are houses, expropriated by the N.C.C. which are vacant and boarded up but there is no low rent housing available—welfare recipients are only allowed to occupy 10% of a low-rent housing development. This desperate situation was brought on in part by the city, too, using its expropriation powers with gay abandon while not having a backlog of housing available. Our ward alderman told me there are 60 homeless families. The cost to the city, housing them in marginal hotels is enormous.

If Mrs. X does not find a place to live her family will be broken up. Mrs. X is a good mother, loving and kind and her children are clean, polite and well looked after. She has had so many problems with a husband who drank, out of sheer misery and frustration, and trying to manage on an inadequate income—that she is receiving psychiatric treatment.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I would be afraid of what might happen if she is separated from her children. She is unnaturally calm.

The older men have made last minute efforts to find something—and I am doing my best—the Huards are Protestants but our church does not seem to have any organization to help them.

No one else would help them, either. Let me refer to another case of poverty. I could talk about this for a long time. There are many cases of this type in all parts of Canada. Here is a letter from an individual who lives in my own city, a woman I know very well:

We have a son 38 now out of work. The man he used to work for hasn't anything for himself, let alone anyone else and he usually puts furnaces in houses. Things are getting so people cannot afford even such necessities as furnaces. Our son was only working casual labour so has not been able to save for a rainy day so to speak. And having no trade complicates matters a bit. He also had a nervous breakdown a month ago and is still under Dr.'s care. Now on top of that the building inspector has been around and we have to sign a paper to say it would be a hardship if we didn't allow our son and his wife to live in the illegal suite in the basement of our home, as if it wasn't enough for him to be unemployed and sick. What is to become of him with no trade? He is not alone either.

I could read you many such letters from pensioners, young people, elderly people, incapacitated people and ordinary people, all of whom are poor. What are we going to do? We cannot shut our eyes to this situation. If we do, we do so at our peril. I think only of those citizens who will turn to crime as a result of poverty.

Let me now read to you from the Economic Council report which states in part:

> We believe that serious poverty should be eliminated in Canada, and that this should be designated as a major national goal. We believe this for two reasons. The first is that one of the wealthiest societies in world history, if it also aspires to be a just society, cannot avoid setting itself such a goal. Secondly, poverty is costly. Its most grievous costs are those felt directly by the poor themselves, but it also imposes very large costs on the rest of society.
>
> These include the costs of crime, disease, and poor education. They include the costs of low productivity and lost output, of controlling the social tensions and unrest associated with gross inequality, and of that part of total welfare expenditure which is essentially a palliative made necessary by the failure to find more fundamental solutions. It has been estimated in the United States that one poor man can cost the public purse as much as $140,000 between the ages of 17 and 57.

No matter how much the government wants to cut back on services, it is not going to cut back on the cost of police and other services necessary to deal with situations resulting from poverty. The government will then find itself dealing with a number of situations instead of one. It will have to take part in providing solutions to those problems resulting from poverty. In order that we can bring up our citizens in the proper way, the government will have to use its money to keep them in health and security.

This is the situation we face. Just what has this government done during this session to alleviate it? I suggest that this government has a poor record with regard to the poverty situation. Earlier in the session the government announced it was going to do something to raise the basic old age pension. We have now had a 2 per cent increase in the form of an allowed statutory increase, but at the same time the cost of living increased by 4 per cent. As a result, the gap has widened.

We were told by this government there would be no increase in veterans' pensions. Again, the gap was widened. The cost of living went up but pensions remained the same. We have been given a number of reasons for the failure to raise pensions. The government, in fact, has not told us directly they cannot be raised but has told us that this situation has been under active, earnest and serious consideration. This government has given us every excuse in the book.

We have considered legislation on various subjects, but none of it has contained provision for alleviation of the housing situation or for urban redevelopment. Perhaps such legislation will be forthcoming, but it is not before us yet. This government has not offered any solution in respect of these situations. It has not given any encouragement to the belief that it will be taking measures in respect of low rental developments and urban development. Is this government afraid to do so? I hope it will bring in measures to do something for this element of our society. These people cannot exist without public housing. This country must be concerned about the lack of housing, just as we, individually, should be concerned.



What is the answer to this soaring cost of living? We were told the other day that the government is setting up another commission to study the cost of living, prices and income. The ledger is completely blank in respect of action on the part of the government along these lines. The government has done nothing in respect of training these people, such as the man to whom I referred who is now 38. Perhaps he cannot be retrained because he is not capable of taking courses. The government has turned a deaf ear to the requests of such people who live in the areas from the maritime provinces to Vancouver.

The only measures the government has taken have been directed to an area so small that they really have had little effect. There is no accommodation in large cities for these people. This is a very black picture. I wish it could be better. We have heard about some accomplishments along these lines as a result of government action, but we know of none in respect of the needs of those people who live in poverty or in that layer just above it. If we do nothing for this latter group, they will very shortly fall into the poverty group and the conditions under which they are now living will worsen.

It is all very well to say we do not have the money to do these things. We are being told all along the line that something will be done. We anxiously await the fulfilment of these promises, but we know very well that the government will again tell us it is not able to provide measures necessary to deal with poverty. The government, on the other hand, has indicated it can afford to combat the cost of living and the increase in the cost of housing. It apparently intends to deal with many other things of this nature.

If war broke out tomorrow we would see the same thing happen as happened when World War II broke out. Many factories would be converted to the production of war materials. After the outbreak of World War II factories were opened to cope with the tremendous need for uniforms, equipment,

ships, planes and other things. We had training courses for pilots, observers and other combat teams. If this sort of thing can be done during wartime it can be done during peacetime in respect of our war on poverty.

We do not follow any old Social Credit policy. We do not believe in the appointment of Crown corporations as an answer to the situation. We do not think the government will succeed in solving this problem in respect of poverty by a false or unrealistic approach. Such an approach might be followed by the opening or re-opening of factories, but would not develop a sound or profitable economy. The only result would be an increased tax load.

**An hon. Member:** Will it ever?

**Mrs. MacInnis:** I see hon. members on the other side smiling. I suggest to them that these necessary things should be done before other things are carried out. These people in the poverty class can work and will work. Before you call me to order, Mr. Speaker, and I notice that you are becoming a little restless, I should like to say one or two things.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I must bring to the attention of the hon. member the fact that her time has expired.

**Mrs. MacInnis:** Mr. Speaker, may I just finish this sentence?

**Mr. Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

• (9:20 p.m.)

**Mrs. MacInnis:** I will make it reasonably short, Mr. Speaker. Before this session is much further advanced the government should at least decide how it can give the people in the poverty bracket in this country faith that the government means what it says, that it intends to work, however slowly, toward achieving a just society.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, the motion which we presented today was rather important since we were tremendously honoured with the participation of two cabinet ministers.

We must admit that this intrusion of the minister in a Créditiste debate is for us a kind of victory, because if we analyse the present political situation in our country and more particularly in Quebec, we find that the government, nay, the party in office has just realized that people are ready to try something new, that they are ready to carry out what the Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion has called illusions.

Mr. Speaker, we are not afraid to put these so-called illusions into practice.

And the participation of these two ministers in this debate shows quite clearly that the Liberal party found that the Créditistes become stronger and stronger, more and more important, not because they are Créditistes as such, but because the solution they offer, in this time of extreme confusion from one end of the country to the other is the only one that bring something new.

Mr. Speaker, you will allow me to challenge the most important argument of the hon. Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). I looked at him from the galleries this afternoon, and the minister was really in fine fettle. He congratulated us, the Créditistes, for having successfully prodded the Establishment, for having finally budged one of these administrations which followed one another and which never thought of implementing solutions which are as simple as shelling peas, Mr. Speaker.

When the hon. Minister of Regional Economic Expansion tells us that he would be the first one to accept our suggestions right away, and that if it were useful to spread around two more billions—that was the figure he gave—to help solving the problem of the distribution of wealth, he would do it immediately and that he would be happy to do it.

And he went on to tell us how he is trying, personally, and along with the government, to solve that problem, how they have set their heart on solving it, and how they are trying everything under the sun. But it is passing strange. Why try so hard, with all kinds of plans, while rejecting our solution out of hand. Why reject it? Mainly because it has never been tried before, they tell us, it has never been put to work.

Mr. Speaker, this is sophistry, an essentially stupid argument. I wish to offer a few comparisons.

Mr. Speaker, fifty years ago, if our grandparents had been told that in a few years they would be able to see animated images transmitted across hundreds of miles, they would have said that it was an illusion, pure utopia, a ridiculous or even an insane idea.

*Distribution of Goods and Services*

Mr. Speaker, today we see on our television screen, things which may be happening thousands of miles away. The mad illusions of a few years back have become a fact.

Closer to home and this comparison has even more value I think—we have a saying: To promise the moon and stars, which means something impossible, an illusion. Well, this afternoon, we were only nine miles from the moon—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Matte:** —and next month, American cosmonauts will land on the moon.

The illusions, the fancies, the mad ideas of yesteryear have come true.

Mr. Speaker, should we be blamed for a policy, a doctrine that is so much in the van of progress that when it was set forth in the thirties it was like asking for the moon and the stars.

But today, after partial attempts made in British Columbia, in Alberta, no reform such as the one we advocate has been achieved. It remains that Social Credit governments in those provinces are firmly established.

It remains that the illusions, the phantasms, the utopias forecast by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion can become real, at least in part. And we have the proof of that. This comparison proves that one should never say in this world that a thing is not good just because it has not been attempted.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the simplest calculation should be a cause for more serious reflection. Is a thing not good just because it is advocated by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), leader of the Ralliement créditiste? The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion addressed the hon. member by his name during his speech, instead of mentioning his riding as required by the standing orders of the house.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, is it because our members come from rural areas, from Eastern Canada, specially from Quebec, that this is no good. If we helped as he said to get things moving, if we helped in making the government take more serious consideration of the problems of poverty, of the distribution of goods, is that demagogy? And what is the difference between that and demagogy that makes people believe that there will be a just society thanks to legislations such as those that have been enacted since last September? That, is the utmost in demagogy, indeed!



As compared to the one used by the government, our kind of demagogy—if you want to call it that—is at least much closer to reality and it seems to me that they should not blame and send to the devil people who spare no effort to promote progress, advancement, and who want only to provide all the people with a system that is really adequate, a system that would help to solve the problem of distribution.

The Minister has also admitted that it is a problem of distribution and that the government was trying hard to solve it. The funny thing is that distribution as set up by the government—and we have all kinds of evidence of this—tends to distribute always in the same place. And the poor remain poor, and the rich continue of course to be rich and even to get richer as they are always at the receiving end.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need to exert ourselves to find programs to make that kind of a distribution. When we recommend another kind of distribution by an easy method, that is to increase the purchasing power, I do not see why it should be called utopia or demagogy.

In my opinion, the very statements of these ministers are the proof that we are right.

They prove that we are taken seriously, since they took the trouble to appeal to the big guns to try and stop our irresistible progress towards the total understanding of what we have been preaching for years.

Mr. Speaker, the minister said, at the beginning of his speech when he commended the leader of the Ralliement creditiste, that he found it very pleasant to listen to the leader of the Ralliement creditiste, especially as he could guess in advance what his speech would be, the same as always, but nevertheless, he enjoyed listening to him.

I have already said, during that famous debate on the omnibus bill, that as a former teacher who taught for thirteen years, I have long learned that when you deal with blockheads, it is quite necessary to repeat the same thing over and over again in order to be understood.

Mr. Speaker, when a truth is obvious, does one have to use other words? Should one find other subjects, other reasons, in order to explain something which is real in itself and cannot be changed? If we advocate a monetary reform, and expect through it to radically change society and the freedoms of the human being, we shall keep on repeating the same thing. That is our purpose. To

accuse us of repeating the same thing all the time is a compliment paid to us. That means that we stick to our ideas, to our principles, to our convictions, that we do want to achieve our aim.

Mr. Speaker, after all those opinions put forward during the debate, we are more and more convinced that in the maze of policies, even if the Minister of the Regional Economic Expansion winced once more when the leader of the Ralliement créditiste mentioned planning, and of course, we know that the government is engaged in planning and is even interested in doing so, especially when a former labour and socialist leader is concerned. Indeed, we know how fond they are of planning.

Mr. Speaker, we also have a plan for reform and want you to understand that we are serious. We would like you, for once, in order to prove to us that we are really wrong, that this is utopia, to be decent enough to tell us that you are going to give it a try. And when the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) is telling us over and over again about what happened during the war, it is because it is a striking example of how problems born from the most extraordinary recession we have experienced in years were solved by the war. Why? Because the money required to step up production, to carry on and to win the war was made available.

Why do we repeat over and over again the same arguments? Because we simply want this plan which worked in time of war to work in time of peace. Those things seem easy to understand but when we are up against ill will, the only thing we can do is to come back over and over again to the same subject until we have made our point.

In conclusion, I would like to stress a few comments on the participation in the present debate of the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans). The Minister of Communications is another one who has taken at heart for some years now the task of fighting against Social Credit. He always fights in the same way. He always brings forward the same arguments and this time he brought out the one we were advocating, namely to distribute money, and said we had no policy to help labour.

Mr. Speaker, here again is an argument that is completely illogical. Of course, if we increase the purchasing power, we increase the consumption of products, we therefore have, that is the producers of such goods have to increase their labour force; as they increase it, they create more work and thus turns the wheel and we finally achieve a just society. It is the only way to achieve that just society.

**Mr. J. A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières):** Mr. Speaker, to reply to all the speeches made this afternoon, especially those of the Créditistes, would lead us so far that, in the end, it would be a great loss of time.

Their notice of motion reads:

> That in the opinion of the house, the government has failed to take adequate measures in order to give Canadians the benefit of a policy of distribution of goods and services which would allow each citizen to obtain his share of Canadian abundance.

First, it is not very clear, because it should be explained what is meant by "his share of Canadian abundance" and "a policy of distribution of goods and services". Solutions should be proposed.

Our friends, the Créditistes, suggest as a solution to distribute national dividends among all Canadians. And where is the money to come from? They do not seem to worry too much about that. They are relying on natural resources.

I think two refutations were quite eloquent, even though the Créditistes won't admit it, and even though they are vexed when they are told they are not always logical, that they are day dreaming. We should remind them that they make no bones about calling other members who do not think like them, names much more offensive than the one they are given.

In the course of the debate who lasted more than three weeks for instance, they went so far as to call us on this side of the house murderers. I therefore think they should not be so sensitive and bear to be called once in a while dreamers or visionaries.

Mr. Speaker, I shall restrict my speech to a few remarks about poverty. It is a fact there is poverty in Canada. It is a fact that there are some in every country of the world and that there will be some also after we have disappeared from the earth's surface, and I did not invent it; nor do I want it. It is said literally in the Scriptures by someone who is superior to us all, and even superior to the members of the Ralliement créditiste. It is Christ who said one day: "The poor always ye have with you".

• (9:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Caouette:** Yes, poor in spirit.

**Mr. Mongrain:** Whatever means you take, there will always be some poor people.

I understand it is our responsibility to fight poverty by all means and this is what we are trying to do as far as possible, and perhaps our friends, the Créditistes, are not aware of it, because they are satisfied with the semblance of truth.

Nevertheless, it is said that, actually, Canada's economy ranks third in the whole world, the first place being held by West Germany and the second, by the Netherlands. I am not saying those things in order to suggest that we should be satisfied with the situation that is ours. It is true that we must always strive for perfection.

I should like during a few short minutes to answer a statement I have often heard from the spokesmen of the Ralliement créditiste, who are rightly complaining that poverty exists in Canada. This is what they say: There is a gross national income of $67 billion in Canada, expenditures amount to about $47 billion. Then, where are—and I quote these figures roughly, naturally—where are the other $20 billion going?

And they suggest that this amount simply goes into what they call the capitalists' pockets, because once in a while they favour private enterprise, then socialism. They say they are against socialism; but the next day, they declare themselves in favour of private enterprise.

Their reasoning is somewhat difficult to follow. Let me show you. I take the official figure. The gross national income is $67 billion.

**Mr. Caouette:** That is not income, but production. That is something else.

**Mr. Mongrain:** Let us say that there is $100 million more for the year 1968. The official statistics indicate, however, that in that $67 billion gross national income, there is what we can call some indirect capitalization drawn from taxes and used, for instance, for the maintenance of roads, schools, hospitals and various similar public services, these requiring altogether from the various governments in Canada about $9,500 million each year. This means that the $67 billion are somewhat reduced.

There is also another part of that gross national product which helps to cope with what is called the depreciation of businesses, farms, dwellings, industrial equipment and this is as important, for example, as the workers' tools if we wish to maintain the productivity in the country which includes another $7½ billion.

This means that we have already reached some $16 or $17 billion which must be subtracted from those $67 billion.

There is another $7½ billion which is affected by the federal and provincial governments to welfare services of all sorts. There is a wide range of them.

This is to say, that after having noted that the gross national product amounts to $67,100 million of gross national product, according to the figures for 1968, there only remains $42,600 million for the daily needs of Canadians. Now, our friends from the Ralliement créditiste ask: "Where does the rest go?" Well it is there. They know it, because they are as well informed as we are, but they play the devil's advocate; they forget to quote the figures that they should quote under certain circumstances.

I would say, that they are not more justified when upholding the cause of poverty to say that the government has done nothing and when I refer to the government I include the previous governments as well as the present one, because according to them, they are all governments of bad guys financed by slush funds who have sold themselves body and soul to financiers. There is an American saying: "Ignorance is bliss." Our friends of the Ralliement créditiste are blissful people. There are so many things that they are ignorant of.

In addition, they have another complex, the Pharisee complex: "God I thank thee that I am not as other men are."

I alone am good. No other man is virtuous. I have much sympathy for my friends, the Créditistes, and even though I do not share their opinion, I shall fight until I die to protect their right to err, and to err, and to err again. But I would object if they kept on deceiving their constituents who have less opportunity to get information, and who, for some reasons outside their competence, may be simple souls, with a poor grasp of public affairs.

Briefly, I would like to say that our present government is not dreaming; it clearly sees the needs of the Canadian collectivity and wants to solve them, not in thirty-five years from now, as one speaker said earlier. He said: "We have been waiting for thirty-five

years." Thirty-five years ago, we could not ask for the moon, but we have finally reached it. It may take another thirty-five years or perhaps another century, to bring it over here. Meanwhile, some poor people need help today, in 1969. Modern governments who are realists, who do not have their head in the clouds and do not wish to deceive the population, have taken concrete measures. I refer to governments who may come into power, or once were in office, and not to those who dream that one day, perhaps in a hundred or a thousand years, they will finally be called upon to conduct public affairs.

Mr. Speaker, there are social and concrete laws, and they know it. Why not admit it? There is such thing as family allowances. They are not high enough? I agree. But they exist. They did not exist thirty-five years ago.

There is the old-age pension. There are also pensions for disabled people. Medicare, student loans, subsidies, grants of the federal government for the construction of school or hospitals, all these things are to help the poor and not the rich.

The grants to universities, to research, all welfare legislation and recreation grants are real, concrete assets.

There is also the ARDA program to foster the economy of some regions and some legislative measures to help farmers. I know there could always be more. That is what our friends say to the poor of the province of Quebec. I observed that in all polls where the Créditiste candidate was gaining in my own county, most of the people lived on welfare allowances paid by the federal or provincial government, because they were taught by the Créditistes not to be satisfied with what they had.

They were not told: "You have this and that," but "You do not have enough." They were not told: "Your father did not get any of this", but "You do not have enough." They were not told: "Your grandfather did not know what welfare meant", but: "You do not have enough. Demand, demand, ask for more."

It is easy to promise the moon and the stars when you do not have to deliver. And since then, Mr. Speaker, this government has increased unemployment insurance benefits; it has promulgated a law on guaranteed minimum income which, after all, does help the needy. It has organized retraining courses in order to give more schooling to the unemployed so that they may get jobs. Grants have been authorized to move the unemployed from one place to another where they may find a job; unemployment insurance is about to be adopted by most of the provinces. Assistance to regional promotion would have been voted if my friends from the Ralliement créditiste would not have spent three weeks in telling us obscene stories. Furthermore, the Canada Assistance Act is contributing to the solution of special cases. Help to consumers will be provided by the hon. minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford). After all, this is quite a number of laws.

Provinces are benefitting from the fiscal equalization program. Such measures tend to help the poor, the low-paid workers, those who have less financial means than others.

But to say that the government is not looking after people is not true. It is demagoguery, it is luring the public with things which my friends from the Ralliement créditiste could not give themselves. It is a kind of charlatanism, Mr. Speaker, which makes them say that they have magical cures to all ills.

A while ago I saw somebody laughing when the minister was mentioning that some sick persons thought that a small piece of wire around a leg or an arm could cure them. One knows the stories about those magic powders, one knows them to be false promises. One knows about those midway barkers who say "Come in and see the big show". Come in, and we will show you how to become millionaires. How to learn English in ten hours. How to play the piano in fifteen. That is what our friends of the Ralliement Créditiste are doing: they lure the population with unattainable prospects.

Obviously, those in poverty—they have always existed and will always exist—follow the saying that it's no use preaching to a hungry man, and they say to themselves: we might as well try that. However, they promise them things which will bring them cruel disillusions.

• (9:50 p.m.)

One may ask, Mr. Speaker, if anybody with a sense of responsibilities, who takes part in the administration of a public body as important as the federal government, which is responsible for ten provinces and 21 million people, has the right to lure an uninformed population with such bright prospects. Such a person must believe himself to be more intelligent than God, Who said: In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread. The Créditistes,

for their part, say: We will pay you to loaf, we will give you dividends every month. I can assure you that the Créditistes do not have any inferiority complex.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we could have lengthy discussions on poverty. We could find solutions. Constructive proposals have been made this afternoon by one of my colleagues of the Liberal party, and by some hon. members of the Progressive Conservative party. I do not want to repeat them all, that would be tedious.

Before offering a suggestion to my party, that I believe constructive, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that economic stagnation has a pause. I am not forgetting that the economic problem is world-wide and some countries, more important than ours, are suffering from it more severely than we are. I would give England and France as examples. The United States have had to increase their taxes by 10 per cent recently to fight inflation. Canada is also a victim and every responsible member of this house wishes to find constructive means to fight this wave of inflation.

There is to my mind something irrational in the way we are going about it, and I wish to make a practical suggestion. While we are adopting legislation to strengthen regional economies, while we are voting moneys for this purpose, for example, in the lower St. Lawrence region as well as in other parts of the country, we are allowing a situation of which I cannot approve to go on. A number of my colleagues, even some members of the Ralliement créditiste, with whom I am not always in agreement, do not approve of this either. I mean that proliferation of strikes which, in most cases, is not justified by serious reasons. I am holding here the last bulletin of the Department of Labour, which we received today. It tells us that, and I quote:

> The total time lost because of work stoppages in the month of April reached 272,490 work-days. that is the equivalent of a loss of 20 man-days per 10,000 man-days—

Take 272,460 man-days at $1.50 an hour, which is very low, and which could be worth $2 or more; that means we lost during that month over $3 million in salaries to workers. That, without mentioning the other benefits, such as those in the subsidiary industries which depend on those large concerns. Nor do I mention, for instance, the taxes of all kinds which the governments lost. This means that multiplied by 12, we would get a total loss of some $60 to $70 million, due to work stoppages through those strikes which, most of the time, are not justified, and are nothing more than prestige strikes or rivalry strikes amongst the unions.



Mr. Speaker, to my mind strikes have become obsolete. Regardless of what their leaders may think, I feel that labour groups should submit themselves to labour tribunals made up of economists, specialists in labour law and sociologists, who would settle the differences. They would then no longer be able to force the workers to stop producing for the nation, to lose their salaries, thus getting into debt and never being any further ahead:

I would even go further. I would even say that today the majority of union members are fed up with being led to strike time and time again by union leaders who do not seem to have any sense of responsibility. I say that is one of the reasons for the losses to be made up by people who earn only from $3,000 to $4,000 a year, which obviously is not enough to live as one should in the 20th century.

I think we should legislate to try to reduce this increasing number of strikes, and I sum up what would have taken me probably half an hour or three quarters of an hour to say. It is that we will not manage to solve the problem of poverty in this country through demagogy, by telling childish stories or by making puns which are good for laughs, of course, but which do not solve anything.

We will manage to solve the problem of poverty if the labour organizations together with the governments agree on some kind of a moratorium, a kind of agreement for one, two or three years and say: We agree on certain measures, we shall stop our little bickerings in order to agree on constructive measures and to build our economy as other countries have done.

Take West Germany, for instance, after the second world war was completely ruined and deprived of all its factories and its equipment and which, precisely because of this solidarity between labour movements and the government, managed to rebuild its economy and to make it so powerful that, today, it is the most powerful in the world and is able to come to the assistance of the countries which plundered it.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It being ten o'clock it is my duty to inform the house that, pursuant to section 11 of standing order 58, the proceedings are now deemed to have been completed.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### INCOME TAX—APPLICATION TO OLD AGE PENSIONERS

**Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North):** Mr. Speaker, I offer no apology for bringing to the minister's attention the case of the filching tax collector. I realize that this matter has been brought to the attention of the minister on many occasions, but there is an old axiom which says that the squeaking wheel gets the grease. I will at another time go into greater detail on the parsimonious way in which the old age pensioner has been treated. He deserves better treatment in the light of the way inflation and over-spending by governments have robbed him.

It was for this reason that I attempted the other day to bring to the attention of the minister the very serious anomaly in present practice relating to the old age pensioner who is receiving supplemental benefits. Nothing could be more ridiculous, having put the pensioner to all the trouble of a means test, than the government's forcing him to reveal his sources of income, however meagre they may be. The government grants him a small benefit and then reduces, it by taxation; renders him ineligible for hospitalization and requires him to pay his OMSIP premiums.

I am sure the minister will on reflection agree that there is a definite lack of fairness in forcing people on welfare to pay income tax, placing them in the position where in granting them one benefit the government takes away two other benefits. I know that this was not the intent of the government's regulations. I simply ask the minister to put his social conscience to work and put and end to this nonsense. If the old age pensioner tries to earn a few dollars, the government taxes this money at the rate of 50 per cent in estimating the amount of supplemental benefit to be paid.

As the minister knows, the supplementary benefit is paid to persons whose proven income is such that they are felt to be in need. It is for this reason that they receive the additional benefit, bringing them up to $109.20 per month from the normal $78. I know the minister would not like to live on $109.20 per month, with or without a means test. In fact, no member of this chamber would want to live on this amount for a month; yet that is what we are asking our old people to do. Often, they are in straightened circumstances. Do not forget, Mr. Speaker, a means test has been applied, but in spite of that we take away from our old people more than we grant.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Many of our old people, as I have reason to know, are ill and unable to take care of themselves. Yet the addition of this small, supplementary pittance—I cannot call it a pension—makes them ineligible for free hospitalization. They have to pay their own medical care premiums. I, therefore, ask the minister if he thinks, in all fairness, this situation can be justified. I am sure that, since he is noted for his fairness and concern, he will agree an end must be put to this anti-social policy.

There is no problem in the case of social assistance recipients, since the welfare payment is not subject to income tax. But the old age pensioner who is forced to take a means test—after all, we recognize him as being in need—and who is granted an income supplement as his right by law is forced to pay income tax on this meagre pittance. I believe that on reflection the minister will recognize the stupidity of this ludicrous tax on what amounts to a welfare payment, which causes a great deal of hardship and suffering.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, how can you find shelter for half the amount of the old age pension today? On half the old age pension, where are you going to eat? What about your clothing and necessary incidentals? Our old people should be treated with compassion. Inflation steals their hope of trying to get by next month without being forced to eat a little less food. Our old people must keep a shelter over their heads. In addition, many old age pensioners need medical attention, only half of which is paid for if they receive any taxable income. I know that many of them need drugs for these chronic medical conditions which become more frequent as people grow older. Yet we do not help by providing drugs.

I suggest to the minister that it is 20 years since any change was introduced to our system of income tax deductions. The cost of living has gone up, up and up, but there has been no comparable increase in income tax exemptions. In all fairness, I suggest that a revision of our exemptions is long overdue. Even if our old people were allowed an exemption of an extra $500 of income, that would take care of much of the problem. We

should thereby stop the taxing of these welfare payments.

In this country there are about 600,000 people, sir, between the ages of 65 and 70. Many of them qualified under a means test for a supplement. I speak on their behalf tonight and appeal to the minister to remember them. Many of our old people must depend on our sympathy and understanding to ensure that justice is done.

**Mr. H. E. Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised a matter that has been raised previously by hon. members on all sides of the house. I believe the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) presented to this house a notice of motion along somewhat similar lines several weeks ago.

I suggest to the hon. member that he is mistaken when he refers to the test of eligibility for a guaranteed income supplement as a means test. It is certainly not like the means test that formerly applied to various types of disability payments or pensions before the introduction of the Canada Assistance Plan, since it does not take into account assets but only income received or earned. And if I am not mistaken, not all income which is received is included as income for the purpose of the guaranteed income supplement.

Also, the test in question—an income test—is based on information provided in a form filed by the applicant himself and not provided through the efforts of an inspector going to the applicant's home, as was done with means tests which applied to disability and similar payments before the introduction of the Canada Assistance Plan.

I would also like to suggest that the hon. member is mistaken when he suggests that amounts earned, sufficient to have the guaranteed income supplement reduced, are taxed at 50 per cent. This rate is only paid by people who earn much more than people whose income is limited to the old age pension and to the guaranteed income supplement. The supplement is designed to make up the difference between the old security pension and a maximum, which is now approximately $109 per month. To the extent the supplement is reduced because of other income of the pensioner, this is certainly not a tax but a recognition of the fact that the purpose for which the supplement is paid has not been demonstrated because of the applicant's income.

[Mr. Rynard.]

It is not because of the action of the federal government that it may turn out that a pensioner, because of the income he gets, is ineligible for OMSIP or premium assistance for hospital insurance from the Ontario government. If I am not mistaken this is due to the action of the Ontario government, a Conservative government which I presume the hon. member supports, and I suggest therefore that he direct his complaint on this aspect to that government.

Finally, with respect to changes in tax laws, as I have pointed out on previous occasions the tradition of budgetary secrecy prevents the announcement of tax changes until the actual budget is presented, but, as the Minister has said, in the preparation of the budget we consider all submissions that have been made to the government in this regard.

• (10:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ABITIBI—GRANT FOR INDUSTRIAL ASSISTANCE

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, on May 7 last I addressed the following question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion:

> Could he tell us whether consultations are taking place between his department and the Quebec government for the designation of Abitibi as a special area with regard to the granting of financial assistance to promote industrial development in that area?

Today, the minister happened to say that in the course of last year, his department and himself have been busy drafting a legislation to meet my request, which concerns not necessarily the Abitibi area only, but all areas in Canada where the rate of employment is low.

When I asked that question, my purpose was to urge the minister's department and the government to look favourably upon that large area which has been plagued for years with underemployment and whose population has to migrate to neighbouring provinces to earn a somewhat decent living.

Therefore, the standards used to implement a legislation piloted by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), in order to designate areas, were not entirely adequate as far as the designation of those areas was concerned, and they failed to see the depopulation of an area. So that is what happened in the Abitibi area.

The No. 3 Paper on north-western Quebec tells us the following:

> Economy consists in the over-all activities of an area or of a country, assessed on a monetary basis. Those activities are divided into two classes: production activities and consumption activities. Production includes three sectors: primary products, secondary products and third products.
>
> The primary sector consists in the development of natural resources. In our area—
>
> The Abitibi area—
>
> —it includes mines, agriculture and forestry.
>
> The secondary sector is the one in which natural resources are being processed. In the north-western area, such process is carried out in pulp and paper mills, in saw-mills and in a few other manufactures.

Therefore, we have enormous wealth or natural resources in our Abitibi area, which includes mining, agricultural and forest resources, and we do not have enough secondary industries where those natural resources can be processed.

On the same day, a Liberal member directed a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), dealing with the northern Ontario area, namely the Timmins area. And the minister answered then that a subsidy had been granted to an American firm, the Texas Gulf and Sulfur, a subsidy that amounted, I believe, to more than $6 million to build smelting works at Timmins.

Since this area, which is next to ours, is now considered as a designated area and since the American corporations can avail themselves of government subsidies. I imagine it is becoming embarrassing for the government to overlook the Abitibi area, which is encircled as by a horseshoe, for all the surrounding areas are designated areas, except the Abitibi region which has a large rate of unemployment.

We have about 10,000 people suffering from under-employment. These people live either on unemployment insurance benefits, either on social welfare allowances or attend pre-employment courses. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, I believe, is responsible for these training courses given to adults. It is one thing to give them new employment opportunities, but it is another thing to create such employment.

That is why I ask the government, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, to see as soon as possible, if that has not already been done, that negotiations are initiated with the Quebec government in order to designate this area as a special one, so that we may avail ourselves of the advantages of other regions and be able to develop processing industries for our raw materials, thus giving employment to our people and freeing them from this quite permanent tendency of being either unemployed or on social welfare.

I think the minister should consider this request which is not only coming from the hon. member for Abitibi but also from all businessmen, from all those who are interested in the development of that region, and I will point out to the minister's representative that in our region businessmen are going ahead, since we have reached a stage where we must build ourselves our roads to future developments.

So I think, that our businessmen's activities prove that we are determined to go ahead. But the government or governments should do their share.

**Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) has already informed the house, the officials have been consulting with the provinces about future programs. But, obviously, the choice of the areas which may be designated under an improved incentives program, is one of the matters that must be examined by federal and provincial officials.

On behalf of the minister, I wish to assure the hon. member that the Abitibi area is not neglected in these discussions. However, I must point out that a final decision shall not be made on any area, until the new proposed legislation concerning industrial incentives has been considered by the house.

I believe I can assure the hon. member that the government is concerned with the economic expansion of the whole country, including the Abitibi area.

[*English*]

## COMPANY OF YOUNG CANADIANS—KAPUSKASING, ONT.—ALLEGED COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES OF GRAHAM DELINE

**Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane):** Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday I raised a question in the house regarding the infiltration of Communist oriented individuals into the Company of Young Canadians as reported to me by the district high school at Kapuskasing. I received a letter from the principal of the high school, Mr. W. J. Peacock, who formerly was head of the history department. This person was really very disturbed, as am I, regarding the attempt to influence our young people in high schools with the Communist

doctrine. I think the best way to explain this would be to read what Mr. Peacock wrote in his letter:

> Yesterday we had as a guest speaker in our school a representative of the "Company of Young Canadians" by the name of Mr. Graham Deline. He had written to us several weeks ago indicating that he would be in this area and that his services would be available to the students of our school.
>
> I had thought that this would be an ideal opportunity for Grade 13 students to contact a representative of a much heralded organization. We made arrangements for him to have the opportunity to meet and talk with all our Grade 13 students. What he said to them, while rather radical, was in the main, tolerable. Our Guidance Department arranged that he have lunch with them at a local restaurant and three students were invited to accompany them.
>
> After this meeting, the students returned to the High School and protested the fact that they were being bombarded with Communist propaganda. Enclosed please find a copy of the Canadian Worker, one of several which he distributed to our students.
>
> This gentleman had a young lady with him who, while not a member of the "Company of Young Canadians", claimed to be doing social work with "hippy" groups in the Ottawa area. A group she mentioned that she was associated with is called "The Diggers". I don't know the significance of the term "Diggers"; all I know is that the first Communist movement in the Western World originated in Puritan England in the 1660's and was called "The Diggers".
>
> Mr. Deline told our students that he was working through and with Universities and Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in the Ottawa area. Some time ago, Mr. Diefenbaker brought to the attention of the House that a large number of the members of the "Company of Young Canadians" had extreme leftist tendencies. I present you with a fact, not a rumour.
>
> I should have expected that as a High School Principal I could have been safe in drawing a speaker from an agency established by our Federal Parliament, and that our school was not risking exposure of our students to revolutionary propaganda. I personally object to contributing as a taxpayer to the employment of people who make it their business to undermine everything I respect.

The letter continues, but I should like to give just a little idea of the type of propaganda that was distributed to those students. This is a copy of the *Canadian Worker* with the headline "High School Struggle Begins". Then it states:

> The first known high school struggle in Canada in recent years involving a group with a clear-cut socialist strategy broke out into the open at Forest Hill Collegiate last Monday, April 28.

Such words as "bourgeois press" are used. Then, the article goes on to state:

> The paper also carried a parable of Forest Hill Collegiate, an academic school located in a predominately Jewish bourgeois and petit-bourgeois "professional" suburb—

And so on.

[Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).]

The article then mentions the lessons taught to the students. There are several points in it, the first being what Lenin had to say. It reads:

> Mao says, "Dare to struggle, Dare to win". Events at Forest Hill have proven that no significant change, even the bourgeois democratic struggle (explained by Lenin as the necessary stage to precede the fight for socialism) now being led by the Student Guard, involves a hard fought battle.

The paper is full of this kind of thing. In one of the papers we have advertisements for books written by Mao Tse-tung and other works by other Marxist authors. This is the first time to my knowledge that a specific case has been brought forth indicating that the Company of Young Canadians may be influenced by people who are actively involved in communist agencies.

The people of Canada are supporting this Company of Young Canadians. I suggest it is time that people like this fellow Deline were thrown out of the organization. It is time we made a thorough examination of the organization to ensure that there are no others like him. Perhaps this fellow has already left the organization and is now acting under false pretences. I do not know that, but this would make the situation even worse because he would be giving the impression he had the approval of the federal government to work against everything we hold dear.

I am not one of those who feel that communism is just another political idea. I believe this is something that works against the fibre of our Canadian nation. We cannot sit here and allow this kind of thing to happen, particularly when these people are using Canadian funds to oppose what we, as a free nation, are trying to do.

• (10:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Robert Stanbury (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows, of course, that the Company of Young Canadians is an independent organization by statute. It is not directed in any way by government, is subject to review by parliament and particularly the committee of which the hon. member is a part. However, I would be very pleased to pass on to the Company through the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), the hon. member's information and comments.

I have been advised by the Company of Young Canadians that Graham Deline is not a member, although he is a former volunteer of the Company; that the Company had received

a number of requests from principals and guidance counsellors for information concerning its work, and because of this interest the Company has in recent weeks made available volunteer members and some former volunteers to speak about the Company of Young Canadians at various high schools. I am told that favourable comments have been received about all such speakers, including Mr. Deline. The Company advises me that it has received no complaint from Kapuskasing or any other source about Mr. Deline preaching communism. However, I am informed that Mr. Deline's name is no longer on the Company's list of available speakers.

I am sure the Company will note with interest the information which has been passed on indirectly from Kapuskasing. No doubt the Company would be glad to hear directly from people who have such information. I think the Company would want to assure the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) and all hon. members that if any persons are operating contrary to democratic interests and infiltrating the Company of Young Canadians, when this information is received by the Company those persons will be promptly filtered out.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.26 p.m.

29180—569

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Friday, May 23, 1969**

The house met at 11 a.m.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. 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 S-36, an act to amend the Foreign Insurance Companies Act, to which the concurrence of this house is desired.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

### AGRICULTURE

Ninth report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, in French and in English—Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean).

[*Editor's note: The text of the foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

### EXPROPRIATION ACT

MEASURE ENCOMPASSING THE ACQUISITION AND ABANDONMENT OF LAND, COMPENSATION THEREFOR, AND OTHER MATTERS

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice)** moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-200, respecting the expropriation of land.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

### NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, 1954

MEASURE TO EXTEND FORGIVENESS FEATURE IN SEWAGE TREATMENT LOANS

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio)** moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-201, to amend the National Housing Act, 1954.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

29180—569½

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### NATIONAL DEFENCE

GENEVA DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE—CANADIAN POSITION ON U.S. AND SOVIET DRAFT TREATIES

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister, of which I gave his office notice. I would like to know what instructions are being given by the government of Canada to our representatives at the Geneva disarmament conference concerning the American draft treaty. Does Canada accept the American draft, or is the government of Canada attempting to obtain more rigorous control and inspection of continental sea bed areas?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for having given me notice of this question. I have informed myself as to the answer. Apparently the draft treaty was tabled only yesterday by the United States. I believe we had been given notice of it in advance; that is, we were shown the text one day in advance. We have had only two days to look at the draft treaty, and we have not had a cabinet meeting on it to consider the position we will take. I understand that the conference will recess today and be reconvened on July 3. By that time we shall have established our position and will be in a position to report on the matter.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, it follows from what the Prime Minister has said that our representatives have not as yet taken a position with regard to this question.

**Mr. Trudeau:** That is right, Mr. Speaker. We did take a tentative position on the Soviet Draft treaty. The conference is now recessed to permit the members to examine both the American and Soviet draft treaties. It is normal that we will look at both treaties over the next few weeks and see whether we should support one or other of them or come up with a third alternative.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## FINANCE

POSITION OF ROYAL SECURITIES CORPORATION AFTER TAKE-OVER BY U.S. COMPANY —POSSIBILITY OF COMBINES INQUIRY

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the concern the Prime Minister expressed yesterday regarding the serious consequences which could flow from the take-over of Canadian financial institutions by foreign corporations, I ask the Prime Minister whether it is his intention to make a statement to the house fairly soon with respect to the government's policy, with a view to preventing such take-overs in the future.

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** No, Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to make such a statement except on the occasion when the Canadian Development Corporation bill is introduced. It will be a matter of how much time we have left to introduce it and proceed with it in this session. There is beginning to be some doubt whether we will be able to proceed with all the subjects which were announced in earlier statements by the house leader.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government reached any decision with respect to the question I raised yesterday as to whether or not the right to use the rediscount facilities of the Bank of Canada will continue to be extended to the Royal Securities Corporation in the event of its being taken over by Merrill Lynch and Associates?

**Mr. Trudeau:** No, Mr. Speaker. I referred this matter to the Minister of Finance, who is now in Europe. I wonder whether the acting minister has been given an answer on this question. I have not been in communication with the Department of Finance on the matter.

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** I have received no information on that matter, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** May I ask when we may expect such information, in view of the fact that the matter is urgent.

**Mr. Chrétien:** The minister will be making a statement on this at some time, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

## THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

WATKINS REPORT—GOVERNMENT ACTION TO PROTECT ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May we expect during this session a statement by the government regarding its intentions with respect to the recommendations of the Watkins report on foreign ownership and control of the Canadian economy?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Not except for a statement being made, as I indicated in a previous answer, if a debate does arise on the Canadian Development Corporation.

[*Translation*]

## TRADE

WHEAT—POSSIBILITY OF FURTHER SALES TO MAINLAND CHINA

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Since we have information to the effect that the wheat crop in China has been very poor, has the minister initiated talks with China or does he expect that Canada can make larger wheat sales to that country?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, I would be grateful to the hon. member if he would join me in my prayers to that effect.

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

Can the minister's prayers touch the heart of the Chinese Communists?

[*English*]

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

NATO—DEFICIT IN STRENGTH THROUGH WITHDRAWAL OF CANADIAN FORCES

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Will he advise our NATO allies in a few days that Canada intends to withdraw its air division from Europe by the end of 1970, and does he intend also to make suggestions on how this deficit should be made up so that the principle of maintaining the NATO force in Europe at full strength—a policy with which this government says it is in full accord—can be upheld?

**Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** The hon. member is proceeding on a wrong assumption.

**Mr. Hees:** May I rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the government when it meets with our NATO allies in a few days time to advise them that Canada intends to withdraw our air division from Europe by the end of 1970?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** It is the intention of the government to indicate through me to our allies that we are planning a phased reduction of our forces over there.

**Mr. Hees:** May I ask a final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Is that not exactly what I asked in the first place, and could the minister not have answered it simply by saying yes?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. This was a final supplementary question.

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Has the government as yet reached a decision with respect to our troop reductions in NATO as indicated by the President of the Privy Council in London the day before yesterday?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have a plan that I will submit to the alliance on Wednesday of next week.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I realise that the minister must have certain difficulties in divulging the plans to Canadians prior to his announcement of the plans to our NATO allies, but is there any way the minister can devise to indicate to our allies next Wednesday what our intentions are and at the same time not close the door completely so that this parliament may have some say in the matter before it is finally decided?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** I am not that ingenious, Mr. Speaker. What I have to do, I believe, is to convey to the allies what the intentions of the government are and at the same time to consult with them on the implementation of the program. I do not think we preclude any suggestions that might come from the allies that there might be other ways of doing things along the general lines we are considering. I find it very difficult, of course, to reconcile the necessity of giving as much information beforehand as I would like to and yet not disclosing the program completely before my announcement to NATO. However, I think the hon. member will be reassured when I tell him that the recommendations and opinions expressed in this house have not been completely ignored in the plan that we are going to submit.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Only 1 per cent.

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Halifax-Dartmouth East):** My question is supplementary to the one directed to the Minister of National Defence. Does the minister intend to discuss with our NATO allies Canada's maritime contribution under SACLANT or directly to NATO?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** The first purpose of these consultations concerns, of course, the troops which are and which will be stationed overseas. But this does not preclude discussion of the maritime effort which Canada is making within NATO and I would be open to any suggestions there.

**Mr. Forrestall:** If I understand the minister correctly, then, it is not his intention in his presentation to our allies to raise the matter of the maritime commitment himself.

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** Not necessarily. But again, I think I would be prepared to discuss it.

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** Are we to take it from the minister's answer that the government has decided upon a maritime role for the Canadian Forces?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** If I understand the question correctly, yes.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Then can the minister get in touch with the chairman of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence and find out what the committee is doing wasting its time reviewing the maritime role of such forces?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

### ALLEGATION BY PROVINCIAL PREMIER RESPECTING AGREEMENT

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and ask him whether he has any comment to make about the accusation made by Premier Robarts of Ontario regarding the dismal lack of action on the part of the Ontario government, the reason for

which, he said, is the fact that the federal government has failed to carry out its part of the bargain in the agreements that were entered into between the Ontario and the Canadian governments dating back to 1966.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think it is not a proper question to ask the minister, simply whether he proposes to comment on a statement made outside the house. I do not think the question in those terms is acceptable.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** May I put it in another way, and ask the minister whether he can advise the house as to what action his government has taken with respect to the federal-provincial agreements relating to Indian Affairs which were signed in 1966 between Ontario and Canada?

**Mr. Speaker:** I doubt very much whether the question as asked is in order. The hon. member is asking for a statement from the minister concerning action taken following an agreement signed three years ago. I would think this is the kind of information which should normally be offered to the house by way of a statement on motions.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** With respect, Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that on other occasions when ministers have tried to rise to answer questions you have been generous enough to give them an opportunity to do so. The minister has been showing his desire—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I feel very ungenerous this morning.

FAILURE OF FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE TO MEET

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Mr. Speaker. Is it a fact that the federal-provincial committee on Indian affairs has not met for 12 months?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question as asked is not in order. The hon. member is asking the minister to confirm or deny that a committee has sat or has not sat. Certainly a question in this form is not in order.

**Mr. Brewin:** I will rephrase the question, then, and ask the minister to tell us when that committee last met.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the implication in the original question was that the committee has not met for one year, I would think the question should be placed on the order paper.

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

## IMMIGRATION

ADMISSION OF PERSONS WITH CRIMINAL RECORDS

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** I have a question to direct to the Prime Minister. Before doing so however I should like to make a correction in *Hansard* of yesterday. As reported at page 8941, in reference to deserters from the United States, I asked the Minister of Manpower and Immigration whether he was aware of the fact that deserters from the United States Army are more or less criminals. Mr. Speaker, the words "more or less" do not belong there. I referred to the fact that deserters were criminals. I now direct my question to the Prime Minister. Inasmuch as a criminal record bars entry into Canada, how can the entry of deserters be justified?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I think the hon. member had better put the "more or less" back in there—perhaps more of the "less" than of the "more".

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. MacInnis:** A supplementary question. I asked the Prime Minister to give me credit for checking this out with the United States authorities before making the statement I did with regard to the position of deserters. I suggest the Prime Minister should also check it out with the United States authorities. May I ask him this? What does he intend to do about the Canadian law under which the death penalty can be imposed upon any Canadian deserter?

**Mr. Speaker:** Of course, that supplementary question is argumentative.

## TRADE

WHEAT—FUTURE SALES—ALLEGED I.G.A. PREFERENCE

**Mr. George Muir (Lisgar):** I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Mr. Speaker. I notice he has been leafing through quite a heavy mail. Could he tell the house whether one of those letters happens to be an order for a substantial amount of wheat?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Muir (Lisgar):** May I rephrase my question. I wonder whether the minister could report to the house on any wheat sales that have been made recently, or which are expected to be made in the near future.

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** There is an expression in English, Mr. Speaker, which says one must avoid "killing crops" around the world. Whenever I have good news I will be delighted to bring it to the attention of the house.

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce inform the house whether or not it is a fact that written into the International Grains Agreement there is a provision giving Sweden, the European Common Market, Spain and Turkey special privileges in relation to part of the transportation costs which allows them to undercut Canada, the United States and Australia?

**Mr. Pepin:** I had explained to me on a number of occasions in recent months the bag of tricks which can be used, but I would not like to point the finger at any one country in particular.

**Mr. Horner:** A supplementary question. I am not pointing the finger at any one country. The minister read and signed the contract for Canada, and I am asking him whether there was written into it a provision that gave relief on part of the transportation costs for certain countries?

**Mr. Pepin:** I signed no contract for Canada. To what contract is the hon. member referring?

**Mr. Horner:** You may have signed no contract, but your department or somebody in it did, and you must have read the contract.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Horner:** The minister should inform the house.

## TRANSPORT

### REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO RAILWAY SAFETY

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, since the minister is in the house today may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport that is supplementary to those asked yesterday. Can the minister advise the house whether he will be instituting an inquiry into the alarming frequency of railway mishaps, and has he any information to give the house in this regard?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. A special inquiry has already commenced into the most recent accident in New Brunswick. The inquiry is being headed by Commissioner J. M. Woodard, himself a former railwayman, and it is already under way.

In addition, over the past several months consultations have been going on between representatives of the commission and the railways for the purpose of examining all the railway accidents that occurred in 1968 and those that occurred in the first quarter of 1969. Out of the findings of these discussions and the internal inquiry, if that is the appropriate phrase, a decision will be made as to whether a public inquiry is then necessary.

As for the most recent accident, no decision has yet been made on a public inquiry, for the obvious reason that an inquest into the unfortunate deaths must be held, and an inquiry would have to come subsequent to that inquest.

**Mr. Benjamin:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether the special inquest into individual mishaps or any possible public inquiry will include an investigation into the adequacy of maintenance and inspection of railway trackage and rolling stock?

**Mr. Jamieson:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is part of the responsibility of the Canadian Transport Commission to do just that, and that is part of the investigation that is now under way.

### ATLANTIC PROVINCES POLICY

**Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Transport. Now that the chairman of the Canadian Transport Commission has stated that he hopes a decision on new transportation policies for the Atlantic provinces will not be too long delayed, will the minister advise the house what progress his department is making in drafting new legislation for an over-all Atlantic province transportation policy?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of progress. I propose to meet with representatives of the Atlantic provinces on Monday, including I hope the premiers of some of the provinces who may be available. The drafting of the legislation will proceed as quickly as possible following these consultations, with the hope of introducing it very soon.

**Mr. Thomas (Moncton):** A supplementary question to the Minister of Transport. Will

these consultations also include discussions on all modes of transportation—that is, truck, rail and water—with a view to arriving at an over-all transportation plan?

**Mr. Jamieson:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the minister could advise the house if he would make a statement or bring forward the legislation for first reading before the end of June?

**Mr. Jamieson:** Mr. Speaker, that is our intention and hope.

## WATER RESOURCES

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—TRACING OF POLLUTION TO SOURCE AT CHEMICAL PLANT

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Can he now inform the house of the cause of the pollution of the waters of Placentia and St. Marys Bays. I am prompted to ask this question because of adverse publicity given to the Newfoundland fishery by publications such as *Time* magazine.

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, last night I received an oral report from our scientists who are at work in the Placentia Bay area. They inform me that they are now certain that the cause of the pollution is phosphorus, discharged by the chemical plant of the area. The plant has since been shut down. Our scientists are proceeding to carry out further tests.

We are also in contact with the company. It is my understanding that the plant will not open again until 99 per cent or more of the phosphorus that has been going into the water of the area has been eliminated. Meanwhile no phosphorus will be discharged as effluent from the plant.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

A.B.M. SYSTEM—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT POLICY—REPRESENTATIONS TO U.S.

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Since construction of the A.B.M. safeguard system has been begun in the United States and since the Prime Minister in an earlier statement to this house said that Canada's attitude to the system and participation in it would be based on whether it contributed to war or peace, or to the escalation of the arms race, will the Prime Minister in the near future make a statement to this house on the government's attitude toward this system?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I hope I did not leave the impression that we wanted to participate actively in this system. I indicated that the position we would have to take in judging this system would be based on whether it increases the possibility of nuclear arms escalation or whether it decreases it. We have not reached any conclusion on this yet.

**Mr. Brewin:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister let the house know what the government's attitude is to this system before the house adjourns for the summer?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the government, I think, would not be very different from the attitude of the opposition. We are not enthusiastic about the system, but this is a defence system being built in another country. Whether it will prevent a nuclear holocaust is a consideration that is in all our minds. But we cannot be pressed into making any rapid decisions about the defence systems of other nations, whether they be the Soviet Union, Japan, China or other countries. We are busy now considering our own defence systems and our own policies for defence.

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Am I to assume from the Prime Minister's statement that there has been some modification in the government's attitude as expressed by the Prime Minister during the debate in this house? Was not the government's attitude that it felt it necessary to assess the significance of the measures proposed by the President of the United States and felt obliged to condemn the system if it concluded that the proposed measures taken by the United States are not in the interests of the world peace? Has that attitude changed? Has my right hon. friend decided that this question should be left entirely to the decision of the United States?

**Mr. Trudeau:** No, Mr. Speaker. The position is still the same. We realize it is important to make this assessment. What I am saying is that it is not likely that any moral judgment we might enunciate will have a great deal of effect on the United States position. The moral judgment that we can make

could equally well be made by the Leader of the Opposition or by the leader of the New Democratic party. This will be, as I say, a moral decision taken by friendly nations. But debate is going on in the United States, and if their policy is to remain or is to be changed, that decision will come about as a consequence of what is happening in the United States debate and not as a consequence of statements made in this house.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It seems to me that this has become debate. This is still the question period and there are a number of hon. members who are anxious to ask questions. They have been rising dutifully for the last half hour and I am anxious to give them the opportunity to ask their questions.

**Mr. Stanfield:** A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the government of Canada were to express an opinion and moral judgment to a friendly nation, is it not more likely that the public officers of that friendly nation would consider more seriously Canada's representations if they were made at an early date before Congress has become involved too seriously in the debate or before a decision is reached?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, could speak out strongly and state his position on this matter. We should like to know what it is, because it might guide us in the establishment of the government's position.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Prime Minister that it was he who suggested that the government of Canada had a moral obligation to express its view on this matter, after having assessed the situation. He said that it would do so.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Since Canada will certainly be affected by any decision reached with respect to the construction of the A.B.M. safeguard system, have any representations been made by the government of Canada to the government of the United States? Are any discussions going on at any level between the two governments regarding this A.B.M. system?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that Canada will be affected, but the whole world also will be affected. If the Canadian government had power to make decisions in this area I think we would suggest that the A.B.M. system should not be proceeded with. But we should also have to make a decision to see that the Soviets do not escalate their arms, and to see that they do not build an A.B.M. system around Moscow. But our writ does not extend to the United States or the Soviet Union. Really, the house is asking me to state a moral position. Our position is that the government hopes that no escalation will be embarked upon by either side.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I was not asking the Prime Minister at the moment to pass any moral judgment. I am asking him a simple question. Have any representations been made by the government of Canada to the government of the United States and are any discussions going on between the two governments at any level?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, I think my answer indicated that the input—if that is the term—into such representations at this stage would be very vague and only of a moralistic nature. Therefore the implications of my statement are that there are no such discussions going on at the present time. When I went to the United States there were exchanges between the President and myself and between some of their officials and ministers and ourselves. We entered into those exchanges in order to gain more knowledge of their case for having an A.B.M. system. We heard this case. Their case rests on their belief that they are not escalating arms; they are trying to respond to an A.B.M. system already built in the Soviet Union. They say they are not trying to embark on nuclear escalation, that that was started by the Soviet Union.

I think each country will have to state what its moral position on this question is. I have stated our position. Once again, I do not think that this will help to solve the debate going on in the United States. It will not help if a prime minister of Canada says to the United States what he thinks they should be doing. There are two sides to this debate in the United States and those two sides are carrying on the debate very vigorously and strongly.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

## FISHERIES

ST. MARY'S BAY, N.S.—DISPUTE BETWEEN SEINERS AND WEIR FISHERMEN

**Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. What action does the minister propose to take in order to solve difficulties existing between the herring seiners and the weir fishermen in St. Mary's Bay, Nova Scotia, which has apparently resulted in gunfire between the two groups?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Chair doubts whether this is a matter of particular urgency.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Judging from the reaction in the house there is an indication that this matter ought to be determined immediately. Perhaps it might be wise to allow the minister to answer the gunfire.

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** The situation the hon. member mentions is being kept closely under review. There is an unsubstantiated claim that shooting has occurred and the R.C.M.P. has been called in. But so far we have no evidence of anything occurring this year which has not happened in previous years.

## AIR POLLUTION

MEASURING DEVICES IN URBAN AREAS

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of water, renewal resources, energy, development and pollution control. My question relates to the installation of instruments in Vancouver for the testing and measuring of atmospheric pollution. Is the government contemplating the installation of this type of instrument in various cities across Canada?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio):** Mr. Speaker, the question about these instruments may have relation to some departments of government with which I could get in contact in order to determine the plans. I will be glad to look at the question in that light.

COAL DUST FROM SHIPMENTS THROUGH VANCOUVER HARBOUR

**Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour):** Can the Minister of Transport tell this house whether any positive assurances can be given that possible coal dust air pollution will not have to be tolerated in the North Vancouver-Vancouver harbour area from coal shipments destined for Neptune Terminals passing through National Harbours Board property?

**Mr. Speaker:** I suggest to the hon. member this is a question that might well be considered and debated at the time of adjournment.

## LEGISLATION

UNDERTAKING TO PROCEED WITH BILL CONCERNING OFF-TRACK BETTING

**Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser):** My question is directed to the acting house leader. With reference to the bill on off-track betting introduced yesterday, can the house leader say when it is the intention of the government to give this bill second reading? Will the house leader say if the bill after second reading will be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs?

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. We hope to bring this bill forward very quickly. The languages bill presently before the house will be followed by the housing bill and the bill of the Minister of Finance dealing with taxes. These will have to receive priority, but subject to that we hope to bring it forward very quickly and refer it to the standing committee.

## PENITENTIARIES

SOLITARY CONFINEMENT OF FEMALES AT PORTSMOUTH PRISON

**Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview):** My question is directed to the Solicitor General. In view of the reports of the Elizabeth Fry Society that some women are being kept in solitary confinement in Kingston penitentiary, has the minister checked these reports and is he going to stop this barbaric and inhumane penal practice?

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** The minister responsible checked the situation very carefully. There are four persons in solitary confinement, one at her own request. It will be seen from this that the premise adopted by the hon. member in his question cannot be accepted.

## PUBLICATIONS

"TIME"—COMMENT RESPECTING HOUSE MEMBERS

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** My question is directed to the

Minister of Justice. In view of the fact that *Time* magazine was granted concessions because the Liberal government was scared of them, is it the intention of the Minister of Justice to investigate charges made in a recent *Time* edition regarding two members of parliament?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Annapolis Valley.

**Mr. MacInnis:** With all due respect, sir, I think the Minister of Justice should consider the statement in *Time* magazine and the statement made by a former minister in order to clear this matter, because other members of this house—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

NATO—ROLE OF CANADIAN MARITIME COMMAND

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence in respect to his earlier answer concerning maritime command. In view of the decision the government has made about the role of maritime command, is the minister advising our allies of a change in that role in the meeting to be held next week?

**Hon. Leo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):** No, Mr. Speaker, not as far as NATO is concerned.

## HOUSING

POSSIBILITY OF REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** I wish to reply to two questions posed the other day in my absence. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands asked a question with regard to the intentions of the government to seek additional appropriations for housing in addition to those now outlined in the estimates. There are two sources for C.M.H.C. loans and advances. One is the estimates which have been approved in the amount of $114 million. The other is statutory votes. These two comprise the capital budget which is approved by order in council and tabled in the house. That amount this year will be $680 million. Over and above that there is $49 million provided in the estimates for grants and subsidies. There is no additional increase contemplated at this time.





**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Do I understand the minister to say that, despite the fact the ceilings are to be raised under the bill which he is going to introduce Monday, there has been no increase in the financial allotments over and above what has already been provided in the figures given to the house?

**Mr. Andras:** If the bill is approved, Mr. Speaker, the financial allotment increase will permit the capital budget expenditures to be dealt with over the next three or four years. This is to give us room to move over the next three or four years. Of the present insuring limit of $11 billion, for instance, a commitment of $9½ billion has already been made. An increase to $15 billion will give us that leeway.

THOMPSON, MAN.—AVAILABILITY OF MORTGAGE MONEY

**Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio):** A question was asked by the hon. member for Churchill, with regard to housing accommodation in Thompson, Manitoba. There are two projects in Thompson. One is a limited dividend project of row houses. That has now been approved by C.M.H.C. and I will be recommending an order in council. The other is a high rise project which will be financed privately. Negotiations for this are now under way.

**Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the minister's announcement concerning high rise apartment applications in Thompson, Manitoba, does this means that present applications to C.M.H.C. for high rise apartments and more mortgage needs will now be approved?

**Mr. Andras:** It means the limited dividend project which has been submitted has been approved by C.M.H.C. The high rise proposal, which is private, is now being looked at and negotiations are under way.

## SHIPPING

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON MERCHANT FLEET STUDY

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport which he may wish to take as notice. Can the minister advise the house of the current position and what progress is being made in the

study embarked upon by the Canadian Transport Commission with respect to the establishment of a Canadian flag merchant fleet?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is asking for a very general statement. I trust the minister will not attempt to make the statement now.

## SHIPBUILDING

FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** I was asked yesterday by the hon. member for Central Nova if it is true my department is not participating in a committee to investigate shipbuilding in Canada. The shipbuilding industry has agreed that a committee drawn from industry would be the most effective in investigating shipbuilding in Canada. The department however will be working with this committee in coming to conclusions.

**Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova):** Will the minister say why he stated in this house on March 27 that this committee, including government representatives, was already at work?

**Mr. Speaker:** The supplementary is argumentative, and I might suggest to the hon. member the original question was probably not put in proper form. I suggest to hon. members that the question period has now expired and we might go on with government orders.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the acting house leader. In view of the fact there have been certain discussions regarding the use of the hour between four and five o'clock this afternoon, and also certain agreements, will the minister take whatever steps are necessary so that provision will be made for any of the late show debates that might be called in that hour?

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I prefer to have another hour or two to check out the agreements that were made. I will then take the appropriate steps to carry them out.

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

• (11:50 a.m.)

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

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

The house resumed, from Wednesday, May 21, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen (for Mr. Trudeau) that Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

**Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, at this point in our consideration of Bill C-120 concerning the official languages of Canada we are deciding whether or not to send the bill to a committee for consideration. We are not deciding the details of the legislation but rather the simple question of whether or not a bill of this type is worthy of further study.

This bill must be regarded as civil rights legislation. In order to have the right perspective we must look at what is happening in other parts of the world such as the United States, Britain and Africa. We should not assume that the demand for enlargement of the rights of minorities will not reach the same fever pitch in Canada that it has in other countries. The facts and the background are different but the human feelings are the same. I believe this bill is a mild forerunner of some of the jarring and traumatic civil rights legislation we may be called upon to consider in this country before very long. If we fail to face up to our responsibilities at this point we will be failing all those who follow us.

The legislation is not in the form in which I should like to see it. Many of the reasons have been expounded by others. Unfortunately the Liberal government has the responsibility for introducing legislation and it has drafted the bill in this way. We must make efforts to put it in better shape, but that does not mean that we can be against it. This does not affect my belief that recognition must be given to the grievances, which have existed for many years, of the French speaking minorities in Canada. It is my belief it would not serve the national interest to try to defeat this bill because it is imperfect. I believe we must accept the principle that minority groups throughout the country should be given recognition and that their desire to have equal rights and opportunities in one country should be facilitated.

At the committee stage we must proceed to improve the bill. Some amendments have already been suggested by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), and on our side the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) outlined some excellent suggestions and amendments we will propose. As we proceed others will be developed.

The bill deals mainly with French speaking minorities outside of Quebec and English speaking minorities in Quebec. The question is rightly asked, what about other minority groups in Canada, those who speak other languages and want to use them? The bill gives those groups nothing more than a casual nod in their direction, a recognition that they exist and nothing more. The government in fact has done nothing to meet the desires of these other groups to become part of Canada and yet retain their cultural and linguistic identity within the country. This is one of the main reasons there is hesitation about adopting the bill. But it does not make the bill itself and the principle any less valid, nor does it justify my voting against it, imperfect and weak thought it be. The intent is to recognize the longstanding feeling by many French Canadians that they are strangers in their own country.

The government may not be moving in the right direction with this bill nor in the proper manner, but the government members are the only ones who in the next two or three years can move at all and it is better they should move than stand still. It follows, therefore, that I must support this bill on second reading without any reservation whatever as to the principle but with considerable doubt about the details.

There have been many speeches during this debate and I have listened to almost all of them. The views put forward by hon. members have been very seriously considered and every hon. member has been forthcoming in his views. I must say, however, that I found it very depressing when the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy) on Wednesday night stood in his place and called others bigoted. I must say that he made what I thought was the most bigoted and provocative speech in this debate. I believe he committed a gross falsehood by calling others bigoted. This does nothing whatever to advance the cause of good will and better understanding in a very difficult situation when many people of good will are trying to represent their ridings, present their views and put forward the very deeply held feelings of their constituents.

The Confederation for Tomorrow conference of all the provincial premiers, held in Toronto in 1967, unanimously adopted the principles upon which this bill is based. A detailed statement of consensus was issued by the premiers at the conclusion of the conference. Similar views came from the federal-provincial conference of 1968. However, at a later conference called by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) it appeared, unfortunately, that the attitudes of some were hardening. I do not think there was any change in the general good will or the general understanding of the principles but rather a hardening because of the way in which the present Prime Minister was proceeding. Rather than advancing the cause of good will and better understanding in Canada, which he led many Canadians to believe he would do when elected Prime Minister, I believe that by ineptitude or carelessness he permitted the situation to deteriorate by allowing positions to harden and old attitudes to be re-established.

I believe that is a tragedy. However, inasmuch as the principle of providing services in the second language in areas of Canada where a substantial minority exists has been established, surely it would be foolish now to abdicate this principle so substantially adopted by those responsible for all the governments in Canada. There were then, as there are now, doubts and reservations about the methods of carrying out this consensus or understanding, but how else could we expect Canadians to react? We have a diverse country. People in one area may have no understanding whatever of the problems of other areas. This is inevitable in this country, and it is inevitable that Canadians will be divided on matters in respect of which they really have no contact. In spite of the difficulties we must try to straighten out, in spite of the doubts we must try to rectify, in spite of the errors made in drafting the bill which we must try to correct, there can be no doubt whatever about the principle.

• (12 noon)

As I said in the beginning, this bill does not move very far in the civil rights field. It does not outline a bill of rights for all Canadians, either in a federal statute or embodied in the constitution. It does nothing to alleviate poverty; to bring our native Indians into the abundant life of the late 20th century, or to recognize equality of opportunity for those who speak other than English or French. It does not move against racial discrimination in the broad sense but deals

mainly with language matters for one group of people. Because of the diversity of our people and our customs, and because of the many different circumstances in which each minority group across this country lives, we cannot be positive that even the bill as proposed to be amended will meet the intended purpose.

This bill attempts to deal with longstanding grievances of one specific and large group of Canadians. There is no use in my standing here and saying these grievances are imaginary or that a better way can be found if we wait a while. No doubt a better way will be found, and perhaps another government will find it. There is no use in saying that many other grievances are not covered or that many other groups have been overlooked or ignored. Another government will correct these difficulties and there are more grievances which must be dealt with soon, but we must apparently wait for that day. The government has moved in a very narrow way to solve a very narrow grievance.

Other speakers have pointed out the great problems in many areas in respect of social welfare and civil rights. I do not need to go over them again because they have been well covered. We feel that the government is avoiding these issues and that it is bringing forward other bills perhaps as an excuse for its failure to meet the real problems of poverty and regional disparity.

In spite of all these things we cannot deny that in respect of this specific problem the government is moving, perhaps poorly and weakly, to rectify it. To this extent I feel bound to support the government with the hope that the committee will rectify some of the errors in the bill with the hope that this first move will precipitate others and will encourage further useful legislation to solve some of the problems facing this country. As I said at the outset, I feel bound to support the principle of this bill, and I will vote in favour of it on second reading.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. E. B. Osler (Winnipeg South Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I would be most pleased to speak only in French on this bill, but unfortunately it is impossible for me to do so right now, because I do not know the language well enough yet. I will continue my speech in English.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) referred at the beginning of his remarks to events that are happening in other parts of the world and the fact that the same things could happen here. I agree with him completely that if they did the results might be similar. However, this is one of the things this bill respecting the status of official languages in Canada attempts to prevent.

I crave the indulgence of the house while I make a brief survey of some Canadian historical facts as I believe they relate to this bill. In doing so I hope I will allay some of the fears, pointed out by the hon. member who preceded me, in relation to the circumstances of the so-called other ethnic groups.

More than 350 years ago there were Canadians living in North America. Their language was French. More than 230 years ago Canadians were engaged in the exploration and exploitation of the west. Their language too was French. Almost 210 years ago French troops fighting in North America lost a battle to English troops, due chiefly to the superiority of the Royal Navy, and Canadians already settled here for more than a century and a half became colonial wards of Britannia in place of Marianne.

Some years later English speaking people, again because of the fortunes of war, began to settle in Canada, chiefly to the east and to the west of the ancient Canadian heartland along the banks of the St. Lawrence. It was not for another 60 years that my own ancestors arrived here from the British Isles, and not for another 30 years did the event known as Confederation take place.

At the time of Confederation both English and French, the mother tongues of the two great immigrant peoples living in British North America at that time, were given equal status in the federal parliament, in the federal courts, and in the legislative assembly and courts of the new province of Quebec. Three years later, when Louis Riel brought Manitoba into Confederation, both French and English were given official status under section 23 of the Manitoba Act which said that either English or French may be used by any person in the debates of the houses of legislature, and that both languages shall be used in the records and journals of those houses. It also said that either language may be used by any person in any pleading or process in any court of Canada established under the British North America Act, or in any court in the province. So clearly the right of the Canadian government to deal with the matter of languages as it would apply to a new territory was there, and it certainly was not challenged at the time.

• (12:10 p.m.)

Incidentally, when Manitoba came into confederation the French speaking people there outnumbered the English. But this in no way suggested to anyone that both language groups should not have equal rights and privileges. Later immigrants from Ontario flooded into the country, putting the principle of bilingualism under relentless and continuous pressure. When Riel was executed years later for high treason in the Northwest Territories in 1885, the jury consisted of six men none of whom could speak or understand a word of French. I think that is relevant to our present concern about some of the aspects of this bill.

Professor George F. G. Stanley has written a very good book entitled "Louis Riel". He observes in that book that Dr. François Roy, a psychiatrist, testified on Riel's behalf and was, in fact, the key defence witness and the Crown knew it. Osler's tactics—that is my great uncle—were therefore, to assume an attitude of bellicosity, to browbeat if not to confuse the witness. This passage in the book continues in the following words:

> Hard pressed to answer Osler's questions in English, Roy fell back upon his own language, French, and in so doing lost much of his effectiveness as a witness, if only because of the difficulty of translating his evidence in a manner easily understood by the members of the jury.

I suggest, therefore, that history proves, from a very famous trial, that our concern over legal rights is a good one.

Be this as it may, fresh immigrants from central Europe began to arrive in the west. They, too, were allowed language privileges; at least they were allowed to use their mother tongue for instructional purposes in school. Right up until 1916 or 1915, when ten pupils in any school spoke French or any language other than English, the teaching of these pupils could be done "in French or such other language, and English upon the bilingual system". This is to be found in Manitoba Statutes, 60 Queen Victoria, C-26. Then one day in order, I presume, to make things nice and tidy and efficient for the Anglo-Saxon mind of the day, English was made the sole language of instruction in the schools of Manitoba.

In my native province things have changed somewhat for the better since then. Nowadays, under some conditions once again French may be used as a language of instruction in the school and, of course, it may still be used in the legislature and courts of record. At the present time neither the Premier of Manitoba, the Leader of the Official Opposition nor the members of the New Democratic party are in opposition to the principle of this bill. But let it be noted by the so-called ethnic groups, which in western Canada now outnumber both English and French, that it is only when the French language has enjoyed full rights and privileges that their own languages have had a chance. Incidentally, it is no accident that the present bill goes out of its way in clause 38 to ensure that "nothing in this act shall be construed as derogating from or diminishing in any way any legal or customary right or privilege acquired or enjoyed either before or after the coming into force of this act with respect to any language that is not an official language."

I suggest that history proves gradualism, advocated by several speakers in this debate, to be a mirage. Unless language rights are nailed down by law it is all too easy for a majority, made intolerant by the pressures of temporary adversity or current fears, to abrogate these language rights. That is what the so-called backlash is all about in western Canada today.

Canada is not and has never been a melting pot. It glorifies in a diversity of peoples almost as varied as the magnificent geography that we all enjoy. We on the prairies are different from some of the rest of you. We have a richer cultural diversity. We have our own unique way of looking at things, stemming from the past we have shared together and the things we have done together to make life liveable in one of the most unforgiving climates in the world.

Apart from what we are and what we have become, chiefly by our own efforts during the last 100 years, our geographical position in Canada is quite different from that which was visualized by the Fathers of Confederation so long ago. My own city of Winnipeg, for instance, is no longer the gateway to the west; rather, it is the centre of a potentially rich heartland that faces both the Pacific Ocean and the Arctic Sea. If it is a gateway to anywhere, surely it is the gateway to the north.

Because of these things, and because we incorporate joyously many cultures instead of just two, we have always rejected the two-nation theory that has been bandied about from time to time. But there is no logical reason why we in the west should hesitate to acknowledge the legitimate demands of those who insist that French should be an official

language. By creating a climate in which French culture can flourish, surely the principle of national diversity is ensured. As I have already pointed out, whenever we dismiss the French fact we must dismiss all the other "facts" too—the Ukranian fact, the Polish fact, the German fact, the Indian and Eskimo fact, indeed, every fact that makes our western region so culturally interesting and rich. By acknowledging the justice of the French fact, however, we infer that there is a need for a means by which the "third force" Canadians, of whom there are so many in the west, can preserve their languages and cultures wherever they are gathered in sufficient numbers so to do. Thus, wholeheartedly and with consistency, we can commend the sort of resolution adopted by the ninth Ukrainian Canadian Congress in Winnipeg on October 14, 1968. I will read that resolution:

> Now therefore be it resolved:
>
> That pursuant to its exclusive constitutional right under section 93 of the British North America Act to legislate in the field of education, the province of Manitoba be petitioned by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee to enact legislation to protect the language and cultural rights of all persons in Manitoba of other than English or French descent by guaranteeing to all such persons, in the districts populated by the respective minorities in such of the public schools therein . . . the right to receive instruction in their respective language as a subject of study and the right to have their language used in such public schools from grade 1—

In my opinion this was a sensible suggestion for the Ukrainians of Manitoba to bring forward. It would be entirely inconsistent and untenable for them to bring forward this resolution if there were not a measure such as Bill C-120. The two things go together and are in my opinion inseparable. The country as a whole has two official languages, and a region or province is justified in encouraging regional languages.

• (12:20 p.m.)

I am convinced that the so-called western backlash has nothing to do with the official languages bill. Those politicians from either side of the house and those public figures who pretend that it has, do themselves and their country a disservice. We need constitutional reform—yes—so that in some way we may have a more effective voice in the west than the one we enjoy at the moment. We want a greater voice in the decision-making bodies of this nation—in parliament, in the Senate, in the boardrooms of our financial and industrial concerns, and on the executives of the labour unions whose decisions affect so many of us today. We are a "becoming" nation, which is both our glory and our cross. As westerners we want more opportunities to help decide what we become.

These are the things that worry us western Canadians, and they have nothing to do with Bill C-120 which, with amendments, is a completely innocuous and a very necessary piece of legislation. What we politicians of all parties from the west should do, after resisting any temptation to place ourselves at the head of a not so holy and utterly sterile crusade against this legislation, is to press with all our might for economic and constitutional reform that will let the west take its rightful place as an equal partner in this great Canada of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse wholeheartedly the principle of this bill.

**Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more inappropriate time for the parliament of Canada to be discussing the bill before us. Many serious problems face the people of Canada, and most of them have a great deal to do with whether or not we will remain a nation in the years ahead. None of these problems will be solved as a result of either the passage or the debate of this bill.

I represent a constituency in the Atlantic provinces. Regional economic disparity is a fact recognized by the government and by the people of this nation. The most recent unemployment figure from that area indicates that the problem continues to be serious and even chaotic. Yet the government does nothing or next to nothing except to send a new minister down to the region to talk about programs and plans that he envisages will take 15 years before having any material effect on the income and status of the people of that region. In spite of this the government says that we must debate this bill even though by its very nature and content it is questionable whether this institution should even consider it.

The government tells this institution and the people of this nation that it has the competence to produce and enact this piece of legislation even though leading jurists of this nation have expressed grave doubts as to the competence of parliament to deal with the legislation before us. While the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) indicates that he and his law officers are of the opinion that the bill is constitutional, an individual of no less stature than the former president of the Exchequer Court of Canada has indicated in no uncertain terms that it is his belief that parliament does

not have the competence to deal with this legislation and that it should be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada for a ruling. The three prairie premiers have also indicated their grave concern over the content of this bill and have questioned parliament's competence to deal with it. We have not heard from them since the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) indicated that certain amendments to the bill will be moved by the government. It is my hope that when the bill is referred to the committee some of the serious objections that have been made to its content will be explored in great detail.

I am opposed to the principle of compulsion so far as language rights in this country are concerned. At the same time I do not oppose a committee of this house examining in detail the content of the bill as it is placed before us because I hope they will examine in detail section 91 (1) of the B.N.A. Act and especially that aspect of it dealing with language rights. I should like to place that portion of section 91 (1) on the record which precludes parliament from dealing individually and directly with language rights in this nation. Section 91 (1) reads as follows:

> The amendment from time to time of the Constitution of Canada, except as regards matters coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces, or as regards rights or privileges by this or any other Constitutional Act granted or secured to the Legislature or the Government of a province, or to any class of persons with respect to schools—

This is the important qualification.

> —or as regards the use of the English or the French language—

If section 91 (1) is construed in a narrow sense, then it is not for us in this institution to make that decision but it is a decision to be taken by the Supreme Court of Canada. In this way language rights are placed in a strait-jacket, as was contended at the time when Prime Minister St. Laurent amended the constitution and added this section to it. If they are placed in a strait-jacket, then we do not have the competence to act on section 133 of the B.N.A. Act which outlines in detail the language rights in this nation.

In answering the Hon. J. T. Thorson on November 22, 1968, the Prime Minister outlined his and I assume his government's attitude with regard to both sections 91 and 133. But once again the fact that the Prime Minister has taken this position does not means that it is the correct position legally. It only means that this is the attitude of the government in this regard. The only way in which we can ascertain whether or not parliament can act on this bill is by referring the decision to the Supreme Court of Canada. This is the only way in which we will know whether in fact we have the right to alter certain aspects of the language rights in this nation.

• (12:30 p.m.)

I indicated that this is the worst possible time to have a debate on a subject that is giving Canadians everywhere a great deal of concern. Today in the province of Quebec English speaking people who reside there are greatly concerned. A great many people are leaving. A great many commercial enterprises are leaving that province.

**Mr. Pepin:** How do you know?

**Mr. Coates:** The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) asks me how I know. Would he not agree that Industrial Acceptance Corporation has just moved its head office from Montreal to Toronto? This is a billion dollar enterprise. If this is not an indication of what is in the minds of the people I should like to know what other evidence the minister expects to find.

When this debate was initiated some time ago we were told that all the government was endeavouring to do was to give French speaking individuals outside Quebec the same rights as English speaking individuals have in the province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I am sure English speaking citizens in Quebec would like to know exactly what their rights are today. A bill was proposed in the Quebec legislature with an indication that those rights would be outlined. That bill has been withdrawn and there is every sign that it will never appear again.

The events at St. Leonard have caused concern to all Canadians, especially to those of ethnic origin who have great difficulty in seeing that their children receive an education in the language of their choice. These are the reasons for my saying that Canadians are concerned. The government should have taken notice of this situation by withholding action on the bill now before us until such time as there is clarification of the rights which Canadians using English as their mother tongue may enjoy in the province of Quebec.

I read the comments of the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis). He drew attention to the deep concern felt by the public servants of Canada who are unilingual.

They are concerned about the danger to their future employment and careers from the concept embodied in this legislation. And there is real reason for this concern because all kinds of events are taking place in this country which are most unsettling to English speaking and unilingual people in this nation. Foremost is the fact that they will become second class citizens because they do not have the second language or the capability of securing a working knowledge of the second language.

This limitation does not necessarily arise because they are not intelligent. I have never endeavoured to secure a knowledge of the French language mainly because I know from past experience that it would come very hard for me. At the same time I have tried to the best of my ability to see that my children have a working knowledge which will allow them to become bilingual in the days ahead should they desire to do so. But it is not a question of any compulsion being placed on me by anyone. I hold this view because I believe my children will be enriched by being able to speak more than one language. I have nothing against them or anyone else being able to speak many languages if that is their desire, but I do not think anyone should be compelled to secure a working knowledge of more than one language and I do not think the absence of such knowledge should in any way jeopardize his possibilities so far as employment or promotion in the government service is concerned. I do not like the idea of any more authorities being set up in Canada to make decisions as will be the case when the commissioner proposed by this bill takes up his duties.

Some of the proposed amendments cause me as much concern as does the bill itself. The proposed amendment to clause 9 reads as follows:

> Every department and agency of the Government of Canada and every judicial, quasi-judicial or administrative body or Crown corporation established by or pursuant to an act of the Parliament of Canada has, in addition to but without derogating from the duty imposed upon it by subsection (1), the duty to ensure, to the extent that it is feasible for it to do so, that members of the public in locations other than those referred to in that subsection—

The reference is to bilingual districts.

> —where there is a significant demand therefor by such persons, can obtain available services from and can communicate with it in both official languages.

Where would that lead us if it became law? Surely it is a provision which implies an extension of power well beyond the proposal embodied in the bill concerning the establishment of bilingual districts.



It is my belief that we accomplish nothing by trying to impose the French language upon Canadians by compulsion. It is my belief that the schism in evidence today in this nation between the two major language groups could become an unbridgable gap if we continue the debate on Bill C-120. It is my hope that the committee, when it is established and considers this measure, will call a good deal of evidence as to the competence of the Parliament of Canada to legislate an amendment to the British North America Act, for this, in my view, is what Bill C-120 does. It is my hope that the committee will recommend that the reference which many in this country have urged should be made to the Supreme Court of Canada to determine the constitutionality of the bill in question will, in fact, be made so that we may know whether we are endeavouring to do what is right or, in the alternative, whether we are trying to do by the back door what we cannot do by the front door because it is impossible for the federal government to secure the consent of the provinces to the amendments they have in mind.

• (12:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Ouellet (Papineau):** Mr. Speaker, since the outset of this debate, many speakers have stressed the fact that this bill will be welcomed by Canadian youth.

I wish to take part in this debate on the status of the official languages of Canada to express not so much the views of a government member, but rather the views of a 30-year-old Quebecer who, for the last twenty years, that is from the first time he left Quebec, has been asking himself many times whether he is a full-fledged citizen in this country.

Anyone who looks at the situation without prejudice should agree with me that Canadians of French language and culture do not have everywhere in Canada the same opportunities as English-speaking citizens, if they want to live, work and bring up their children in their mother tongue.

This definite situation has existed for quite some time, and it has not varied in spite of the thousands of grand patriotic speeches delivered in the past by men of authority and, very likely, of good will.

Today, this situation must change. Otherwise, I would not hesitate to predict that

Canada itself will change, and we will then see the disruption of the country.

Indeed, my generation and the one that follows do not have the patience of our parents or grandparents. We want the adoption of this bill, because we have waited a long time for it. That is the minimum, as far as we are concerned, and it is time it came about.

The vastness of our country, poor means of communication, isolation, mediocre teaching of Canadian history, a too-often unbalanced competition, have had as a result that, for years, French Canadians and English Canadians have not felt close to one another: either they knew one another not at all or very little, and badly at that, or else, more often than not, disliked one another without really knowing why.

It is easy then to understand why our parents and grandparents nursed so many grudges and prejudices.

Today, communications are much better. The young people travel a lot and the teaching of Canadian history has improved considerably. It is no longer taught, amongst other things, that the bad English encouraged the Iroquois to massacre the French, that the depraved French gave alcohol to the Indians the better to rob them.

Fortunately, my generation and the one that follows hold no grudges nor any prejudices. On the contrary, we are willing to make many concessions. We are willing above all else to pay the price so that Canadians may feel at home throughout the land.

When, in the summer of 1965, a private company made a survey across Canada on behalf of the B & B commission, Canadians under 35 who were questioned answered in a proportion of almost 100 per cent that all Canadian citizens should be able to deal with the federal government in English or in French, as they choose.

I therefore do not hesitate to say that the young people of Canada support this bill wholeheartedly. On their behalf, I urge my colleagues in this house to vote for this bill without reservations, unanimously.

Doubtless, the bill asks a generation of men steeped in prejudices to accept realities they were never ready to recognize. But, on behalf of the country they love, on behalf of the children and grand-children they cherish, I ask them to do violence to their feelings and allow a new generation of young and open minds, willing to forget their forefathers' quarrels, capable of tolerance and respect of others, to build a united, prosperous and serene Canada.

It is unfortunate that some members are seeking all sorts of excuses to oppose this bill. Whether the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) was too outspoken or not, whether this bill should come before the house before rather than after the bills concerning housing and industrial incentives. that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) did not see fit to inform the house earlier of the amendments to the bill whether the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is in an ivory tower or not, all that, in my opinion, is quite frivolous talk in such a serious and important discussion.

May I be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to tell those who have made such remarks and who would be tempted to vote against this bill on such pretences, that the young people of Canada are fed up with all their nonsense and regard them as dusty old reactionaries: the sooner they vanish from the present political scene the better.

I feel there are actually only two questions to clarify about this bill. First, can it be anticonstitutional? Second, can it cause injustices towards unilingual civil servants?

To the first question, I shall answer that, in my opinion, the bill is perfectly constitutional. I think that this bill comes under the jurisdiction of parliament. It is not in any manner detrimental to the rights and privileges granted by virtue of section 133 of the British North America Act.

On the other hand, as the Minister of Justice said in the house last Tuesday, it would not be fair to interpret the constitution so as to freeze, in a way, the use of French apart from the rights granted by section 133. The fathers of confederation conceived a bilingual Canada, a bilingual parliament, and they have drawn up a constitution in which the two languages are on the same footing.

This bill certainly does not betray the spirit of the constitution. Besides, beyond the constitution, beyond parliament, the Canadian people recognize and accept bilingualism in Canada. Gallup polls show that more than 80 per cent of Canadians recognize the principle of language equality. It would therefore be unfortunate if we were to ask the courts for a ruling on the constitutionality of the bill, because such a procedure would inevitably entail long delays.

Such a procedure would greatly antagonize—and I do not hesitate to say so—the

young people who want action from the leaders of this country and who are becoming increasingly impatient.

I hope the consultations the Minister of Justice had with several attorneys general have been useful and that the proposed amendments will satisfy the most fearful.

I will not enlarge upon the subject at this stage, because we will have the opportunity to look fully into the bill in the committee. It seems obvious to me however, that the Minister of Justice has done a wonderful job and that he deserves our gratitude.

• (12:50 p.m.)

I think that the propositions suggested as a whole should be accepted by the Western provinces as well as by the province of Quebec and certain Maritime provinces. I do not think that it is necessary to have the bill in its present form with its suggested amendments referred to the Canadian courts in order to have it passed so that it may become law.

As for the second question, in my opinion, no provision of that bill justifies the fears of some unilingual officials who believe that they could not take advantage of the opportunities which they would otherwise have had.

The government has said that it is only from 1970 on that the knowledge of both official languages or the will to acquire it will be required in localities—and this is very important—where bilingualism answers a need. That is the general policy the government will follow for management and administration positions, and the same requirements will apply to promotions within the service in 1975 only.

Therefore, a person speaking English only could still be promoted in a locality where bilinguism is not required. Then, in the next few years, a unilingual person will still be able to take all means made available free of charge by the government to improve his knowledge of the second language. Therefore, if he takes the trouble, he could be promoted in a centre where bilingualism is a requirement.

Do I need to say that at present, it is essential that French Canadians know English to enter the federal public service. All that will be needed for an English-speaking civil servant to be promoted in some localities will be his will to learn French.

Mr. Speaker, some hon. members have complained that televator operators and door watchmen have been transferred because they were not bilingual. To my knowledge, none of them has lost his job. I do not believe that they were in the government service to be necessarily in charge of a particular door or elevator. If they are working elsewhere, it is because of the circumstances, the same way as a machine operator in a plant is transferred to another job when the plant manager decides to replace his machine and to secure the services of another younger employee to operate it.

If some hon. members are too fanatical to understand that the higher interests of the country demand that those in charge of the central entrance of the parliament buildings, for instance, be bilingual, I cannot help it, but that is the prevailing situation.

In such a case, the government should take its responsibilities and transfer somewhere else the official who is not up to the new requirements. Anyway, the civil servant being transferred should consider himself lucky, as he is privileged over those who speak only French who will never be accepted in the civil service unless they learn English.

This being said, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words to those who underestimate the significance of this bill. I was surprised that even the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) did not grasp all the implications of this bill when he said on October 17 of last year, when the house was considering the draft resolution, as reported at page 1484 of *Hansard*, and I quote:

> Within the framework of Canada's constitutional evolution and of the problems we still have to resolve, this resolution can hardly be regarded as a very significant or decisive step.

It is the Leader of the Opposition who is speaking.

> As I have said, it is quite a small part of the over-all question, and from the point of view of the government it is the easiest part. All that is required is the drafting and presentation of a resolution and a bill in this house.

The Leader of the Opposition tells us that all that is required is the presentation of a bill. Yes, only that was required. Yet before that was achieved, many years went by; thousands of patriotic speeches of all kinds were delivered and it took a gallant government and, above all, a resolute and responsible Prime Minister to undertake it.

The need for an act respecting the status of official languages was one of the main conclusions of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. The Liberal party, not the party of the Leader of the Opposition,

made it one of the planks of its election platform. The campaign of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau)—not that of the Leader of the Opposition—was centered round that principle. The Prime Minister laid emphasis on the equality of languages in all parts of Canada. He dealt with that subject in all areas of this country, expressing himself in those occasions in both languages. The people, especially the young ones, understood and accepted that.

Far from being an unimportant step, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, I believe this bill is a decisive step that will enable us to really unite Canadians by making them equal partners.

I think that the achievement of linguistic equality in Canada is at this time the most important challenge, the most urgent and most essential task, without which everything else could very well be useless.

Several of my fellow citizens at the present time preach unilinguism in Canada. An important movement advocates Quebec's independence. Obviously many have lost patience and do not want to belong to a country where you have to fight constantly to preserve your linguistic rights.

The hon. member of the opposition who spoke before me put forward the case of St. Leonard. He pointed out the enormous importance of this bill when referring to St. Leonard.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that fine speeches are not enough and that action is required. If the nice words we hear, here and there, are spoken in earnest, it would therefore be normal to put them in writing and to put in our statute books the principles recognized in the measure under consideration. Only the law can protect people's rights.

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** It being one o'clock, this sitting stands suspended until two o'clock this afternoon.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

**Mr. Ouellet:** Mr. Speaker, I was saying, before lunch, that rights can only be protected by law, and I mean by that that it is no longer good enough to make fine speeches. If we are truly sincere and if we truly want to do something positive, it is high time that we spelled out and incorporated in our statutes the principles endorsed by this bill.

I feel that to approve this bill is the best way to refute the arguments of several separatists. Then, French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec would enjoy the same rights as English-speaking Quebecers, since French Canadians would then feel more at home in every part of the country, and more especially in the national capital. It would then be possible for them to live in an English environment without giving up their cultural background.

As the Prime Minister said on October 17 last, and I quote:

> —Those who argue for separation, in whatever form, are prisoners of past injustice, blind to the possibilities of the future.

Let us make the future beaming with possibilities by passing this bill, and the ghost of separation will blur away as this bill is applied progressively.

The main object of this bill is to remove cultural and linguistic inequalities in Canada. It will enable everyone to be on the same footing to develop their talents and use their energy and their knowledge for the benefit of their fellow-citizens.

I would like to recall the words uttered last Friday by the Secretary of State, when speaking to the bill, and I quote:

> The bill concerns not individual bilingualism, but institutional bilingualism; that is, the use of the two languages by government services in their dealing with the public.

Members of the opposition have accused the Secretary of State of using extremist language. I wonder how his words could be construed as extremist. Further on, he said in particular that it follows from the principle stated in this bill that:

> —all official documents . . . must be published in both official languages.

This legislation. . .

> —provides for the establishment of federal bilingual districts in all regions inhabited by both French and English speaking citizens—

In my view, it is only normal to hope that such bilingual districts are established—

> —as long as 10 per cent or more of the population . . . use the minority official language as their mother tongue.

I fail to see anything extremist in that demand.

The Secretary of State also said that in the bill, and I quote:

—provision is also made for all departments and bodies of the Canadian government, all federal courts, quasi-judicial and administrative bodies and Crown Corporations to ensure that both languages are used in all their relations with the public.

I feel that it is quite normal—there is nothing extremist in that—to allow a Canadian citizen to deal with his government in his mother tongue.

Finally, the Secretary of State said:

—the bill deals with the appointment and duties of a Commissioner of official languages for Canada . . . The commissioner will be responsible for ensuring that the status of both official languages is recognized in practice and that the spirit of the law and the intention of the legislator are respected in their entirety.

I feel there is nothing extremist in asking that there should be some sort of ombudsman of language matters in Canada.

In the course of our history, we have experienced rather difficult times, especially several years ago, when language and education issues arose in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and even in Ontario. I am under the impression that this legislation offers us certain guarantees through the appointment of a Commissioner of languages, who will see that the rights—I repeat—the rights of every Canadian citizen are respected. French Canadians are not asking for a privilege or a favour, but simply for the recognition of a right by this legislation.

In concluding my remarks, I would like to repeat what I said at the beginning—and I speak not only for myself, but on behalf of all young Canadians who believe in the future of the country, who are proud to be Canadians, and who want this bill to be adopted—it is the minimum and is long overdue.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville):** Mr. Speaker, in the past two years the cries for national unity across Canada have been increasingly vocal, but it is about time we as Canadians recognize the fact that unity is not achieved by assimilation. It is about time we realized that the only way to achieve unity in our nation is to preserve and promote the inherent diversities of the Canadian mosaic. The French Canadian minority in Canada has a right to participate in the social and economic life of our country. It is the combination of our multi-culture expressed in the two official languages which preserves the Canadian identity and makes it distinctive from that of the United States. It is also this combination, I believe, which could contribute much to the unity of our country.

For these reasons I should like to say at the outset that I support the principle of the bill and its referral to the committee. I believe that basically and essentially it is a civil rights bill. I think it has been long overdue and that something like this should have been implemented years ago. We must understand the minorities, protect them and most of all make sure that they become involved within our country. If we do not, then I believe we will face a danger at some future time. We have seen the conflict among many minorities in different countries. We see the strife in the United States, in Great Britain and in an exaggerated sense in the country of Nigeria. It is my belief, if we do not do something about situations such as we have in Canada, that something like this could happen here if carried to the extreme.

As I have said, I think that basically this is a piece of civil rights legislation which will guarantee the French Canadians in particular greater equity in participating in the social and economic life of our country. It is basically from this point of view as a democratic socialist that I rise to support this legislation in the hope that it will remove some of the inequities and inequalities we have in our country. I also hope that it will make Canada more accessible to both groups of Canadians. Second, this piece of legislation should help to make Canada more distinct in identity and culture from the United States. I believe it will add to the individuality of Canada as a nation and promote the Canadian conscience and attitude on national unity throughout the world.

I shall try to be brief. I want to support this bill not because I am basically either an English or French Canadian but because I am representative of the so-called third group of Canadians. I believe Canada has an advantage over the United States in that many of the cultures and languages of the third group of Canadians have been preserved because in Canada we are more tolerant in this regard as a result of our bilingual and bicultural nature. In my opinion this ethnic diversity is of value to our Canadian culture much more than is the case in the United States where it tends to go into a huge melting pot. These are some of the reasons I should like to support the principle of the bill before us today.

Some members have made a point about alienation in different parts of the country with regard to this bill. Many people have spoken of the western alienation. This is something at which I believe we should look quite realistically because there would appear to be in the west a latent feeling of alienation and mistrust of eastern Canada. I believe it has become more vocal in recent years because the farm population has faced hardships on account of the lack of grain sales, low incomes and so on. No doubt this situation will become more serious unless something is done about it. I do not believe, however, that basically it is because there is an anti-French Canadian feeling in western Canada. I think it is more a mistrust of big business and of a government that is unwilling to instigate policies of social economic change.

I believe it is unfortunate that people in this house and outside the house take the opportunity presented by this bill to exploit the anti-French feeling. As the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Howard) said, there are essentially two main groups in western Canada who vocally oppose the bill. The opposition comes first from the four western premiers and, second, from a small group of Conservatives, the same people who of course opposed the flag and the Criminal Code amendments and probably will oppose the recognition of mainland China. I do not think this is truly a reflection of the feeling of western Canadians. I believe that most people recognize that Canada is a nation with two official languages.

I do have a few concerns about the bill before us today. First of all, I believe we must be careful when implementing a bill of this nature. We must not go about forcing bilingualism on people throughout the country. If we do this I believe we will run into trouble. The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) a few days ago made representations to the minister about civil service employees and employees of the Canadian National Railways, for example. I do not think we should make the lack of bilingualism a handicap to these people whether they are French or English speaking, because it can be carried to extremes. For instance, an elevator operator in a federal building in Regina or Edmonton could be demoted or not get any more promotions because he did not have a second language. These are some things we have to watch out for in the implementation of a bill of this sort.

Another thing that concerns me is that I do not think this bill is the be-all and end-all in regard to national unity in Canada. It is only a part of it. It is only a recipe; it is not the entire menu. It is only a web of a weaving that helps to tie the different groups in Canada together in better understanding and communication. We need complete social and economic change throughout our society.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Taking bilingualism, for example, we are going to have to develop a bilingual program in all schools across the country both in the French speaking areas as well as the English speaking districts. To do this will require more federal aid to education in order to promote greater bilingualism in the schools. If this is done, perhaps we can have what the minister suggested in introducing the bill, a bilingual school in every major city in Canada. This is desirable provided we have federal aid to education and a large enough population to warrant it.

But, as I said before, many other things must be done in trying to achieve and preserve Canadian unity. We need many social and economic reforms to go along with the languages bill. In French Canada, French Canadians must gain control of their own destiny more than they have today. In western Canada we have to do such things as sell grain and get more income into the west; otherwise the people there too are going to feel more and more alienated. We have to recognize the poor and give them greater security with increased housing across the country. Even more important, we have to get people involved in their country and participating at all levels in life. We notice this in particular among young people who want to play some part in the decision-making process. The Indian people want the same thing; they want to have some of the say in decisions that affect their lives. I think these considerations are very important and should go hand in hand with the official languages bill. For Canadians involvement is going to have to be the most important thing.

If we are going to be an independent nation we have to start promoting more Canadianism at all levels of our lives. We have to do many things, for example, get more people involved in basic arts, sports and culture and more people participating toward this end. Today social development tends to cater to the elite segment of our society, while participation should be the key for all groups in society irrespective of their origin. All too

often funds that are spent in Canada on development of arts, sports and culture are spent on projects such as theaters in Montreal and Toronto that only cater to 5 per cent of the people of Canada. These, of course, are the top income people.

I am very sceptical about the arts centre in Ottawa. We should take care with respect to the type of programming in this centre. I notice that opening night requires a black tie and it is also very expensive. Automatically, many people are excluded from participating. I feel this is scandalous.

We see the same thing in sports. We tend to worship professionalism, the Olympic mania, if you want to call it that. We forget to get people involved in sports—in hockey, softball and other types of sports. In many cities and towns across Canada, many people cannot go to a skating rink because they cannot afford to pay the admission.

Among other things, I think we should set aside a national day for sports and arts in Canada in order to have people in all communities and age groups participating. This goes hand in hand with a bill of this sort, for it gives people a feeling for their country and its place in the world. We should set aside a day in the springtime and get people involved in a national holiday. We could take Victoria Day in order to promote Canadianism. Victoria Day does not really mean anything now to people. Something like this could do much to promote Canadian unity. Instead, Victoria day now represents a lack of imagination by the powers that be in Canada. It is a thing of the past.

I do not want to go on much longer Mr. Speaker, except to say that I support the principle of the bill and I hope it can be referred to the committee as soon as possible. However, I also want to stress again the importance of social and economic reforms and involvement of the people in their country. Otherwise the whole purpose of this bill will be defeated. Many of the speeches made on the bill will be irrelevant because Canada will not be preserved as a nation unless we do things together. With that, Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to add my support to the principle of the bill.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. H. E. Gray (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I am neither of English nor of French origin. I was born in this country the son of European immigrants. I am proud of my origins but, at the same time, I am proud to be a Canadian.

[Mr. Nystrom.]

And it is as a Canadian sharing two great heritages that I give my full support to this bill and that I urge the House of Commons and all the people in this country to support it.

It is obvious that the future unity of our country depends upon the recognition of the present situation which results from some historic facts which brought forth two linguistic communities in Canada, one English speaking and the other French speaking.

So that our country may continue to extend from one ocean to the other, this situation has to be recognized by the federal government, in order that our government may be a truly national one, made up of French speaking and English speaking people.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Here is the purpose of this bill: to give equal status to the two official languages in the federal field. I want to point this out. The bill deals only with the equality of the two official languages. It does not grant any superior status to any ethnic group as such. In Canada, where a third of the population is made up of various ethnic origins, neither French nor English, it is the only way to act that is acceptable and suitable.

In my opinion, if the bill is really based on language and not on race, those who are members of the so-called third group must not feel wronged or concerned.

Obviously, the fact that an immigrant is neither of French nor English origin does not mean that he and his descendants will always speak mostly their mother tongue. Most such immigrants and their children speak one of our official languages and sometimes both, although they might still have some knowledge of their ethnic tongue and be proud of their cultural heritage. Most of them speak English for reasons I shall briefly mention later on.

As concerns the Anglo-Saxons who try to question the principle of the bill and allege that it ignores the third ethnic group in our country, they show a lack of information and understanding in connection with the people who are of neither French nor English extraction.

The members of the third group above all want all citizens to have equal opportunities, regardless of their racial origin. In order that the members of that third group, or at least the majority of them, may be confident of the future of this country, we must see to it that every opportunity is provided to whoever has

the required qualifications, and who is ready to work in any or both official languages, according to the needs and circumstances.

Most of the people in this third group speak English fluently, as I have said. But English is not an artificial language. It is related to a certain nation and to its culture. However, there is no question of granting special privileges to that group, because its language is used throughout the country as a result of certain historical facts.

But if it is true that the English language belongs to a certain ethnical group, namely the Anglo-Saxon and British one, it is also true that it has played a part as a national language here, which had not been played up to now by the French language. I say this because the knowledge of English has allowed immigrants and their descendants not only to find work but to participate to some extent in the community life, in most of the regions of our country where English is mainly used. This is not the case with regard to French.

French Canadians and all other Canadians consider French as the particular language of French Canadians. The reasons for that are not what they used to be. The French Canadians, who were 70,000 at first, now represent 6 million people, 5 millions of which form the greater part of the population of the province of Quebec. If French and English languages are to be equal in federal activities, then, French must be a national language in Canada as English has been for a long time. It must become the language within a community life for all those who wish to use it regardless of their ethnic origin or religious belief. French must not be considered as the private property of the French Canadian group, no more than English is considered the sole property of the British group.

I am speaking in French today to show that if the French language is to be fully recognized as an official language in Canada, at least at the federal level, it is mine as much as English.

According to the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission, as stated in the first volume of its report, equality:

> —should not only be that of the two nations that have founded Confederation, but that of their respective languages and cultures, therefore that of all those who speak those languages and belong to those cultures, whatever their origin.

This is, in my opinion, the philosophy on which is based the official languages bill.

Its purpose is merely to assure all our citizens that they can apply to the federal government and its agencies in one of the two official languages, as they choose.

As the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) already stated, the bill deals with bilingualism related to institutions and not to individuals. The government does not intend to force English-speaking people to learn and speak French, or to force French-speaking people to learn and speak English.

And since I am referring to the third group in our country, it must be noted that clause 38 of the bill is to the effect that the legislation does not deprive any other language of its vested rights and privileges. The measure does not take anything away from the many other cultures which have added much to our life. The fact of having in Canada not one, but two languages with an official status has created a climate which increases for other cultures the possibility of their having a valid and assured place.

If the object of the bill is to suppress injustices and to solve problems, it obviously does not intend to create new injustices and new problems.

If the bill proposes the establishment of federal bilingual districts, in which some federal services will be bilingual, it will also be possible to create such districts for English-speaking minorities, in Quebec for instance, and for French-speaking minorities, elsewhere in the country. And if the bill proposes the appointment of a Commissioner of Official Languages, it must be pointed out that his task will be to protect the linguistic rights of both English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians at the federal level.

It is feared by some that the bill and the government's bilingual policy will adversely affect the careers of unilingual English-speaking Canadians in the federal Public Service.

Unfortunately, those who, at the present time, raise such a point, never or almost never raised it in the past—I mean quite recently—when it was hard, if not almost impossible, for a French-speaking Canadian to be hired by the public service if he had not an adequate knowledge of English and the desire to use that language in his work, and when for a French-speaking taxpayer—too often, in the past—it was difficult, if not impossible, to deal in French with the federal government to which he paid his taxes.

But in truth, the fear I was speaking of is groundless in my opinion. In that connection,

I think that the policy of the government is clear. Its policy, according to the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), has provided that from 1967 reasonable competence in both official languages or the desire to get it, by attending adequate training courses—at the government's expense—should be a criteria when choosing university graduates as trainees in administrative posts in areas where bilingualism meets a need. These same principles apply to both French and English-speaking Canadians.

This means that it is not necessary to be fluent in French to be hired, but only to show the will to learn French—at the government's expense—after having been hired. And this will only be required for certain civil service positions where bilingualism is a prerequisite.

• (2:40 p.m.)

One must not forget that the main object of the public service is to serve the public. And in order to do this, one should have the required qualifications. And when the work to be done requires contact with the public, one of the qualifications must be to be able to communicate in the official language used or preferred by the individual citizen.

Judging from the increasing number of applications for employment in the federal public service from English universities' graduates English speaking graduates are not at all afraid of being victims of discrimination. They are obviously not afraid because they feel as able to learn French, whenever French is needed to hold certain positions, as the French speaking employees have been able to learn English for years in similar circumstances.

There are proofs that our young people recognize the soundness of the principles of this bill. Young Canadians have more faith in themselves and in their ability than some people who have doubts about the future effectiveness of the bill before us.

But one must not forget what the government said, namely that it will not apply this legislation and this policy in an unequitable way as regards present unilingual civil servants or unilingual people wishing to enter public service. Merit will remain the basic principle of public service, and that is corroborated by one of the amendments moved the other day by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner).

[Mr. Gray.]

However, one must not forget that the knowledge of both official languages can obviously enable a better qualified candidate to be superior, as to merit, for holding a position, especially if it is one where he will have to be in contact with the public, using either of the two languages.

It must be pointed out that the provisions of the bill are flexible and will give the time required to adapt the structures and to train the personnel. This is also confirmed by some of the amendments proposed by the Minister of Justice.

Once the act comes into effect, it will be applied gradually as our human and financial resources will allow.

It is true that bilingualism at the federal level will entail certain expenditures. But, to my mind, these will not be too high and we will realize that the implementation of this bill will enable us not only to have a country, but to benefit from the advantages of living in a country where the official languages are of world importance. I see that as a positive advantage instead of a crushing burden.

The growth of our economy depends, to a large extent, on the increase of our exports as well as access to the most recent technological developments. As I said, French is a language of international importance. It will therefore enable us to have direct access to foreign markets and technological progress not only in English but also in French.

We also want to remain an independent country. But our powerful neighbour to the south shares this continent with us. To remain independent, we must have a truly Canadian identity and the will to keep that identity alive. The fact of having two official languages and their interplay in our country are two factors that are essential if we want to maintain our identity and, consequently, our independence.

I started my remarks by saying that I was speaking like a Canadian who was the son of Canadians who had emigrated from Europe. Europe as well as Canada have suffered from the effects of misunderstanding, of prejudice and of extremism. We should therefore get acquainted, when we are at school, with the European past and with our own.

Our future depends on greater understanding and more goodwill. We should not only do our best to understand each other but also consider good relationship between both our linguistic groups as a golden rule and an essential policy.

To sum up, in a few words, the substance of this bill on the official languages, I think it will be simply fair to try and do to others what we would expect from them if we were in their place. They can certainly trust in the future of a country built on such a principle. And it is perhaps, also, a symbol of our present and our real future that the name of our country, Canada, is spelt exactly the same in French and in English.

In order to bring about this future, we must support this bill and continue to work like men of goodwill in order to create a country, a Canada, which will be that of French-speaking and English-speaking people, regardless of their religion or of their origin. A better Canada in a better world.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*English*]

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on this important piece of legislation I wish to say that I believe it to be a continuation of the dialogue that has been going on for some time in Canada. I also say with no hesitation that the government is rushing this dialogue, has come to a conclusion on it and in fact is forcing a decision far too soon before the people all across Canada have had ample opportunity to become really fully involved in the dialogue and to understand the full meaning and logic of the aim of the legislation which is that Canada should become a truly bilingual country. If Canada and Canadians accept this decision, then I have no hesitation whatsoever in saying that I also fully agree with it, but I want to have an equal opportunity to contribute to the dialogue on the bilingual country which we are to become. In my opinion this bill is poor legislation which is being hurried through the house in order to curtail the dialogue before the people of Canada have really understood it or have become involved to a great extent in it.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), who introduced the bill, and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), who spoke on the bill, have all said that the main purpose of the legislation is to create greater unity in Canada. It is my belief that this bill might well do the very opposite. This is why I am so concerned about the curtailment of the dialogue and a conclusion being reached before everyone in all parts of Canada has become fully involved. We are told that this legislation is not being forced down anyone's throat. How can legislation really be effective if the people of Canada do not understand its spirit? I believe they would have understood the spirit of the legislation if the dialogue had been allowed to continue for some time until the full meaning of bilingualism was understood across the country.

I think there is much truth in what Premier Robarts had to say at the last confederation conference in February of 1969. I should like to read this paragraph from page 227 of the report:

> We do not think that the place of the two official languages in Canada can be solved simply by means of directives, regulations, legislation, charters or indeed constitutions. We think that we must take steps of this nature, of course. But we think we must also have in the country a willingness among Canadian people to act in a generous and fair manner in the question of language usage. We do not think it is only a question of legalities. It is much more than that. It is a question of heart. It is a question of conscience. It is a question of attitude, a question of thoughful attitude.

I think that Canadians all across Canada could have drawn the same conclusion eventually as Mr. Robarts has so clearly and vividly outlined in the paragraph which I read had the dialogue not been cut off.

As to the constitutional question, the Minister of Justice said it is a political and not a constitutional or legal question. The minister was very weak in his defence of that argument. I would never seek him as a lawyer to defend me after having heard how badly he defended this legislation. There is no question about the fact that this is a strictly legal and constitutional matter which should be settled by the provinces that make up confederation. Agreement should have been reached on the matter before the legislation was proceeded with. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that such agreement has not yet been reached. Yet the Minister of Justice suggests that this is a political issue which should be settled through politics.

Many hon. members who have taken part in this debate have said that this is a political issue which was settled in the last election. At the time of elections politicians are sometimes inclined to make promises which cannot be kept and are sometimes apt to use any method in order to get elected. There is no question in my mind that during the last election this issue was used as a political gambit as a result of which people throughout Canada have become confused. This issue was presented with no clarity or succinctness.

*Official Languages*

• (2:50 p.m.)

The Prime Minister suggested that he believed in one Canada. He went out west and said he would hold the line in Quebec. He went into Quebec and said, as he was justified in saying, "We must make room for you in the rest of Canada." But what was done to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) at that time? He was misrepresented all over Canada. No wonder people have such a disgust for politicians, when they cannot resist the temptation to play politics with vital issues which can affect the country for years to come.

The hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell) said the other day: "I accept the principle of two founding nations." Mr. Speaker, what ridicule some members of the Liberal party heaped upon our leader when he was going across Canada trying sincerely to bring about an understanding of this issue and made similar statements! And similar things were said by other Conservatives. Now the hon. member for Peel South tells us he accepts the principle of two founding nations. I shall not belabour the point. Unfortunately, it shows that politicians are ready to play politics with the heart issues of this country and to becloud these issues throughout Canada. I am sorry this had to happen.

There is no question in my mind that the bill before us will not lead to unity. Indeed, it is more likely to produce a further distinction between Canadians. I believe the Prime Minister was clear as to the kind of Canada he wanted, and in this connection I should like to quote from *Hansard* page 8907. The hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) quoted, in the course of his speech, what the Prime Minister said last October:

> Canada had to survive as one national state. Within this state there is no room for special status and there is no room for a degree of autonomy granted to any province which is not available to any other province.

What about the bilingual districts? Do they not fall into the category of special status? They will fall into it very quickly, whether or not the Secretary of State recognizes this.

There is no doubt in my mind that this is a legal constitutional issue. Sections 91(1) and 133 of the British North America Act make this abundantly clear. After reading these two simple sections I am convinced that even if it is not a legal, constitutional question it is a moral, constitutional matter and that the government has a moral obligation to seek a full understanding of this legislation before proceeding with it further.



The Minister of Justice had this to say as reported in *Hansard* on page 8837:

> It is our hope that the provinces will wish as quickly as possible to take steps to achieve the goals which all governments set for themselves at the constitutional conference in 1968. Indeed, we should not forget that the Confederation for Tomorrow Conference convened in Toronto by the Prime Minister of Ontario in 1967 accepted the principle of linguistic equality within Canada for Canadians.

What was the conclusion reached by the constitutional conference of 1968? The Prime Minister spelled it out very well when he initiated the discussion which took place at the constitutional conference held in Ottawa in February of this year. He said this, as reported at page 215 of the report, setting out the final conclusions of the 1968 conference:

> Recognition by this conference that as proposed by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism and as a matter of equity French speaking Canadians outside Quebec should have the same rights as English speaking Canadians in Quebec.

But this does not necessarily mean there should be complete equality throughout the rest of Canada. This seems to me to have been a poor reference for the Minister of Justice to use.

As to the constitutional issue, it seems obvious to me that the constitution of a young and growing nation such as Canada is bound to grow too; it has to make provision for growth. If anyone doubts that statement, let him look at what has happened in the past. The growing tree principle is well established in law. This is the principle the Alberta government encountered in the late thirties in connection with money. The same has to be true with regard to people. The constitution has to grow and it has to make provision for growth, particularly in a country as young as Canada and with so much potential as Canada.

This languages bill will become part of Canadian life, but it allows for very little growth. Perhaps I am thinking in this way because I come from western Canada. I do not really believe so. My father was born in the province of Quebec and there are many relatives of mine still living in that province and enjoying a good life there. I was born in a Russian community in Saskatchewan. I saw those people come to Canada. The Canadian government encouraged them to settle in western Canada. It encouraged them to fight nature in that hard, harsh country, as many

thought it was in the twenties and thirties. I saw the energy and the effort those people devoted toward making their contribution to Canada. I saw the desire of those people to become full Canadians. The first generation was eager to attend university. They made a solid contribution to science, medicine, law and agriculture in this country and they have earned their right to participate in the national life to the full; they have earned the right to become full Canadians. This languages bill which will become part of our constitution will prevent them, in today's society, though maybe not 10 or 50 years from now, from reaching their desired goals. This is one reason I consider the present bill to be poor legislation.

Whether we like it or not, this bill will become part of the life of Canada. I accept without hesitation the principle that confederation in 1867 was the coming together of the two founding peoples, the French and the English. I accept this readily. But we must not make it difficult for other people to become full Canadians. If it is the intention of the government that Canada shall become a fully bilingual country, I would have no hesitation about getting with it. But in this case the government should have announced, as a first step, that it was prepared to contribute toward the cost of sending additional teachers to the vast area of western Canada, to Newfoundland and to every nook and cranny of this country where people have no opportunity to learn the other language. In Quebec the same course should be followed.

If it is the desire of the government to make this country fully bilingual it has a duty to give everybody an opportunity to contribute and participate fully in the life and affairs of the country. The bill before us would prevent the people of Newfoundland, for example, from making the contribution they would like to make within the next 10 or 15 years until they become proficient in the other language. It would have the same effect upon the people of Quebec who have not learned the other language. This bill will do the same thing for the people in that vast area west of the Lakehead.

• (3:00 p.m.)

There is no question in my mind that the first step the federal government should have taken was to give everybody the opportunity to contribute. Then, the government could have introduced its language bill, instead of bringing it in now and ostracizing or putting up barriers against those people who have worked hard, are eager to contribute and who want unity as badly as those in other parts of Canada. To me, Mr. Speaker, we are making a tragic mistake.

This is not a new experiment. We are going through a period of constitutional reform; there is no question of that. As reported at page 8837 of *Hansard* the minister said that we must bring national unity to Canada, particularly in this period of constitutional reform. However, I suggest we should be a little more careful about the results of this dialogue.

Many hon. members have said that this bill is an experiment; that Canada is launching itself upon a beautiful experiment. I think that was said by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and perhaps by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) as well. Indeed, it is always very interesting when scientists contrive to mix a formula and create a positive result. All of the ingredients in the test tube must be apportioned very carefully.

It seems to me we believe that just by placing the two national languages into the test tube we will reach our desired goal. This might be the case if all the other elements in our society were non-contributory. No experiment has ever been done so blindly, so do not be surprised, Mr. Speaker, if the desired result is not obtained. The whole purpose of a scientific experiment is to achieve a goal. In order to achieve that goal you weigh each ingredient very carefully, keeping each free from contamination by the others. Only then, perhaps, can you achieve a positive result. In the present situation it is practically impossible to keep all of the ingredients from being mixed together. Consequently, we may find that this particular experiment will not turn out very satisfactorily.

Many people have made derogatory remarks about western Canada's contribution in this regard. We have been called fossils, bigots, uneducated, and so on; I could go down the list. I wish that those who level these accusations would examine the reason that people in western Canada feel the way they do. Some 50 per cent of the people in the provinces of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta have an ethnic origin that is other than French or English. If anybody doubts those statistics may I refer them to the first volume of the B and B commission report. About 36.6 per cent of the people in the province of British Columbia have an ethnic origin other than French or English. It is, therefore, no wonder that people in some areas of British Columbia find themselves without an

equal opportunity to contribute to every phase of development within our great country.

I suggest that once again in that wonderful area west of the Great Lakes the people will find themselves having to fill out forms to determine what kind of Canadians they are. This practice will once again become evident. We will find people in that particular area being referred to as hyphenated Canadians. There is no doubt in my mind that the people in western Canada today are already what they regard as the best kind of Canadians—only one kind. Whether people are born Canadians or are naturalized Canadians, their citizenship is accepted and that is all there is to it. I suggest that this bill will put us back to that difficult period of the late twenties and middle thirties so far as this particular issue is concerned. To introduce this bill at the present time is, to me, a mistake.

With regard to the bilingual districts that are going to be set up across Canada, if we educated the people and gave them an incentive to become fully bilingual then the bilingual districts would not be necessary. Canada would become a fully bilingual country, and proud we would be of that fact. On this question I think Premier Bertrand of Quebec was exactly right when he said, as reported at page 223 of the conference report:

> In any event, in practice the entire province of Quebec will be a bilingual district. Conversely, however, bilingual districts in other provinces may quickly turn out to be what, in certain cases, has been referred to as "reserves" or ghettoes.

Since I am quoting the premier I might as well place another statement of his on *Hansard*. As reported at page 376, in referring to his position, Premier Bertrand said:

> —our representatives were opposed to the very idea of bilingual districts.

Premier Bertrand does not feel particularly enthused over bilingual districts in his province. He does not feel particularly enthused over bilingual districts in other parts of Canada, or about the contribution that people of his ethnic group will make to Canadian society in those areas.

This bill will cause disunity at the community level. It will cause unrest at the community level, and this unrest will grow. Having used the word "unrest" I am reminded of the unrest that exists throughout the world today, particularly in the country of our great neighbour to the south. I am also reminded of the unrest that is creeping into our society, our universities, among some of our farmers and the underprivileged in other areas.

[Mr. Horner.]

I am given cause to wonder at the manner in which this bill is being brought forward. I am wondering whether we really want the bill to be successful in view of the way we are carrying out this experiment. We are running headlong into the experiment without first making a sound financial contribution to the education and enlightenment of the people. If this approach were adopted the people would have a full understanding of what a great country this could become if we were all bilingual.

With regard to the agreement that was reached with Quebec at the conference in 1968, I should like to ask how English Canadian have been treated in that province during the last couple of years. We have all heard about the desire of some people in St. Leonard to have their children educated in English. We all heard about the grant to McGill university a couple of years ago and the difficulty that university experiences because it is regarded as an English university. We have all heard that the minister of culture in the province of Quebec has declared it is wrong for any person in Quebec to take English before reaching grade 9. In western Canada today we are attempting to do the same thing as far as French is concerned but we require a little more help in getting sufficient French teachers.

• (3:10 p.m.)

The educational authorities in Alberta are trying to begin the reaching of French in Grade 1 and would do so if only they could be helped with the cost of the program. Yet a directly opposite approach is being taken by the authorities of that great province which has contributed so much to Canada. I refer to the studies undertaken in Quebec to determine ways in which French can always be maintained as the major language there. That sort of action does not suggest that both languages will enjoy equal status, in that province as this bill suggest they should.

I think there has been much misunderstanding about the conclusions reached at the conference of 1968. Certainly, the western premiers made known in the conference of 1969 that they were opposed to the principle of this bill. There is no question in my mind that the creation of bilingual districts will create ghettos. Some have said to me, "Jack, don't worry about that; western Canada will never become fully bilingual." That is precisely the point, Mr. Speaker.

If the idea behind this legislation is to prevent western Canada from becoming fully

bilingual, then I say it is sinful. Western Canada must play its full part in the Canadian political spectrum. Of course, if the commissioner to be appointed under this bill tries to force our people to become bilingual, he may well put their backs up thus defeating the purposes of the bill. I suppose that is why many people have said to me, "Fear not; if they bring bilingual districts eventually to western Canada the people in them will live in French speaking reservations or ghettos." I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is bad to condemn people to live in ghettos or reservations. It was wrong to force our Indians to live on reservations, and our Indian people say that themselves. When they live on reservations they are precluded from participating fully in our society.

Considering all these things, I say without hesitation that unless Canada in some way can become a fully bilingual country this measure will fail completely in its purposes and divide instead of unifying the country. Those living in French speaking ghettos will not be helped by this legislation.

Much fear has been expressed in certain quarters that civil servants will be affected by this measure. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), in several soothing, reassuring statements, has said that it will not affect civil servants. What poppycock is this, Mr. Speaker? Of course they will be affected. Bilingual civil servants now receive a premium of 7½ per cent of other salary. The Minister of Justice said, "But you need not be individually bilingual; we are thinking of institutional bilingualism." I ask, if a bilingual public service is not the ultimate aim of the government, why is it paying a premium of 7½ per cent of their salary to bilingual civil servants? We all know that the government prefers to have fully bilingual heads of departments. I think corporations in the Ottawa area also prefer bilingual personnel.

The Minister of Justice may say that the government is concerned about institutional bilingualism, but the fact remains that bilingual civil servants are paid 7½ per cent extra. I am told that the bilingual preference payment is to be increased. Clearly, there is no question about the direction in which the government is heading. Under this bill senior civil servants will have to become bilingual. It is as simple as that. A reading of clauses 9, 10 and 11 will support my contention. I think clause 36 spells out certain relevant details connected with the point I am discussing. In other words, if you want promotion in the federal civil service, in the armed service or in the R.C.M.P., or in any agency affiliated with these bodies, you will need to be bilingual. Clause 10(1) reads in part:

> Every department and agency of the Government of Canada and every Crown Corporation established by or pursuant to an Act of the Parliament of Canada—

That wording embraces the Canadian Wheat Board. If the Canadian Wheat Board comes within the terms of this bill you must, of necessity, include every grain elevator in western Canada because the grain elevators work in conjunction with the Wheat Board. Let's not kid ourselves; let us not try to pull the wool over anybody's eyes. Let us not play politics with this issue but let us be frank so that we may all understand what this legislation is intended to do. Surely, if a bilingual country was desired we should have made certain the other language was adequately taught across Canada. As a western Canadian and as a member here speaking for western Canada, I say that our people are complaining loudly because they are not being given a full or fair chance to participate in the decision making and policy making in this country. They complain that they do not have an adequate chance to participate in this country's administration and that the government is not aware, as it should be, of the problems of western Canada.

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) has enunciated our oil problems. I am reasonably familiar with our grain problems and have had difficulty in convincing the government that they are as serious as they are. The people of western Canada complain that the federal government pays inadequate attention to a whole gamut of problems. They ask, how will it help us if top civil servants must be bilingual? They fear that few from western Canada will be promoted to the top ranks of any agency or department of government since few of them speak French. Many of our people have not had the opportunity to learn the other language. Only about 3 per cent of the population of Alberta is French speaking, the figure being lower for British Columbia. Less than 7 per cent of the people of Manitoba speak French, and only a nominal number in Saskatchewan speak the language. Many of our people, as I say, just have not had the chance to fully become Canadians speaking both languages, as this bill suggests they must. Can you blame our people for looking askance at the Minister of Justice even when he reassures us that civil

servants will be selected and promoted according to merit?

An amendment to this bill suggests that civil servants will be selected and promoted according to merit, as that term is spelled out by the Public Service Employment Act. But the Public Service Employment Act says that bilingual employees will be given preference. It is that simple. Where is the merit, then? The ability to speak both languages will weigh heavily in decisions affecting merit. The reassurance the amendment seeks to give to some is a false reassurance. We cannot, therefore, in all conscience support this bill. Why should we? We all know of the statements made by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier). He is to report to parliament on the actions of the commissioner to be appointed who, under the proposed amendments, will be a very powerful individual. He will be able to direct, manipulate and send money out to various regions. The Minister of Justice suggested bilingual districts would receive additional financing to promote and maintain themselves. People living outside of bilingual districts may not receive the same contribution from the federal government to learn a language they have not previously been able to learn. I believe this is completely wrong. When talking to members of parliament from all parties they say, I must support the bill because if I do not then Canada will separate. This bill is poorly understood and I do not think it will have any success in holding Canada together.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I have listened to and read most of the speeches regarding this bill. No one has been able to convince me there is enough strength and meaning in the bill to keep Canada united. Canadians are being asked to place a false hope in this bill. These hopes will be dashed by the waves. The Minister of Justice could logically be accused of attempting to play politics with this bill. A headline in the Windsor *Star* states: "Turner urges no court test. Challenge to bill 'tragic'." There is a picture of the minister speaking before microphones along with this article. The minister said, if we lose there will be separation; if we don't we will remain united.

A headline in the Toronto *Telegram* reads, "Turner to provinces: 'Don't kill Bi-Bi.'" I presume this statement is directed to the four western premiers, and more particularly to those who have suggested they are going to challenge the constitutionality of this measure. Let us quit playing politics. Let us continue the dialogue, be frank, above board and open with one another. All Canadians should understand and know the full implications of this bill. In one newspaper article the following appears:

> The Prime Minister drew heavy applause from the 3,000 guests in the university arena when he said his government is firmly resolved to contribute to the resurgence of the French speaking minority across Canada.

Statements such as that will not promote unity. If the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is resolved to make us all bilingual he should give us all an equal opportunity to become bilingual, but he is not prepared to do that. The Prime Minister is prepared to create disunity because he wants to reassert himself.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

**Mr. Hubert Badanai (Fort William):** Mr. Speaker, on October 17, 1968, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) introduced Bill C-120, which is the subject of the present debate. The provisions embodied in the bill are a declaration that English and French are the official languages of Canada for all purposes of the parliament and government of Canada, and that all federal notices shall be in both official languages. In addition, the bill seeks to ensure that all departments of the federal government shall offer their services to the public in French and English. One of the important features of the legislation is to ensure that persons appearing or giving evidence before federal judicial bodies may be heard in the official languages of English or French.

In my constituency there are comparatively few French speaking persons. Fort William, in its early days, had several hundred French speaking families of French Canadian origin. However, with the step-up of immigration and the influx from the British Isles and Continental Europe, Fort William became more cosmopolitan in character. The roots of its culture were in many lands. But for all practical purposes, English was the only language in use. Those of French speaking origin became absorbed into the fabric with the rest of the population.

It was fitting and proper that the principal recommendations of the B. and B. royal commission should be contained in the bill because, happily, they are endorsed by the leader of the official opposition, although

there has been open resistance to them by some members of his party.

In a recent issue of the Montreal *Gazette* the editor pointed out that many English speaking Canadians have criticized French Canadians for being withdrawn, living a life unto themselves, behind the barrier of an antiquated provincial autonomy. But if in the future the French Canadian is to be not merely a Quebecker but truly a citizen of all Canada, he will naturally wish to be as much at home anywhere in Canada as he is in Quebec now.

At a Transport Committee meeting held in 1962 one of the then members of the Social Credit group from Quebec asked the then President of the Canadian National Railways, how many held the office of vice-president in the C.N.R. The answer was 16. The president was asked how many of the 16 who hold that office were French Canadians. He reluctantly admitted there were none. No French Canadian, said the president, had been appointed because none had been found with the required qualifications. This exchange, which occurred in the railway committee room sparked a reaction which, I believe, gave birth to the separatist movement which has since made inroads in a province that gave Canada a Laurier, a St. Laurent and our present Prime Minister. It is easy to see that the purpose of this bill is to rectify a long standing grievance among French speaking Canadians.

Ever since my election to the House of Commons 11 years ago I have been a constant advocate of French and English bilingualism, as I consider it to be the very cement which binds the founding races into a united Canada. The languages bill, once translated into legislation, will be not only a unifying force but it will be a potent device, if I may call it so, which will ensure the preservation of our district Canadian identity. I am convinced that its implementation will strengthen the fabric of our nation by easing the effort of understanding each other.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Some members of the opposition have said that the government should have given priority to other business, but what other business could be more important than good will, understanding, and unity within the nation? Others have entertained fears that the passage of this bill would mean that senior positions in the public service would automatically go to French speaking applicants at the expense of English speaking civil servants. The hon. member who preceded me in the debate expressed his doubt about the wisdom of this legislation which in his view would divide rather than unite. He could not be further from the truth. These unfounded fears cannot be but the product of prejudice or partisanship. I hope neither of these passions will prevail to spoil the general goodwill which, in my constituency at least, seems to be in obvious evidence since French is now being taught in all elementary public and separate schools in grades 7 and 8. Beginning with the school year in September 1969, this practice will be extended to grades 4 and 5. This augurs well for the practical implementation of the spirit of the languages bill in the very young.

The status given to French instructors in public and separate schools by the Ontario government is, in my view, the real hope for bilingualism. If this policy were adopted by the other English speaking provinces, it would go a long way toward ensuring that English speaking pupils would become bilingual. As everyone knows, the bill itself reflects the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism that English and French be used in government services relating to the public. In other words, a citizen, when dealing with agencies of the federal government, may use either English or French.

The province of Ontario has already indicated that in areas where at least 10 per cent of the population is composed of people who speak an official language other than the one used by the majority, which in Ontario would be English, all services will be made available in both official languages. In districts such as Thunder Bay and other similar districts dual language services will not be enforced and, therefore, civil servants will not be required to speak both languages. In short, no one will be forced to speak either English or French. On the other hand, the fact is that Canada began as a nation with two basic language groups.

Now, approximately 14,500 thousand people speak the English language, 6½ million people speak the French language and about 3 million Canadians of other origins speak a third language in addition to French or English. Of course, these various cultures and languages have enriched our nation beyond compare.

At this point I wish to congratulate the Prime Minister for not delaying the introduction of this bill because it relates to a

fundamental question which should be decided as quickly as possible. I should also like to commend the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) for his excellent presentation of the bill. A great deal of credit should go also, to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) for his fearless and unequivocal determination to stand behind the principles of the bill and for demolishing any misunderstanding existing in the English speaking provinces that the bill is designed to force the average citizen to speak French.

This bill was never designed to achieve compulsory bilingualism but rather to provide equality of opportunity to use either language in communicating with the federal government. In an article in the Montreal *Gazette* of May 3, 1969 the Minister of Justice is reported to have said this:

> Our policy as set forth by former Prime Minister Pearson in 1964 is that no one should be penalized for not having acquired the second language if he has not been afforded an opportunity to learn it. The key to this policy is that an opportunity will be given to people seeking advancement to acquire a working knowledge of the other language.
>
> It is not necessary that a candidate be already bilingual to obtain a position within the public service in an administrative trainee capacity, which is the general category for university graduates. However, this policy makes it mandatory that any candidate indicate his willingness to learn the other language at public expense. Such a policy takes into account the fact that in certain parts of this country, the opportunities to learn the other language are very limited.
>
> On the other hand, one could raise the point as to whether such a policy will deter English speaking Canadians from joining the public service.
>
> As an answer to that question, I would like to quote the following figures. Since 1965-66, which is the year when this policy was made public and implemented within the public service, the number of English speaking applicants for administrative trainee positions has gone from 1,925 to 3,515 in 1967-68. Furthermore, the number of anglophone applicants for foreign service positions has gone from 697 in 1965-66 to 1,861 in 1967-68, for an increase of approximately 160 per cent over the 1965-66 figure.
>
> This latter example becomes even more significant if one considers the fact that of all the federal departments, External Affairs is perhaps the one where the bilingualism policy has been pursued the most actively.
>
> The public service has been a factor of national unity in the past, perhaps the greatest, because of the national character of its composition. The figures quoted show that so far our policy on bilingualism has not deterred English speaking university graduates, to say the least!
>
> The languages bill, then, is at the core of our guarantee of the equal rights and privileges of our two founding communities.

[Mr. Badanai.]

That sums up the purpose of this bill which, as pointed out by the Secretary of State in his presentation, is to give equality, by legislation, to the two official languages of our country, in so far as the matter comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government. There is a definition given by the Secretary of State which I should like to quote:

> Indeed this bill is a gesture of faith in the future of Canada, a hope and a pledge for most Canadians, who wish to fix their sights and determine their common objectives well beyond the differences that are threatening to divide us today.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I think this quotation should be inscribed in every school in Canada so that the school population may draw inspiration from it. I have heard people ask; why do we need a languages bill? We have been able to do rather well without one for 100 years; why bring this up now? The same was said in respect of the flag bill during the debate in 1964. Individuals said the old flag had served us well. Dire predictions were made that the new flag would divide the country. Happily the results were the very opposite, and I am confident that this bill will do equally as much for unity and the development of a national consciousness.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments at this second reading stage of the official languages bill introduced by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) together with the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier).

Mr. Speaker, obviously we cannot be against this bill for the simple reason that pondering over every clause, one by one, as well as over the various amendments proposed by the government, we realize it is what one could call a positive bill in the sense that it acknowledges a factual situation and aims at removing some injustices and preventing others that, unfortunately, have occurred in the past. This bill aims at strengthening the ties of national unity.

In fact, we could summarize the bill under four main headings. First: acknowledgement of French and English as the two official languages of Canada, which is really nothing new and which was already acknowledged in 1848, then in 1867 and embodied in statutes; unfortunately, this was never recognized or respected.

Secondly, as far as judicial bodies, Crown Corporations, parliament and the government

are concerned, the bill is aimed at recognizing both official languages in all cases where the general public has a right to use them or where services are obtainable.

Thirdly, the bill aims at establishing certain bilingual districts, under given conditions.

Finally the bill would aim at establishing a so-called linguistic ombudsman post in order to preserve the rights of the people and to see to the enforcement of the act on official languages.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, the bill on official languages is essentially and solely the official recognition of the two languages and their use in certain areas in Canada.

The bill is but a first step towards a bicultural and bilingual country, pursuant to the agreement reached during the recent federal-provincial conferences on the Canadian constitution.

As a matter of fact, at the conference held in February 1968, the right honourable L. B. Pearson, the former Prime Minister, said—and in that, he was supported by the various provincial premiers—that an agreement had been reached in principle. That agreement provided for what the leader of the Ralliement créditiste (Mr. Caouette) had already been repeating over and over since 1962—it took six years to get it across—and I quote:

> Recognition by the conference, as proposed by the Royal Commission, on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, that French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec should have the same rights as English-speaking Canadians in Quebec, in all fairness.

Such is the essential principle upon which the philosophy of the present bill is based. And that principle cannot be said to be false. On the contrary, we must commend the government for taking a positive step, out of that principle, with the agreement of the provinces in order to protect the rights and the interests of minorities, while protecting those of the majority.

This is a fundamental question. After all, it is nothing new. However, this is not where the problem lies. Those who want a bilingual and bicultural Canada and who want to keep Quebec within confederation are willing to acknowledge as a fact that there are two main cultures in Canada, although there are others, of course, that two languages are used by two majority groups and that consequently, we must fulfil certain obligations, recognize certain rights and a certain language equality and finally establish some areas where both official languages will be used. So, this factual situation has always existed but was not always acknowledged, and this bill is intended specifically to acknowledge that situation.

The official languages bill may give rise to at least three basically different attitudes.

First, there are English-speaking Canadians, for whom Canada is an English-speaking country, and French Canadians, colonized water carriers.

English-speaking Canadians will not acknowledge as a fact the use and respect of the other official language, no matter what is said or done in parliament. Such an attitude, in my view, contributes to divide our country, and this is truly unfortunate in 1969.

There is another attitude, just as backward to say the least, and it is that of French Canadians who consider Quebec as their country and for whom all our ills must be ascribed to—pardon me the expression—those damned English. In my opinion, such an attitude is just as backward and negative. It can only contribute to divide Canada, build a sham China wall and aggravate economic and monetary problems in Quebec.

There is a third attitude, which I endorse, and it may be defined as follows: To every Canadian, be he French-speaking or English-speaking, Canada is a country which must be built on concepts of respect, equality and comprehension, equal sharing, cultural respect, economic respect and responsibility.

This language bill is not an innovation, but rather a protection. It represents an official recognition of both languages and their use in certain parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we have known many injustices in the past. For example, in 1864, French was abolished in the schools of Nova Scotia.

In 1871, French was abolished in the schools of New Brunswick.

In 1890, the French language was abolished as official language in Manitoba.

In 1892, French was abolished as the language of the administration in North-West Keewatin.

In 1915, for all practical purposes, the French language was abolished in the schools of the province of Ontario. And so on.

And yet, we were beyond doubt a people—Canada—with two great languages and two great cultures.

The honourable Maurice Sauvé, then Minister of Forestry and Rural Development, speaking before the Richelieu club on October 19, 1967, about a dynamic nationalism, which

I support, and which I found quite interesting at that time, said:

—the fundamental problem facing Canada cannot be solved solely through constitutional reform since it is actually a problem dealing with the relations between English and French Canada.

He said also:

But what seems more fundamental to me is to determine whether English Canada will finally agree to share with us the power it has in the fields of business, finance, industry, politics, in the public service, and in social and cultural life.

Then he was more explicit:

As French Canadians, what matters most is to know whether English Canadians will agree to yield to us part of the ground they occupy almost exclusively in every area of Canadian life.

Mr. Speaker, such nationalism incites us to collective and individual fulfilment. We have definitely passed the survival period. We want to explode on the world, to take part fully in our society. And this desire for participation is irreversible. We want to live a positive, open nationalism, sensitive to the influence of the outside world, determined to achieve freedom and security for every Canadian. We want an economic nationalism which will give back Canada to Canadians. That is what concerns us in practice.

• (3:50 p.m.)

But to achieve this, Mr. Speaker, one must feel at home in Canada. A great many Canadians no longer feel at home in Canada. This is a regrettable thing to discover, but true to fact. For instance, French Canadians do not feel at home in Ottawa, the Federal capital. It is sad to have to say so today, when discussing this bill on languages. Especially in the public service—French Canadians are not at home and have never been. I shall prove it beyond all doubt, if I have time.

Bilingualism is the price to pay to have a Canada at peace with itself. If Canadians are not ready to pay that price, at all levels of administration and management, if they are not ready to respect one another, to have equal rights and duties, that is because, fundamentally, they really do not want to have a Canada.

There is no alternative. The bill on languages meets with the wishes and needs of all Canadians and reflects the image of the Canada we want to have. This bill is a first step, but we must not delude ourselves.

What is really happening? What do we find, Mr. Speaker? French Canadians who leave Quebec to settle and work in another province automatically lose the rights and privileges they enjoyed in their native province. The same thing does not occur when English Canadians come to live in Quebec. In Quebec minorities are respected.

The other provinces should respect minorities just as fairly, otherwise national unity is all rot, and this bill nothing but a political day dream and a great exercise for intellectuals.

Therefore, let us shake hands instead of tightening our belts. Let us understand one another and live a real dialogue, not one of the deaf, as has been the case since the beginning of Confederation.

In principle, if not in fact, French Canadians could not be heard in French in civil courts and even in criminal courts, although these come under the federal jurisdiction and should have been bilingual long ago.

The official languages bill is intended to correct the two unfortunate situations I have just described, and so much the better, Mr. Speaker.

It took a long time for the federal government to understand the problem and then to act. Meantime, many injustices and many disappointments occurred, but today the official languages bill deals with those absolutely unbearable situations and injustices and tries to remedy them. That is an excellent thing. However, let us hope now that it does not come too late.

In his own country, the French-speaking Canadian who leaves Quebec for another province is like an exile, an outcast, though he has no immigration or customs formalities with which to comply. In practice, he feels like a stranger everywhere in Canada. There again the languages bill solves part of the problem.

But we realize all the importance—and the question boils down to that—of the unlimited and deeply human understanding that will be needed to apply such a bill, otherwise it will fail completely and there will be nothing left to hope for.

But let us talk about bilingualism instead. It is more complex than the brief definition given in the dictionary, that is the coexistence of two languages in an individual or in a country.

It is obvious that the languages bill is not a bill on bilingualism, but solely a legislation aimed at having both languages recognized.

We must immediately lay the foundations of a bilingual country and that is why we must know where this policy will lead us.

It is obvious that the phenomenon of bilingualism is not necessarily of the same nature or import whether individuals or nations are involved.

One can be bilingual by personal choice, due to intellectual, material advantages, etc. but it definitely remains that bilingualism is a wealth for a country while unilingualism in Canada is an idea which can no longer be considered from the English as well as from the French point of view.

The unilingualism of a far too great number of Canadians and officials has given rise to anomalies and injustices even in Quebec. It has given rise to two great solitudes. Without doubt, one of those solitudes, the French one, was able, in this manner to ensure its survival, and even its self-achievement as an ethnic group.

But as nothing urges the other solitude, the English one, if not its own interest, to speak French, most English Canadians usually learn French only to the extent that it helps them to communicate with inferiors. For instance, it is the unfortunate situation that prevails in the public service.

Mr. Speaker, the only persons that are bilingual in the public service, are clerks and ordinary employees whose mother tongue is French. Those who speak English or other foreign languages have high managerial or administrative positions and are not bilingual. They do not deal with the public.

That is the main problem, the weakness of the official languages bill, Mr. Speaker: it will oblige all public servants and employees who deal with the public to be bilingual. Nothing indicates that something will change. The bill will not affect the administrative and the managerial levels of departments and Crown agencies, in order to give French Canadiens the positions they are entitled to. That is a grave danger of which the official languages bill does not make any mention at all.

At the administrative and managerial levels of the public service, the working language is English and French-Canadian employees can only reach such levels if they are bilingual.

Unilingual English-speaking employees, for their part, may easily, and often through favouritism, obtain managerial and administrative positions where salaries exceed $17,000 annually. They are therefore among the better-paid and their chances for quick promotion are very good.

This is the truth. And this is what I learned from the numerous questions I have put on the order paper—close to 80—since the beginning of this session; and the replies can only be official since they were supplied by the government itself.

Two vast solitudes, two great official languages which are ignored by the high officials of the civil service!

There is one danger. We are to set up bilingual districts, where people—

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** 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, private bills.

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with private members' hour, I understand there has been an arrangement that we would proceed with one bill, namely, order No. 10, page 34 of the order paper, and then we would proceed with some of the questions set down for the adjournment debate. I am not clear as to which questions are ready to be proceeded with, but there is at least one. I wonder whether, in view of this arrangement, we require to use this hour for the consideration of private members' business. I ask whether we could continue the debate on the bill now before the house, either before or after dealing with private members' business. I wonder whether there is any disposition to do this, with a view to trying to finish the official languages bill today.

**Mr. Horner:** No.

**Mr. Aiken:** Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there has been no consultation whatever with regard to this matter. First, I do not know how many questions are to be dealt with in the adjournment debate, and second I do not know how long it will take to dispose of the private members' bill with which we are dealing. Therefore, I do not think we can agree to the suggestion put forward by the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith).

• (4:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment, not on the matter of continuing debate on the languages bill, because I believe there is objection to that to my right, but just to comment on what the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) said about the arrangements that have been agreed upon. I think it will be found that

there is general agreement for us to call the private bill which is No. 10 on the order paper, Bill S-31 in the name of the hon. member for Okanagan-Kootenay (Mr. Stewart), and to give it second reading without debate so that it can be referred to the appropriate committee. Then, the arrangement was that we could take any of the questions to be raised on the adjournment debate if both the member and the minister concerned were here. So far I know of only one question in relation to which both the member and the minister are here, namely the one of hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). He is ready with his question and the Solicitor General is ready with his answer. There may be others by the time that one is over, but this is what has been agreed upon thus far.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am not sure whether the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) took the position that there was no agreement to that. Does he disagree with the latter proposition as put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)?

**Mr. Aiken:** There was consultation in connection with proceeding with a certain private members bill and then proceeding on to the late show to dispose of a number of adjournment questions. That was agreed upon.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** If that is agreed, I might also inquire whether there is unanimous agreement that orders Nos. 1-9 on private bills be stood so that we can proceed with order No. 10. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** And I understand there is also agreement to the order of business outlined by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

## PRIVATE BILLS

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY

**Mr. Douglas Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)** moved that Bill S-31, respecting Canadian Pacific Railway Company, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. In accordance with Standing Order 40 and in pursuance of a special order made earlier this day, a motion is deemed to have been made that this house do now adjourn.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

PENITENTIARIES—TECHNIQUES IN DEALING WITH PRISONERS

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, on May 9 I addressed a question to the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) asking him whether his department was giving consideration to implementing in some of our correctional institutions new techniques in dealing with prisoners, which have been developed and which are being implemented by a group located in the department of psychiatry at McGill. It is an interesting but sad fact that the program is being implemented not in a Canadian correctional institution but in the Clinton institution in New York State.

The problem of how to deal with people who break the law, who are convicted and sentenced to correctional institutions, is one which has concerned the people of Canada for a long time now. There have been a number of royal commissions, parliamentary committees and special committees which have looked at the question. There has been the Archambault commission and the Fauteux royal commission which is now dealing with the problem of corrections. Parliamentary committees have looked at the problem of Canadian corrective institutions and their inmates and have agreed that our correctional institutions have been dealing with the problem too much in terms of incarceration and punishment, in terms of keeping people who have been convicted locked up with little or no programs of work or rehabilitation. There has been unanimous agreement that if we are to change the trend, if we are to rehabilitate prisoners instead of simply punishing them, we have to find new methods of rehabilitation. Among these new methods is one calling for the increased use of psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, teachers and a whole team of ancillary staff.

When the public have asked why these modern methods are not used more we have been told that it is extremely difficult to put

this kind of program into effect because Canada is very short of the skilled and trained personnel which is required. One merely needs to look at the reports of the Solicitor General on correctional institutions to see that there are only a very few psychiatrists, psychologists and social service people on the staff. I know I am not far wrong when I say that there are only one or two full time psychiatrists and very few part time psychiatrists working for the department. So, I was shocked and chagrined to find that a team from McGill University has been working since 1966 at the Dannemora clinic at the Clinton Institution in New York State some 80 or 90 miles from Montreal. Who are these people? They are people who have been working at the department of forensic psychiatry at McGill. I am certain they would be able and happy to work in Canadian institutions, such as St. Vincent de Paul and other institutions around Montreal, if they were given the opportunity and the physical facilities as well as the feeling that they were wanted and needed.

I have with me some of the material which was prepared by the New York authorities indicating how happy they are to have an opportunity to use a trained and skilled team which we, ourselves, ought to be using. Let me just quote very briefly from some of the statements which they made about the program:

> On June 21, 1966 Governor Rockefeller signed into law a bill permitting the Department of Correction to establish a psychiatric and diagnostic clinic at Dannemora as part of Clinton State Prison—
>
> —the purpose of the clinic is to provide "intensive physical, mental and sociological diagnostic and treatment services", including "pre-parole diagnostic evaluation—and scientific study of the social and mental aspects of the causes of crime". —the clinic can become a laboratory for new treatment methods that might be used in all correctional institutions. It can also provide new and better methods of training personnel and thus become a centre for advanced training or a model for training in other institutions.

They go on to say:

> An important feature of the new clinic is that it is to be run in co-operation with McGill University, located in nearby Montreal. McGill will prepare the plan for an "ideal" treatment centre, participate with the State and with other universities in furnishing the treatment, design the research project, and have general responsibility for the research. McGill's participation is to be under the direction of Bruno M. Cormier, M.D., director of the McGill Clinic of Forensic Psychiatry.

This is great for New York State, but in the light of our shortage of skilled and trained personnel why is this scheme not working in our institutions in Canada?

They go on to say:

> The initial McGill group will consist of one psychiatrist, three psychologists, two social workers and one group worker. (These services will, of course, be on a part time basis).

Why were these people not encouraged to work in our institutions which are so woefully lacking in staff?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please.

• (4:10 p.m.)

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):** Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for raising this important question but I must confess that I find he is considerably misinformed. The gentleman at McGill University to whom he refers is a part time employee of the Canadian penitentiary service. He put forward this experimental scheme which is being tried at Clinton in New York State. This is, of course, an interesting and, I believe, very important experimental program. But I should add that we have a similar program running in Canada, though the hon. member chose not to speak about it. It is being carried out at the Springhill institution. It is true it is being done on a somewhat different basis because there are two views as to how the program of therapeutic communities should be administered—whether they should come exclusively under the control of the psychiatrists or whether control should involve the other forensic sciences on an equal footing. Subject to this change, we are doing the kind of work of which the hon. member has spoken in the Springhill institution.

The gentleman the hon. member speaks about has written to the department and has requested that one of these programs should be started in one of the institutions in Quebec province. This matter is receiving attention but no decision has been taken as to whether another will be started within the penitentiary service. If an affirmative decision is reached, I am not prepared to say it would be established in one of the Montreal institutions. We might start a scheme in one of the other institutions across the country because the penitentiary service is a nationwide service, and it is not necessarily valid to say that an experimental program such as this must be carried out in a particular province to suit the consultant who wishes to administer it. These things have to be evaluated carefully.

But the point I wish to make is this: We already have this type of experiment under way at Springhill; we are following the one at Clinton very closely, and we are also considering starting another.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The motion to adjourn the house is now deemed to have been adopted—

**Mr. McIlraith:** Before you put the question, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether hon. members would object to continuing the public business.

**Mr. Bell:** We cannot go back on that, now.

**Mr. McIlraith:** Why?

**Mr. Aiken:** We had some speakers here who expected to take part in this debate but they went for a walk. I do not know how we could go back having had the adjournment debate.

At 4.16 p.m. the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Monday, May 26, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion)** moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-202, to provide incentives for the development of productive employment opportunities in regions of Canada determined to require special measures to facilitate economic expansion and social adjustment.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

### FOREIGN INSURANCE COMPANIES ACT

AMENDMENT TO AMPLIFY DEFINITION OF "ACTUARY"

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (for the Minister of Finance)** moved the first reading of Bill No. S-36 (from the Senate), to amend the Foreign Insurance Companies Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

### AGRICULTURE

REFERRAL OF REPORTS OF CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD TO STANDING COMMITTEE

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder whether I could have the permission of the house to revert to motions for the purpose of referring the reports of the Canadian Wheat Board to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** The supplementary report of the Canadian Wheat Board for 1967-68 was tabled earlier this day. If the house is agreeable, by way of unanimous consent I would like to move that the annual and supplementary reports of the Canadian Wheat Board for the years 1965-66, 1966-67 and 1967-68 be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Motion agreed to.

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES RESIDENT POPULATION

Question No. 1,591—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. (a) What is the total resident population of the Northwest Territories (b) how many of these hold Indian or Eskimo status?

2. (a) How many people resident in the Northwest Territories are qualified to vote in federal or territorial elections? (b) how many of these hold Indian or Eskimo status?

3. How many eligible voters not holding Indian or Eskimo status and resident in the Northwest Territories are employed by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development or the territorial government?

4. How many eligible voters not holding Indian or Eskimo status and resident in the Northwest Territories are employed by other federal departments or Crown agencies?

5. What, over the last ten years, has been the average period of residence in the Northwest Territories for full-time employees of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development or territorial government not holding Indian and/or Eskimo status?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Chief Electoral Officer as follows: 1. (a) The population of the Northwest Territories, according to figures supplied by the Commissioner in 1967 on the basis of a projection of the 1961 Census, was as follows: Indian, 5,763; Eskimos, 10,278; Others, 14,202; Total, 30,243. (b) Information not available.

2. (a) Records of the Chief Electoral Officer indicate that 13,807 names appeared on the list of electors at the election of June 1968; (b) Information not available.

3. Information not available.

*Questions*

4. Information not available.

5. Records in the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development are not kept in a manner which would provide the information requested.

GRAIN DRYING ASSISTANCE

Question No. 1,631—**Mr. Stanfield:**

1. Has the government given consideration to representations from farm organizations requesting assistance of 10 cents a bushel in grain drying for Western farmers?

2. Will the government amend the legislation to allow assistance up to $600 regardless of the size of the farm, removing the present 1,000 acre requirement for the maximum advance?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce as follows: 1. Yes.

2. The Government has no plans to amend the Act to permit advances up to $600 regardless of the size of the farm.

CANADA-FRANCE AGREEMENT EXPENDITURES

Question No. 1,801—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. What is the total expenditure by Canada to date under the Canada-France agreement?

2. What is the total expenditure by France in Canada to date under the Canada-France agreement?

3. What is the nature of cultural assistance offered by France to Canada under the agreements?

4. Does such cultural assistance include subsidies or contributions by the Government of France to magazines, periodicals, publishing houses or other media operations in Canada and, if so, to what magazines, periodicals, publishing houses, etc., and in what amounts in each case?

5. What organizations in Canada are receiving financial assistance from the Government of France under the Canada-France agreements and in what amounts and for what purposes?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** In so far as the Department of External Affairs is concerned: 1. The department's financial contribution under the 1965 cultural agreement with France amounted to approximately $600,000 per year in the first two years of operation, i.e. 1965-66 and 1966-67. It increased to $850,000 in the fiscal year 1967-68 and it has reached about one million dollars in the fiscal year 1968-69 for a total of about $3,050,000 to date.

[Mr. Forest.]

2. The exact figures and statistics which represent France's contribution to the agreement could only be given by the French authorities themselves.

3. French cultural exchanges with Canada under the 1965 agreement include scholarships, exchanges of professors, artists, scientists and technical experts, book donations and cultural events such as tours by theatrical or musical companies, film showings and other activities of that nature.

4. No.

5. None. Several French institutions (schools and cultural institutes) are however active in Canada, with the financial help of the French Government. These institutions were in existence before the signature of the cultural agreement which does not mention these subventions.

RADIO SERVICE—NORTHERN CANADA

Question No. 1,855—**Mr. Reid:**

1. Has the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development been conducting negotiations or having consultations with the C.B.C. concerning the development of a policy providing AM or FM transmitters for the Northwest Territories and/or the northern parts of the provinces?

2. Who initiated these discussions or negotiations, when did they begin, how many meetings have been held, and when did they conclude?

3. Has the C.B.C. and/or the Department come to any conclusions, either jointly or separately, concerning the provision of this service?

4. At what stage are these negotiations or discussions?

5. When will a policy on this be announced by the government or the President of the C.B.C.?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: 1. Yes. These discussions relate to the possibility of providing isolated communities in the North, particularly the Eastern Arctic, with low-power locally operated FM broadcasting stations.

2. The discussions were initiated on July 18, 1966, in a letter from the Director of C.B.C. Northern Service to the then Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs. Following a meeting of representatives of Indian Affairs and Northern Development with the C.B.C., on November 22, 1966, a working subcommittee was established to prepare a report on the technical aspects of the problem of providing community-operated low-power FM stations to remote and isolated settlements in

the North. A representative of the Department of Transport was included in this subcommittee which held a number of meetings and completed its report early in 1967.

3, 4 and 5. No final conclusions have been reached as to the responsibility for constructing, operating and financing the proposed stations. Discussions are continuing, but it is not possible to forecast when a policy decision is likely to be made.

*AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM

Question No. 1,969—**Mr. Brewin:**

1. Is the Canadian Commercial Corporation involved in any contracts related to the proposed Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) and, if so, on behalf of whom?

2. Is the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce actively seeking contracts for the AWACS?

3. Is any government department or agency actively involved in the development of AWACS?

4. Have any Canadian companies been hired in the development stages of AWACS?

5. Is the government committed in any way to AWACS and, if so, what is the anticipated expenditure?

**Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Department of Supply and Services, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and the Department of National Defence as follows: 1. The corporation has no contractual involvement which is identifiable with the AWACS.

2. The Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) qualifies under the Canada-United States production sharing program and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is assisting Canadian companies in their efforts to participate with U.S. companies in this program.

3. No.

4. No.

5. No.

CBCT PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Question No. 1,975—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. When is it planned that CBCT will provide adequate television coverage to all Prince Edward Island viewers?

2. When is it contemplated that CBCT will be able to originate programming via microwave connection with the C.B.C. network?

3. What explanation is given for the discontinuance of daily editorials of the Prince Edward Island legislature by CBCT as compared to its predecessor, CFCY?

4. What plans are there for providing C.B.C. radio programming and coverage to the residents of Prince Edward Island?

5. When is it contemplated that the CTV network services will be available to the residents of Prince Edward Island?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: 1. The Corporation is now studying cost estimates of a new transmitter and antenna for CBCT which would cover the entire Island. If funds are available the best present estimate is that such service could begin in 1970-71.

2. At present, the Corporation has tentative plans for the development of modest studio facilities in Charlottetown within the next five year period. The exact time for the start of this development has not yet been established and will depend to a large extent on the availability of funds.

3. To the best of the C.B.C.'s knowledge there were no daily editorials on the P.E.I. legislature over CFCY-TV. At one time the station did telecast a wrap-up of news about the sessions each day when the legislature was sitting. This wrap-up was done by a freelance journalist but the program was discontinued long before the C.B.C. took over the station.

4. At present, Prince Edward Island is served by the Corporation's station CBA Moncton and an affiliated station, CFCY Charlottetown. Investigation is presently underway concerning the possibility of providing a stronger signal whereby the Charlottetown area could adequately hear the full C.B.C. national network service.

I am informed by the Canadian Radio-Television Commission as follows:

5. The Canadian Radio-Television Commission has been working very actively on this matter, but has not yet set a date for providing CTV network services in Prince Edward Island. An announcement will be made on this matter in the near future.

CRUDE OIL MOVEMENT COSTS

Question No. 2,032—**Mr. Harding:**

Has the government undertaken any study to update estimates made by the Borden Commission of costs of moving western crude oil to Montreal under (a) public ownership of pipelines (b) private ownership of pipelines and, if so, when was the study made and what were the results of it?

*Questions*

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio):** The National Energy Board reports as follows: While no detailed studies have been undertaken, the National Energy Board has reviewed the matter from time to time. These reviews indicated that the competitive position of Canadian crude oil in the Montreal market has not improved since the time of the Borden Commission.

---

POSTAL RATE ON PUBLIC HEALTH PUBLICATIONS

Question No. 2,077—**Mr. Chappell:**

What publications have been accepted to date, at second class rate, pursuant to the words "devoted primarily to the promotion of public health" contained in Section 11(1)(c)?

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

| Title of Publication | Publisher |
|---|---|
| The Caliper | Canadian Paraplegic Association |
| Paragraphic | Canadian Paraplegic Association—B.C. Division |
| Para-Elite | Canadian Paraplegic Association—N.B. Division |
| The Volunteer | Canadian Red Cross Society—Alberta and N.W.T. |
| Les Actualités de la Croix Rouge | Canadian Red Cross Society—Quebec Division |
| Red Cross News | Canadian Red Cross Society—Nova Scotia Div. |
| Canadian Red Cross News Bulletin | Canadian Red Cross Society—Ontario Div. |
| The Despatch | Canadian Red Cross Society |
| Contact | Canadian Red Cross Society |
| Splash | Canadian Red Cross Society—Ontario Div. |
| Swim Signals | Canadian Red Cross Water Safety Service—Alberta |
| Newsletter | Canadian Red Cross Youth—Alberta and N.W.T. Division |
| Juniors in Action | Canadian Red Cross Society—Ontario Div. |
| Junior | Canadian Red Cross Society—Various Provincial Branches |
| Provincial News | Canadian Red Cross Society—B.C. and Yukon Division |
| Junior | Canadian Red Cross Society—Nfld. Division |
| Canadian Welfare | Canadian Welfare Council |
| Bien-être Social | Canadian Welfare Council |
| Crippled Civilians Quarterly | Society For Crippled Civilians |
| Candid Facts | Canadian Cystic Fibrosis Foundation |
| Bulletin | Canadian Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association |
| The Canadian | Ontario School for the Deaf |
| Le Signal | League De Sécurité De La Province De Québec |
| Explorations | Quebec Association For The Mentally Retarded |
| Information Sur L'Alcoolisme Et Les Autres Toxicomanies | Office de la Prévention et de Traitement de L'Alcoolisme et des Autres Toxicomanies (OPTAT) |
| New Scotian | Interprovincial School for the Deaf—N.S. |
| Canadian Journal of Public Health | Canadian Public Health Association |

*Questions*

| Title of Publication | Publisher |
|---|---|
| The Advocate | Alcohol and Drug Concerns Incorporated |
| Alcoholism Review | The Alcoholism Foundation of British Columbia |
| Western Institute for the Deaf News | Western Institute for the Deaf |
| News Bulletin | Sanatorium Board of Manitoba |
| Progress Against Cancer | Canadian Cancer Society |
| Progrès contre le Cancer | Canadian Cancer Society |
| Canadian Cancer Society Newsletter | Canadian Cancer Society |
| Ontario Chapter Bulletin | Canadian Hemophilia Society—Ontario Chapter |
| Canadian Hemophilia Society | Canadian Hemophilia Society |
| Mental Health Matters | Canadian Mental Health Association—Ontario Division |
| Re-Mind | Canadian Mental Health Association—B.C. Division |
| C.D.A. Newsletter | Canadian Diabetic Association—B.C. |
| Your Health | Tuberculosis Christmas Seal Society |
| Déficience Mentale—Mental Retardation | Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded |
| Health | Health League of Canada |
| Health Rays | Nova Scotia Sanatorium |
| Working Safely | New Brunswick Industrial Safety Council |
| Canadian Hearing Review | Canadian Hearing Society |
| E.D.C. | Ontario Association for Emotionally Disturbed Children |
| Life Liner | Royal Life Saving Society of Canada—Ontario Branch |
| Journal | Canadian Association of Children's Aid Societies |
| Addictions | Alcoholism Research Foundation |
| New Horizon | Alberta Association For Retarded Children |
| Concept | Division of Alcoholism Alberta Department of Health |

FOREIGN STUDENTS IN GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Question No. 2,102—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. Has the government been consulted by the Province of Ontario about the latter's inquiry into the numbers of foreign (as distinct from Canadian) students working in graduate programmes at Ontario universities?

2. Has the government any policy whereby it is prepared to assist, especially with financial support, graduate students from the newer, developing Commonwealth countries?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1. CIDA is not aware of any inquiry made by the Province of Ontario concerning the number of foreign students working in graduate programs at Ontario universities.

2. Yes. Graduate students from the newer countries of the Commonwealth may receive training awards for study in Canada under Canadian technical assistance programs and under the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan.

LEASES IN NATIONAL PARKS

Question No. 2,129—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. How many leases are held at present in Banff National Park, in Jasper National Park and in Waterton Lakes National Park?

2. How many leases were held on July 1, 1960 in Banff National Park, in Jasper National Park and in Waterton Lakes National Park?

3. How many licenses of occupation are held at present in Banff National Park, in Jasper National Park and in Waterton Lakes National Park?

*Questions*

4. How many licenses of occupation were held on July 1, 1960 in Banff National Park, in Jasper National Park and in Waterton Lakes National Park?

5. How many different types of leases are there held at present in Banff National Park, in Jasper National Park and in Waterton Lakes National Park?

6. How many different types of licenses of occupation are there held at present in Banff National Park, in Jasper National Park and in Waterton Lakes National Park?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. There are 1,028 leases in Banff National Park, 676 leases in Jasper and 211 leases in Waterton.

2. On July 1, 1960 there were 978 leases in Banff, 602 in Jasper and 212 in Waterton.

3. There are presently 39 licences of occupation in Banff, 29 in Jasper and 9 in Waterton Lakes.

4. On July 1, 1969 there were 44 licences of occupation in Banff, 30 in Jasper and 6 in Waterton Lakes.

5. There are nine kinds of leases currently held in all three National Parks as listed below:

| Type | Banff | Jasper | Waterton |
|---|---|---|---|
| Perpetually renewable commercial | 179 | 36 | 28 |
| Perpetually renewable residential | 532 | 303 | 112 |
| 42-year standard commercial | 16 | 15 | 3 |
| 42-year standard residential | 71 | 137 | 16 |
| 42-year commercial sever and remove | 16 | 11 | 8 |
| 42-year residential sever and remove | 2 | 35 | 3 |
| 42 plus 21-year commercial | 48 | 17 | 10 |
| 42 plus 21-year residential | 73 | 65 | 23 |
| short term (21 years or less) | 91 | 57 | 8 |
| Total | 1,028 | 676 | 211 |

6. Only one type of licence of occupation is issued.

JASPER PARK SKI FACILITIES

Question No. 2,130—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. Does the National Parks Branch propose the development at any future date of ski facilities at or near Maligne Lake in Jasper National Park?

2. Have snow studies been made within the last 30 months in the Maligne Lake area and, if so, what is the purpose of these studies?

3. Is it the intention of the National Parks Branch to allow development of accommodation facilities at (a) Maligne Lake (b) Marmot Basin (c) Mount Edith Cavell at any time in the future?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. There are no such plans.

[Mr. Sulatycky.]

2. Yes, there have been studies over the last 30 months. These studies are part of a comparative survey being carried out throughout Jasper National Park to provide historical data for Avalanche forecasting and the effects on the Maligne watershed and the water level fluctuations at Medicine Lake. There is also a local warden snowfall record check in that area.

3. Maligne Lake—there are no plans for overnight accommodation at this time, however, this is subject to review at a later date. Marmot Basin—there are no plans for overnight accommodation. Mount Edith Cavell—there are no plans for overnight accommodation.

JASPER PARK—PALLISADES TRAINING SCHOOL

Question No. 2,131—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. What was the acquisition cost of the Pallisades National Park Training School in Jasper National Park?

2. What amount has been expended in each year since its acquisition for the operation and maintenance of the Pallisades National Park Training School?

3. What are the names of the individuals other than those bona fide receiving training, who were guests during the year 1968 at the Pallisades National Park Training School?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. The cost of this school was $277,850.

2. The accounting system in effect prior to 1966-67 did not provide for individual operation and maintenance cost breakdown: 1966-67, $3,858; 1967-68, $9,452; 1968-69, $17,666.

3. Her Royal Highness Princess Margriet of the Netherlands and her husband.

JASPER PARK—MALIGNE LAKE BRIDGE

Question No. 2,133—**Mr. Sulatycky:**

1. What was the cost of the bridge at the North outlet of Maligne Lake in Jasper National Park?

2. What traffic is or will be served by this bridge?

3. What was the purpose of clearing a road right-of-way beyond the bridge at the North outlet of Maligne Lake?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. The cost of the bridge was $336,119.

2. (a) boat concession; (b) warden service; (c) maintenance and garbage disposal; (d) fire lookout tower; (e) access to bald hills; (f) recreation areas; (g) parking areas; (h) possible road up and over Poboktan.

3. To provide access to and development as shown in 2 above.

*CIGARETTES—AMOUNT SPENT TO DISCOURAGE USE

Question No. 2,135—**Mr. Mather:**

What, in dollars, was the total amount spent by the federal government in 1968 to encourage non-smoking and to discourage cigarette disease in Canada?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare):** For the fiscal year 1968-69, the Department of National Health and Welfare expended a total sum of $233,517 in the anti-smoking program and for the distribution of information dealing with the harmful effects of smoking upon health.

This figure does not take into account the contribution in air time made by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the broadcasting of anti-smoking television and radio commercials.

[*English*]

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF COMPANY OF YOUNG CANADIANS

Question No. 2,156—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What is the name of the Executive Director of the Company of Young Canadians and what is his salary?

2. What are the names of the Associate Directors of the CYC and what salary does each receive from the federal government?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** 1. Claude Vidal, Executive Director, Company of Young Canadians, $19,000.

2. Not applicable.

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION COMMISSION PERSONNEL

Question No. 2,157—**Mr. Coates:**

What are the names and salaries of the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and Commissioners of the Canadian Radio-Television Commission?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Chairman, Pierre Juneau; annual salary $26,500. Vice-Chairman, Harry J. Boyle; annual salary $26,250. Commissioners, Mrs. Pat Pearce; Real Therrien; Harold Dornan. Commissioners receive annual salaries of $24,000.

Members (part-time): Dr. Gordon Thomas, St. Anthony, Nfld.; Armand Cormier, Moncton, N.B.; Gordon Hughes, Windsor, N.S.; Colomb Cliche, Quebec City, Quebec; Miss Helen James, Toronto, Ontario; Dr. Northrop Frye, Toronto, Ontario; John Shanski, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Mrs. Gertrude Laing, Calgary, Alta.; George McKeen, Vancouver, B.C.

Part-time members are paid on a per diem rate of $100 an average of two or three days per month.

*Questions*

BOOKLET, "INDIAN SUMMER"

Question No. 2,160—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. Was Mrs. Eiko Emori of Ottawa, Ontario chosen to provide advice regarding a booklet entitled "Indian Summer"?

2. Is there no one in the employ of the Indian Affairs and Northern Development Department competent enough to have done this work?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** 1. Yes.

2. There is no graphic art consultant in the department.

C.B.C. PROGRAM "SOMETHING ELSE"

Question No. 2,167—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Was a program for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Ottawa series "Something Else" videotaped on March 6, 1969?

2. What was the nature of the program and who were the participants?

3. On what date was it subsequently shown and, if it was not shown, what prevented it from being telecast?

4. What steps are being taken to prevent further instances of this kind?

5. Was anyone reprimanded for the difficulties that were encountered and, if so, who and what was the nature of the reprimand?

6. Are further steps being taken to tape and telecast this program at a later date?

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** I am informed by the C.B.C. as follows: 1. Yes.

2. The program concerned bilingualism in the civil service. The participants were 16 civil servants who discussed problems associated with learning a second language.

3. The program was not shown. The tape was erased by mistake.

4 and 5. The employee concerned has been reprimanded and the seriousness of his action has been emphasized in accordance with Corporation procedures in cases of this kind.

6. The retaping of this program segment is under active consideration.

POST SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL ADJUSTMENTS

Question No. 2,170—**Mr. McIntosh:**

Are there any claims in respect of the fiscal year ended March 31, 1968, from any provinces for post secondary educational adjustment payments still unpaid by the federal government and, if so (a) from which provinces (b) for what amounts (c) for what reasons in each case have the claims not been paid?

**[Mr. Pelletier.]**

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** Payments in respect of the fiscal year ended March 31, 1968, have all been made, pending any adjustments necessary when final audited returns for 1967-68 are received from all provinces, and when final calculations of both tax abatements and equalization are available.

DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION IN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Question No. 2,184—**Mr. Robinson:**

Is the federal government considering the setting up of diplomatic relations with communist countries and, if so, which ones, and when is it anticipated that the arrangements will be finalized?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Negotiations are currently under way in Stockholm for the establishment of diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China; at this stage it is not possible to anticipate when these negotiations are likely to be successful.

Canada already has diplomatic relations with eight communist countries. Apart from the current negotiations with the People's Republic of China no consideration is at present being given to the establishment of relations with other communist countries.

FOREST FIRES CAUSED BY SMOKERS

Question No. 2,192—**Mr. Mather:**

What, in dollars, was the loss caused by forest fires attributed to smokers in 1968, 1969?

**Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** The Department of Fisheries and Forestry does not record the dollar or acreage losses caused by forest fires attributed to smokers; it does record the percentage of fires caused by smoking material, including matches. Data for 1968 have not yet been received from the provinces. During the 10-year period 1958-67 the average percentage was 21.4. In 1967 the percentage was 23.1 of the total forest fires in Canada.

PERSONNEL AT SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I. BASE

Question No. 2,205—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. How many service personnel were stationed at Canadian Forces Base, Summerside, Prince Edward Island, in each of the years from 1959 to April 1, 1969, inclusive?

2. How many civilian personnel both permanent and casual were employed in each of the years 1959 through to April 1, 1969, inclusive?

3. What construction occurred at Canadian Forces Base, Summerside, in 1968?

4. What construction has occurred or is contemplated at Canadian Forces Base, Summerside, in 1969?

5. What is the value of the permanent assets of Canadian Forces Base, Summerside?

6. Are there buildings or facilities at Canadian Forces Base, Summerside, at present, not in use and, if so, for what reason?

7. What buildings or facilities are presently required for Canadian Forces Base, Summerside?

**Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence):** 1. As of March 31, 1959, 827; 1960, 1,018; 1961, 1,058; 1962, 1,273; 1963, 1,421; 1964, 1,455; 1965, 1,452; 1966, 1,355; 1967, 1,305; 1968, 1,312; 1969, 1,164.

2. As of March 31,

| | Permanent | Casual |
|---|---|---|
| 1959 | 196 | 122 |
| 1960 | 208 | 73 |
| 1961 | 238 | 100 |
| 1962 | 236 | 101 |
| 1963 | 231 | 64 |
| 1964 | 243 | 88 |
| 1965 | 243 | 135 |
| 1966 | 243 | 122 |
| 1967 | 248 | 72 |
| 1968 | 232 | 74 |
| 1969 | 265 | 5 |

3. New construction at CFB Summerside completed during 1968: (i) Renovations to Hangar 5, $22,200; (ii) Renovations to Hangars 3 and 4, $19,000; Total, $41,200.

4. No major new construction planned for 1969 at CFB Summerside.

5. The estimated market value based on a 1967 assessment of the real property assets of CFB Summerside is $13,000,000.

6. Yes, Building No. 14 with an area of 900 sq. ft. and Building No. 112, with an area of 200 sq. ft. are vacant because there is no further requirement for their designed function and they would be uneconomic to use because of their size. Buildings No. 1 and 12 are also surplus and have been sold by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation for removal from site.

7. CFB Summerside has a requirement for all the facilities and buildings currently occupied by the Base. Some of the space is not used to full capacity due to the fact that there has been a reduction in the number of aircraft operating from the base; however, from an operational viewpoint, it would not be economically feasible to consolidate activities in order to vacate additional buildings at this time.



INCOME TAX APPLICATION TO INDIAN ESKIMO ASSOCIATION

Question No. 2,209—**Mr. Asselin:**

1. Was the Indian Eskimo Association of Canada denied status as a charitable organization for income tax purposes on the grounds that its objects include activities "promoting a closer relationship and better understanding", which has been held not to be a charitable purpose?

2. Have other organizations been denied status as a charitable organization for income tax purposes for the same or similar reasons and, if so, which organizations?

3. Is the Minister considering changes in the standards for determining status as a charitable organization for income tax purposes, to accommodate organizations like the Indian Eskimo Association of Canada?

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue):** 1. The Indian Eskimo Association of Canada has not been denied status as a charitable organization for income tax purposes.

2 and 3. In view of the answer to part 1, these two parts are considered to be not applicable.

WHALES QUOTA UNDER COMMISSION REGULATIONS

Question No. 2,257—**Mr. Anderson:**

1. What is the Canadian quota under the International Whaling Commission's regulations for (a) fin whales (b) sei whales (c) sperm whales, in the North Pacific for 1969?

2. Are these quotas to be taken by Canadian whalers, or, if not, what is the nationality of the whalers who are authorized to take the Canadian quotas?

**Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** 1. No Canadian national quota has been established under the International Whaling Commission regulations for fin, sei, or sperm whales in the North Pacific area for 1969.

2. Answered by 1.

OKANAGAN BOUNDARY ARDA PROJECTS

Question No. 2,310—**Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary):**

1. How much money has the federal government spent on ARDA projects in Okanagan Boundary constituency?

2. What was the provincial government's expenditure on these projects?

3. What was the largest project?

4. How many projects have been commenced to date?

*Questions*

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** 1. $2,920,787.

2. $2,920,787.

3. Black Mountain Irrigation District Rehabilitation.

4. 36.

FORESTRY PUBLIC RELATIONS STAFF

Question No. 2,323—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Forestry and Rural Development have a public relations staff and, if so, how many?

2. What was the total cost of public relations for the Department for each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

**Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** 1. No.

2. Not applicable.

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

FOREIGN STUDENTS IN CANADA, 1960-68

Question No. 1,595—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many people (a) male (b) female, have been allowed entry into Canada as students during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

2. From what country of origin did each student come and how many came from each country represented in each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

3 What is the racial origin of each person (a) male (b) female, allowed entry into Canada as a student during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

4. Have any people (a) male (b) female been refused entry into Canada as students during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive, and what was the reason for refusal in each case?

5. How many students from outside Canada received support and/or allowances from the federal government, directly or indirectly, and what was the value received by each student in Canadian dollars during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Return tabled.

GOVERNMENT BONDS—MATURITY AND REPLACEMENT

Question No. 1,879—**Mr. Latulippe:**

1. Which Canadian Government Bond Issues reached maturity between April 1, 1967 and April 1, 1969?

2. Which of these issues was the government able to pay on maturity without further borrowing?

3. Which of the issues maturing within this period were replaced by new issues on new conditions and rates of interest?

[Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary).]

4. In each case, what are the interest rates and terms and what are the differences between the interest rates of the old issues and those of the new?

Return tabled.

SUBSIDIES AND/OR SUPPORT PROGRAMS—LABOUR DEPARTMENT

Question No. 1,924—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Department of Labour provide subsidies and/or support programs for any segment of the economy, groups or individuals inside Canada, and, if so, to what extent, in what amounts, and to whom are the amounts paid?

2. What amounts have been paid for subsidies and/or support programs during each of the years 1960-68 inclusive?

Return tabled.

**Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a second appeal for an answer to question No. 2,252 from the Minister of Manpower and Immigration regarding the Digby manpower office. I hope this question can be answered soon.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### SHIPBUILDING

CANADIAN VICKERS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON GOVERNMENT ACTION TO RESOLVE DISPUTE—FREEDMAN REPORT

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In view of the severe criticism over the weekend levelled against the government by the shipbuilding industry and in view of the continuation of the shutdown of Canadian Vickers Company and the controversy in respect to it, can the minister say whether a meeting will be held with the shipbuilding industry officials to lay down definitely the government's plans in this regard?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, I do not see why I should be held responsible for the shipbuilding industry in Canada. I would understand the hon. member meeting the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce or the Minister of Manpower and Immigration

regarding the readjustment of workers, but as far as regional development is concerned, this matter is certainly not within my jurisdiction.

[*English*]

**Mr. Bell:** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister has some responsibility in this, and since he was the one who made the indelible promises in the heat of the campaign in the last election when he was worried about things, will he stand up and say something to the industry?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister and ask him if he could indicate to the house when, if at all, the government would be in a position to indicate their over-all maritime policy.

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

**Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova):** May I ask the Minister of Labour whether he is considering bringing in legislation to ensure that in matters such as the Vickers closing—and there are other examples—proper notice is given by industry to workers affected by such actions?

**Hon. Bryce S. Mackasey (Minister of Labour):** I recall making a statement on this subject last October when I had an opportunity of speaking in the house, and if my memory is correct the hon. gentleman supported my premise that such legislation is necessary. I pointed out at the time that in view of the need to study the Woods report such legislation could not be expected until next spring.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** I should like to ask the Minister of Labour a supplementary question and in doing so to congratulate him on his statement over the weekend to the effect that there ought to be legislation defining the moral responsibility of employers in cases such as that of Vickers. I want to ask the minister whether the government intends to implement the recommendations of the Freedman report which dealt with the questions of notice, severance pay and negotiations along lines which he himself declared over the weekend to be desirable.

**Mr. Mackasey:** I might point out, also, that the unions, too, have a responsibility. Some of the unions, in their efforts on behalf of their own members, leave an awful lot to be desired in their policies, and when we see one union blocking the efforts of another union this calls for the same kind of castigation as I have devoted to industry. I have said on several occasions that I intend to bring in legislation based on the philosophy of the Freedman report. I said this during the time the hon. member was not in the house. I am pleased to say I had the support of all parties when I made that statement.

**Mr. Douglas:** May I ask the minister a further question, in view of the vagueness of his answer? Could I ask the Babe Ruth of the negotiating table whether the tender solicitude he showed for the workers over the weekend was genuine or whether it was more Irish blarney spread out to kid the workers—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I think that neither the question nor the reply the minister is about to make would be in order.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister.

Would the government or the Prime Minister consider taking over the management of Canadian Vickers until a solution has been found to the problem of the 1,000 laid-off workers?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Ralliement Créditiste is advocating the nationalization of all industries or just that of Canadian Vickers?

[*English*]

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** I should like to ask the minister whether, in considering legislation, he would bear in mind that it is frequently the ill-advised and misplaced intervention of this government in economic affairs of the nation which brings about conditions resulting in these lay-offs.

**Mr. Mackasey:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** The minister may wish to rise on a point of order. Let me say that the type of question asked by the hon. member for Peace River gives rise to difficulties because it is obviously out of order; his question is, really, a statement. Questions of this kind have to be ruled out of order, and then there

is a temptation on the part of ministers to reply.

**Mr. Mackasey:** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. On reflection, I think you are right and I shall not make the point I was about to make. However—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The minister, having ruled me to be right, will not be allowed to go further.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** In view of the fact that all parties in the house supported the minister last fall when he said he would bring in legislation based on the Freedman report, can he tell us when this will be done?

**Mr. Mackasey:** Last fall I undertook to bring this kind of legislation forward and, as the hon. gentleman has pointed out, all parties supported me. I said on that occasion, however, that I could not visualize such legislation being before the house until late fall or early spring, and I see no reason which would enable me to advance that date.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Late fall or early spring of what year?

## IMMIGRATION

### DISPOSITION OF APPLICATIONS FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the reported immediate success of the governments' new policy of welcoming United States army deserters, will the minister assure the house that applicants for landed immigrant status from Greece, Italy, Portugal, Trinidad, Hong Kong and elsewhere will receive exactly the same prompt and solicitous consideration, even though they have not broken the law of their own country?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

### LICENSING OF CZECHOSLOVAKIAN DENTISTS

**Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for Oxford.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I doubt whether that question was in order but the hon. member may wish to ask another question.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Mr. Thompson:** I will direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that the Czechoslavak refugees of the Soviet rape of their homeland were assured in Vienna that they would have no difficulty in obtaining suitable positions in Canada, and in view of the failure of all of the 16 Czechoslovak dentists who sat the special licensing examination of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons of Ontario, will the minister assure the house that the government will extend all necessary support to enable these men to take courses in Canadian dental techniques?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, with regard to one point raised by my hon. friend I want to make it clear that professional people who were seeking admission to Canada during this movement were fully and carefully advised of the situation in Canada. Applicants, especially those in the professions, were required to sign a statement recognizing that they might not be able to practise their normal trade or profession and that they were willing to accept alternative employment should this be necessary.

This statement was made to all the professionals, including the Czech dentists, and indicated they fully understood that the licensing requirements in Canada were such that their entry into the profession was solely at the discretion of the licensing authority. These statements were given in their own languages to the persons coming to Canada.

It is unfortunate that such persons have been unsuccessful, but they have been examined under the authority of those responsible for licensing arrangements. We have given every assistance to the Czech dentists, and particularly the one whose remarks were reported in the press this morning.

**Mr. Thompson:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Considering the great shortage of dentists in Canada and considering that, according to the College of Dental Surgeons, the dentists in question are deficient in the area of Canadian dental techniques, can the minister assure us that the Department of Manpower and Immigration will do all within its power to help these people overcome this difficulty?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, we can do all that it is within our power to do; but as I understand it, the dental authorities here have determined that these Czech applicants, along with others from other countries,

including the United States, did not meet the necessary requirements. In some cases it will be necessary for them to take additional training in Canada, but that is outside the purview of this department. We are continuing to give these persons adjustment assistance and language training where necessary. We take a very sympathetic view of their situation and that is why we took great pains during this movement to ensure that they have as full an understanding as possible of the situation here in Canada.

**Mr. Lincoln Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Since the government has the situation of the Czech dentists well in hand, I wonder whether the minister would consult further with dental authorities in this country so that, notwithstanding statements made by these immigrants, some changes may be brought about to the dental regulations to permit these people to be accepted here as dentists?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, we have continuing consultations with professional licensing bodies in the provinces with respect to the admission of professionals from other countries. But standards are set by the professional bodies. In this case examinations were held or made available as a special concession. I understand that sixteen Czech dentists failed; in addition there were four from the United Kingdom, two from the United States and others from such countries as Ireland, South Africa, Norway and so on. I understand these people can re-apply for another examination in the Fall.

It is unfortunate if any professional has come to Canada with the impression that the situation is different from the existing one. I wish to assure my hon. friend that we have taken pains to advise these people in time of the situation, and we are taking pains to ensure they are receiving the best possible treatment in Canada. Nevertheless, standards are still a matter to be determined by professional licensing bodies.

ADMISSION OF PERSONS WITH CRIMINAL RECORDS

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. On what basis does the minister decide just what constitutes a criminal record when applications are made for the status of landed immigrant. Is that decision made by the minister's department or is it based on the law of the country of origin?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order please. I think that type of question ought to be placed on the order paper.

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, in some ways my question is supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for Oxford. It is addressed to the Minister of National Revenue. Has an investigation been undertaken to determine whether a United States criminal who crossed the border last Friday carrying a hidden tape recorder escaped customs duties?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Coté (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, may I take that question as notice.

## AGRICULTURE

REQUEST FOR GUIDELINES AND EMERGENCY ACTION TO ASSIST WESTERN FARMERS

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Following his attractive appearance on television yesterday when he dealt with agricultural matters, and in view of his admission that there is a crisis in western agriculture, will the minister now say when some action is going to be taken in regard to what has been described by the *Western Producer* as a callous disregard for the western farmer? In particular, will the western farmer be given guidelines as to expected sales; and is it the intention of the government to give an acreage payment or a summerfallow allowance to encourage farmers to summerfallow rather than seed even at this late stage?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the right hon. gentleman is aware that it would take more time to respond to the broad range of subjects that he raised in his question than the question period allows. However, I will tell him that this morning we received the report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, the members of which toured western Canada. On Wednesday, I think it is, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture is sending a delegation to Ottawa to discuss the grain problem with some members of the cabinet. I should like to assure my right hon. friend and the house that these representations are important to the government, and therefore ought

to be taken into account before recommendations are made.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the members of the opposition have been directing the attention of the government to these matters for the last seven or eight weeks, is it not about time the government had enough backbone to announce its policy?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The supplementary question is argumentative.

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** A supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister assure the house that the government has given this matter serious consideration, and that some emergency measures are under consideration and will very soon be reported to this house?

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is perhaps better aware than any other single member of this house of the consideration that was given to this question by the Standing Committee, its observations and recommendations. Indeed, there was some delay in presenting the report as a result of legitimate opinions expressed by members of the opposition. However, as I say, the report was received this morning.

[*Translation*]

DAIRY POLICY OF GOVERNMENT

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture, in connection with the dairy policy announced on March 31.

Many producers will suffer rather heavy losses owing to that new policy. May I ask the minister whether he intends, following the protests he has already received or will undoubtedly receive, to suggest to the government that this policy be changed, so that there may be an increase in prices?

[*English*]

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, the major change in the dairy program for the 1969-70 dairy year is the change in the holdback that we will need to meet the increased costs of exporting milk powder and other dairy products for export. I should draw to the hon. member's attention that these changes are designed to hold down surplus production, and to the extent we are successful there could be an increase to the producer.

[Mr. Olson.]

## TRADE

WHEAT—FLOOR PRICE ON EXPORTS

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a further question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the government preparing to establish immediately a floor price under wheat being exported? I do not think such action depends on the recommendation of any committee.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, that suggestion, and it has been received a number of times, is one of the matters the government will take into consideration when deciding what will be helpful in the situation that exists in western Canada.

**Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot):** I wonder if the minister could give this house some indication when we can expect a decision as to that particular aspect of the committee's report?

**Mr. Olson:** As soon as possible, Mr. Speaker.

## SOCIAL SECURITY

DISCUSSION WITH QUEBEC GOVERNMENT RESPECTING MEASURE

**Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** My question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Will the minister advise whether his department has been consulted by the Quebec government regarding the new welfare legislation, Bill 26, introduced last week? Will he also advise if the program outlined in the bill qualifies for federal assistance under the Canada Assistance Plan?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have some serious reservations about the question. The first part is the type of question which should be placed on the order paper. In the second part of the question the hon. member is inviting the minister to interpret the law. In view of the circumstances I do not think the question should be allowed.

**Mr. Allmand:** Could I rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker? Can the minister advise if the federal government will be contributing to the Quebec welfare program under the Canada Assistance Plan?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Not specifically under the Canada Assistance Plan, but by allowances there will be a contribution.

## PUBLIC SERVICE

ALLEGED REJECTION OF APPLICANTS FOR LINGUISTIC REASONS

**Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** My question is directed to the Secretary of State. Is bilingualism a requirement for employment in the public service in the national capital area at the present time?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It seems the question asked by the hon. member is a very general one. I think it is the type of question which should normally be placed on the order paper. At the same time I also suggest to the hon. member this is the very substance of the debate which is presently before this house. Perhaps that is when the question might be asked.

**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** I rise on a point of order, with all due respect and deference to Your Honour. Your Honour is probably not aware of what is transpiring at the moment with regard to applicants attempting to secure positions in the public service. While the official languages bill is being debated there are people trying to get employment in the public service and are being rejected because they are not bilingual. That is the reason I pose the question and why it is urgent.

**Mr. Speaker:** If there is the urgency the hon. member suggests, he knows what his recourse is under the rules. I would be very pleased to make sure that question is given precedence for discussion during the adjournment debate.

**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is a straightforward question: Is bilingualism required?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question is straightforward and I hope my ruling is also straightforward.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

A.B.M. SYSTEM—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON ESCALATION

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** My question is directed to the Prime Minister. It relates to answers given by the Prime Minister on Friday regarding the A.B.M. system. Could the Prime Minister say whether the decision, to which he referred on March 19, that the A.B.M. system constituted escalation, will be made in the near future?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I believe on Friday I said we were considering this as part of our review of defence and foreign policy, but that this was not the most urgent question for us to decide. We were trying to establish the orientations in Canada's defence policy before deciding how other countries should run theirs.

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PASSPORTS—ISSUANCE WITHOUT NORMAL PROCESSING

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** My question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the continued difficulties in obtaining passports will the minister advise if any instructions have been issued for emergency issuance of temporary passports without going through the usual processing procedures? If such instructions have been issued, can the minister advise the house when they were issued? If they have not been issued, will they be issued?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** I think hon. members know we are issuing temporary passports where all the requirements for the issuance of permanent passports cannot be met immediately. These passports can then be made permanent when the balance of the information is provided.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Will the minister and the government agree to the opening of offices authorized to issue passports either on a regional or provincial basis? Also, will the minister consider inviting the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to show the passport office how to set up a filing system?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

## SHIPBUILDING

CANADIAN VICKERS—EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for LaSalle.

**Mr. Prosper Boulanger (Mercier):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but may I be allowed to remind you that I am the member for Mercier.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

In view of the incidents that have occurred at the Canadian Vickers, could the minister tell us if the manpower centre has succeeded so far in finding employment for some Canadian Vickers' workers?

[*English*]

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the placement services of the Department of Manpower have been at the disposal of the workers for some time now. I would like to advise my hon. friend that Marine Industries, Sorel, have today employed 125 of these persons. I understand an additional 250 men will be employed on Monday next.

**Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):** In the light of the strong statements made by the Minister of Labour regarding the closing down of Canadian Vickers shipyard in Montreal and consequent unemployment of more than 1,000, can the Minister of Manpower state whether the government has evolved a program either to keep the yards open or provide alternative employment, aside from what he mentioned regarding private industry?

**Mr. MacEachen:** It has been apparent the shipbuilding activity of Vickers is to be terminated. Since then it has been our objective to provide alternative employment where it could be found. I understand there are still some opportunities in the industrial division and the ship repair division at Vickers for employees displaced from the shipbuilding activity. This further demand for labour at Sorel will help the situation a great deal and will possibly absorb all the displaced workers.

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** May I ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration if Canadian Vickers Limited has refused to co-operate with his department in the reallocation of the men employed in their shipyards?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, for a number of months the Department of Manpower has been interested in getting a manpower adjustment program in operation at the Vickers plant which would involve the co-operation of the employer and the unions, to plan ahead for the displacement and to set up programs that would look after the workers. We received very little, if any, co-operation from the employer in the early stages, and in the latter stages we have received very little, if any, co-operation from the unions.

[Mr. Boulanger.]

## FISHERIES

### CLOSING OF WEST COAST CANNERIES

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister a supplementary question relating to an equally difficult situation on the west coast with respect to the fishing industry and the closing of a number of canneries announced earlier this year. Can the minister announce what he has done about that?

**Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have been working towards the establishment of a manpower adjustment agreement. We have a research program in being that we hope will provide answers to some of the problems that will arise as a result of displacement of persons in these canneries. From our point of view the situation is well in hand.

## TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

### REQUEST FOR DEBATE ON FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the government house leader. In so doing I would like to welcome the minister back to the house and hope he has drawn the proper inference from the progress that has been made during his absence.

My question has to do with the statement made by the Minister of Transport on Friday in which he said legislation has now been drafted regarding transportation policies for the Atlantic provinces. Will the government house leader assure the house that the legislation will not be brought forward until the Standing Committee on Transport has a chance to make its recommendations in that regard, and furthermore until the fifth report of that standing committee, which is now government order No. 68, is brought forward for debate?

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his kind remarks. As he will have noted the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) was also absent from the house during the same period. I am going to confer with him to see if our continued absence from the house will promote business and if that is the case I am sure both of us will volunteer to continue our absence. With regard to the hon. member's other representations I will take them into account and discuss them with the Minister of Transport.

## NOISE ABATEMENT

STEPS TO COMBAT NATIONAL PROBLEM

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Having in mind the fact that noise is becoming a national problem in our country—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Louder.

**Mr. Mather:** I was saying that having in mind the fact that noise is becoming a national problem in our country, and that the United States government last week took some steps to combat a similar problem in that country, would the minister ask his departmental officials to look into this in Canadian terms, in the hope that they will make some recommendations about this national problem?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member could help solve the problem by placing his question in writing.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

NATO—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON DISCUSSIONS WITH ALLIES

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for either the Prime Minister or the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In the light of the fact that the Minister of National Defence has now had conversations for a full 24 hour period in Europe with the United States Defence Secretary, Mr. Laird, and others, could either of these hon. gentlemen enlighten the house as to the nature of these discussions?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I believe we have no cause to depart from the timetable the minister put to the house before leaving. He is consulting with the various allies of Canada within NATO and on Monday, when he is back in the house, I am sure some of the members opposite will be present to hear him make his report.

[*Translation*]

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PROGRAM FOR NORTHERN ONTARIO

**Mr. Gaétan-J. Serré (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Can he tell the house whether his department is considering an economic expansion program for the underprivileged areas of northern Ontario?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member's question is of a very general character. However, if it is urgent, I should be happy to get a notice from the hon. member to the effect that the wishes to discuss the question at the time of adjournment.

**Mr. Serré:** At ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

## HIGHWAY SAFETY

REQUEST FOR ACTION TO REDUCE DEATH TOLL—AUTOMOBILE STANDARDS

**Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the very high death toll on the highways over the weekend would the Prime Minister advise the house when we might expect the minister responsible to take some action on this very serious problem?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Again I would think the question is of a general nature. I know it refers to an urgent situation, but as asked I would not think it would be in order.

**Mr. Noble:** As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister which minister is responsible for this?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** I will tell the hon. member gladly. It is the provincial ministers of highways.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question, supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe, to the Prime Minister. In view of conflicting statements emanating from the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Minister of Transport regarding legislation for automobile safety standards, could the Prime Minister tell the house what minister is responsible for this legislation and when it will be brought forward?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is a question of manufacturing it might also come under the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It really depends on what aspect of the question you want to debate. I understood the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe was asking what minister is responsible for policing the highways, and this is a matter that comes under provincial jurisdiction.

**Mr. Noble:** I did not ask who is policing the highways. I asked what minister of this cabinet is responsible for this legislation.

**Mr. Trudeau:** I am relieved that the hon. member is not suggesting that we should police the highways.

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Would he ask the Minister of Transport to give consideration to answering me on this very serious question, as he undertook to do about two weeks ago, and say what action the federal traffic and safety people are taking to reduce the number of traffic accidents?

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PASSPORTS—ISSUANCE WITHOUT NORMAL PROCESSING

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I appreciate Your Honour's ruling out my supplementary, but may I ask Your Honour's indulgence to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to answer the first part of my question about the opening of regional or provincial passport offices?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I have already announced that we do intend to open regional passport offices at the beginning of 1970. It is quite impossible to open them before about that time because of the lack of machines and trained personnel.

## GRAIN

WHEAT—DELIVERY TO ELEVATOR WITHOUT PERMIT BOOK

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the recent advertisement in the Saskatoon paper asking for 1 million bushels of No. 2 Northern grain at 70 cents a bushel delivered to the nearest elevator, would the minister say what elevator company is accepting this grain and whether any investigation is being made into this situation of delivering grain without permit books?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if the hon. member would send me a copy of this advertisement. If any organization wants to advertise that they are willing to receive grain at any place and anyone else wants to sell it to them, then so long as provincial borders are not crossed there is no offence in selling the grain.

[Mr. Noble.]

## INDUSTRY

LONG HARBOUR, NFLD.—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO ELECTRIC REDUCTION COMPANY

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Was there any involvement of any kind by any federal department, or any federal government agency, in the establishment of the Electric Reduction Company plant at Long Harbour in the province of Newfoundland? I am thinking specifically of any financial assistance, either direct or indirect, that might have been given the project through dealings with the provincial government.

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Mr. Speaker, I will take this question as notice.

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SASKATOON, SASK.—APPLICATION FOR TELEVISION OUTLET

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Secretary of State. In view of the circumstances in which the C.B.C. may no longer be in a position to purchase facilities at Moose Jaw or Regina for the establishment of a C.B.C. television outlet in the province of Saskatchewan, can the minister inform the house whether the C.B.C. is prepared to proceed with an application for an outlet based in the city of Saskatoon?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member should place his question on the order paper.

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

SUMMER ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL MUSEUMS PERSONNEL

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. I understand that museums come under his jurisdiction. Will National Museums officials be permitted to spend this summer, as they have previous summers, digging around in old Indian grave sites, thus upsetting the sensitivities of Indian people in the villages close to the grave sites?

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not sure whether the question is one of urgency but perhaps the minister might reply.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** The question was one of urgency, Mr. Speaker, but the minister was not paying attention.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

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

The house resumed, from Friday, May 23, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen (for Mr. Trudeau) that Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, when the debate on the official languages bill was adjourned last Friday, I was saying that we are facing a grave danger, namely that bilingual districts are to be set up where services will be provided to the public in both languages.

Mr. Speaker, we agree. The public will be served by mere clerks, good French Canadians who, to be hired, will have to take a bilingual test and attend language courses.

As for English Canadians, they will continue to control the management and the administration of the billions of dollars allotted to the various departments and Crown corporations.

In fact, the bill will only increase the number of bilingual employees but will change nothing in the high management.

Equal partners in a new Confederation, yes, but not one-way. The "After me, you come first" attitude must cease or we will have to bring it to an end one way or another. It is for us to choose.

The bilingualism which the government has undertaken to apply appears like a defence of Canadian individuality and unity, within, against separatism in Quebec, without, against a too strong Americanization. This concept of bilingualism results from the mere juxtaposition of the two linguistic groups, along with a certain tolerance in the great public instead of a true understanding.

It is important to go further, to show more fairness, to allow each and every one to participate at all levels.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I was driving at in concluding my remarks.

No doubt you know that I have asked nearly 80 questions—in three separate groups—since the beginning of September, in connection with bilingualism in the public service. I wanted to know whether there was a place for French Canadians in the Canadian public service or whether they were nothing but water carriers.

It is clear from the government's replies that they are just good enough to carry water, close doors and bring coffee. They give information to the public, occupy lower positions and get starvation wages.

However, higher management in all departments and Crown corporations is controlled only, and I emphasize the word "controlled", by English-speaking people. Unfortunately, the official languages bill does nothing to correct that situation.

Government members may argue that we must wait, that we must be patient, that changes are in the offing, that language courses are being offered. Yet I must say that language courses are in full swing since 1966.

But let us consider what has happened in the federal public service since 1966. I shall give you figures pertaining to the Bank of Canada, the Industrial Development Bank, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Eldorado Mining, the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Corporation and the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

As far as those Crown corporations or government agencies are concerned, the following can be noted:

The number of French-Canadian officials with those agencies has gone, from 6.9 to 5.6 per cent.

According to the figures from 1966 to 1968 we are not progressing but going backwards as far as our representation within the public service is concerned.

On the other hand, during the same period, the percentage of Enlgish-speaking civil servants employed by the same corporations increased from 88.6 per cent to 91 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out that within those very crown corporations, people whose mother tongue is neither English nor French outnumber those whose mother tongue is French. And for the posts concerned, a salary of $17,000 or more is paid.

I would like to know how the government proceeds in that field. Does it intend to assign the lower posts to all French Canadians and to give English Canadians the administrative and managerial positions? Could the government tell us whether it acts fairly with regard to promotion, reclassification and appointment to positions in the civil service for which a salary of $17,000 or more is paid?

I can quote figures to support this and I can give those figures to any hon. member. The government itself supplied those figures and they have appeared in *Hansard*. Unfortunately, no mention is made of that in the newspapers. I ask the Canadian Press and the Press Gallery reporters, not to speak about me, but to read in *Hansard* the answers supplied by the government since September. If they are conscientious, they will have to tell the truth to the public, namely that all French Canadians are considered fit for is to carry water or to give information to the public.

As for management, in all crown corporations and in all government departments, it is under the control of English-speaking people only.

As far as Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. for example, is concerned let me quote some figures.

The proportion of French-speaking directors receiving $17,000 or more annually has not varied from 1966 to 1968; it has remained nil. In the same period and in the same crown corporation, I repeat in the same crown corporation, from 1966 to 1968, the number of English-speaking employees receiving $17,000 or more per year increased from 36 to 117.

There is a limit to being deluded with promises by prime ministers who tell us: Long live confederation, long live bilingualism. Keep quiet, you French Canadians, Quebecers, you will eventually get your place.

If we have to wait another 100 years to enjoy the rights granted to us by confederation, in 1867, I for one would prefer to get out of it. I am not prepared to wait another 100 years to know if we can have our place within confederation and the public service. If Canadians really want a bilingual, bicultural country, if we are really honest with ourselves, the ratios of 0 to 0 and of 36 to 117 will have to disappear, and not in five years hence, but right now, for our French Canadians brains will come less and less to Ottawa, and will rather develop their own state, because they will have no other choice.

I am willing to live in Canada, because I am no separatist, and I do not believe in separatism, and I say so sincerely, honestly, until proof to the contrary. But I do not believe either in the present confederation, or in this government who deludes us with bilingualism-biculturalism trifles, the application of which will change absolutely nothing, will contribute to increase the control by higher English-speaking officials, and will continue to restrict the role of French Canadians to lesser positions in the public service, answering the public.



I think the population is unaware of the true situation. The people believes that this official languages bill will change the situation. I for one, think that it is all eye-wash, and that nothing in this bill guarantees that French Canadians will have their share of higher positions in the federal public service.

I could give you more figures for the Department of Finance, the National Research Council, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, the Treasury Board, the Canadian Transport Commission and the Comptroller of the Treasury.

Among the senior officials earning $17,000 or over in the above-mentioned departments, the mother tongue of 40 only is French. On the other hand, the number of senior officials whose mother tongue is English reaches 518; this is a percentage of 6.6 per cent for French Canadians against 85.4 per cent for English-speaking Canadians.

The truly interesting point is to note the number of senior officials earning $17,000 and over and whose mother tongue is neither English nor French. The proportion is 8 per cent and the number, 49. Therefore, more citizens whose mother tongue is neither English nor French than French-speaking citizens are hired.

In 1965, Crown agencies and departments were administering more than 10 billion dollars. Mr. Speaker, that is big management. That is where the money of Canadian taxpayers goes. In my opinion, French Canadians are truly part of confederation, they are considered as very good taxpayers, and, consequently, they should have their share in the administration of those billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, we are subjected to much discrimination. We are ready to live through the tremendous adventure of confederation. We are ready to continue, for better or for worse. We do not want to take anything away from others, but we want our share. We do not want to create injustice for others but we want to be put on the same footing.

We do not want to be deluded into the belief that we are being treated in the same manner as English-speaking Canadians, we want to be first class Canadians at all levels of the public service, or else that body will continue to be what it is now: An ivory tower accessible only to English-speaking Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, many highly competent French Canadians—and I could name dozens of them—have complained to me about the injustices, the discrimination they were submitted to.

• (3:00 p.m.)

When these very competent graduates from French-Canadian universities apply for a position in any department, and are turned down because they do not speak English, I say that is pure and deliberate discrimination on the part of certain narrow-minded English-speaking people in the public service who want to have control over the positions, when unilingual English-speaking applicants with the same qualifications get the positions.

Mr. Speaker, if our rules concerning the recruiting of civil servants are to be based on the degree of competence, I agree. But the language spoken should not be ground for discrimination because it would be the glaring proof that Confederation is not possible for French Canadians since they would be excluded from all senior administrative positions.

We are French-Canadian members in the federal parliament. I have been here since June 25, and I have the honour of representing my fellow-citizens from Lotbinière. I do all my work in French, everything is done in French. Mr. Speaker, your mother tongue is French. Many hon. members have French as their mother tongue. There are many French Canadians in the public service, and thanks to the work the Ralliement Créditiste has done since 1962, we are respected in the federal parliament. The French fact is also recognized within the government.

However, Mr. Speaker, having French-Canadian ministers is not everything. In addition, the administration of the government, the leadership of the government—because we know that parliament is one thing and that the government is another—must be open to French Canadians.

We read and hear speeches from some separatists in the province of Quebec. I do not share their opinions; however, basically, I admire those people who stand up and say that the French-Canadian people should enjoy equal status. However, I fail to agree when they say that nothing can be altered in Ottawa and that separation has to come.

Mr. Speaker, I would like this government to prove that Confederation is viable and that the French-Canadian people can really have the positions they deserve in the public service. I wish this government would, without depriving others, make it possible for us French Canadians to be treated as equals. Let us recognize both official languages, but let us also recognize the individuals who speak those two official languages; otherwise, Confederation will be meaningless.

Not only must we recognize both official languages—something that should have been done over a hundred years ago—but also the human beings who speak those languages. If those who speak one of these two languages are thrown out of the public service, I say that this bill is a lot of nonsense as well as the public service and Confederation.

It is up to us to prove to the whole world and to the Canadian people that Confederation is worthwhile, that it is possible within it to be respected and to respect others as well, to be considered on an equal footing without depriving one another, by recognizing, not only the official languages, but also—and that is even more important—those who speak them.

[*English*]

**Mr. George Muir (Lisgar):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the debate because regardless of the effect this bill will have on the nation as a whole it will place a burden on western Canada in addition to those already affecting the economic and social life of that part of the country. The bill represents an intrusion by this government into an area specifically reserved under the constitution, that is, the usage of the English and French languages.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) in his opening statement the other day said:

> It is true that our constitution already provides for the use of both languages. At present, however, section 133 of the British North America Act applies only to the legislative assembly and courts of Quebec and to the federal parliament and courts. Though in no way amending the constitution, the bill which is being submitted to you does concern language usage in connection with the federal government and parliament and the institutions thereof. Seen in this light, the present bill represents the culmination of an extensive evolution.

The only way one can bring about an evolution of the constitution is by properly amending it; otherwise a written constitution is meaningless. Section 91 (1), an amendment to the constitution brought in under the St. Laurent government, restricts the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada as regards the use of English or French. It is obvious that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is trying to amend the constitution without the necessary consultation with the

provinces. If this can be done by the federal government on a unilateral basis in the case of languages, would it not be equally justified to alter the rights of education and religion on the same basis?

The question of language rights is one of the recognition and should be in, and form part of, the constitution of the nation; otherwise it has no meaning. The Prime Minister should have placed the matter before a federal-provincial conference in an attempt to secure the consent of the provincial premiers to the appropriate constitutional amendments. It is obvious that the Prime Minister is attempting to do by the back door what he is unwilling to do by the front door and in the proper way.

Western Canada is prepared to accept recognition of the basic rights of both languages under an amendment to the constitution. However, it will be with reluctance that it will accept an attempt by the government to force its views on all Canadians in this underhanded manner. We cannot legislate good will. The bill imposes stresses in areas where none now exists, and will be divisive rather than unifying.

Parliament has a right to know how the provinces stand. In a matter involving language rights entrenched under the constitution of Canada, parliament has a duty to know how the provinces stand. The Prime Minister has called a federal-provincial constitutional conference for the very near future. Why did he not reserve this bill until that time so that Canadians across the country would know where the provinces stand on the question of equal language rights?

• (3:10 p.m.)

The present bill is restricted to areas under federal administrative control, except for the provision relating to two official languages. That provision constitutes an amendment to the B.N.A. Act and should have been brought forward in the regular manner. Since the government has refused to do this, at least it should give further consideration to clauses 19 to 34 dealing with the appointment of a commissioner and defining his powers and duties. They give to one man more power than any one person should enjoy in a democratic society. He will be no mere ombudsman but rather a veritable czar. He will in fact become the grand inquisitor of the realm. He will have authority to compel the attendance of witnesses, receive evidence under oath or without, conduct an inquiry in secret, and accept evidence that would not be permissible in a court of law.



The commissioner or an authorized member of his staff may enter into any office of any department, crown company, agency or institution of the government, or any office under parliament's or the Speaker's administrative authority. He will become a super-snooper, and will have far more authority than that granted the Auditor General or any other appointed public servant in Canada. Anyone who has any doubt as to the tremendous power this bill will give him should carefully read clauses 19 to 34 of the bill.

When the constitution was written no provision was made for a commissioner. The constitution has worked since, why should we have a provision now giving a commissioner such tremendous powers? I suggest that the clauses dealing with the commissioner and his powers should be deleted from the bill or democracy as we know it in this country will cease to exist.

Liberal speakers in the debate have intimated that the bill guarantees equality under a just society. However, if the proposed amendment to the bill regarding the necessity for bilingualism in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the armed forces is any criterion, it would seem that some of our citizens will be less equal than others. I refer to the third group of Canadians whose mother tongue is neither English nor French and who comprise one-third of our population. The Scandinavians, Ukrainians, Germans, Dutch and other groups have made a tremendous contribution to the economy and culture of our nation. In western Canada we are proud of the fact that some of our most esteemed citizens represent that group of Canadians. Their forebears, seeking homes in a new land, brought with them a love of freedom and a deep sense of purpose. To impose upon them any restriction on their desire to participate fully as citizens is to deny them the promise of this land of opportunity.

Finally, because we in western Canada represent a multi-racial group and have acquired a mutual respect for those of different racial origin, we have learned to live together not as hyphenated Canadians but as a mosaic comprising the cultures of many lands. We are not opposed to change or to recognizing the language rights of others. Our provincial governments have already recognized the special rights that our French speaking people enjoy under the constitution, and they have been going farther in recognizing that there may be unwritten rights to which they are entitled. This is being done in

a manner that will not impose a burden on our other groups. Throughout the years a tremendous fund of good will has been built up that is allowing this to happen. To impose at this time a bill of such a divisive nature into this climate of good will could very well destroy the purpose for which this bill is intended.

For that reason I oppose this bill unless it is first referred to the Supreme Court or is brought in as a proper amendment to our constitution.

**Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate on second reading of Bill C-120 I want first to protest against the false and misleading reporting of this stage of the legislative process by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It was stated on the C.B.C. news program, "The World At Eight", on Friday morning that this measure could perhaps receive approval in principle by second reading later that day, and I understand that this statement was repeated again this morning. I also noticed that this morning's issue of the *Globe and Mail,* I believe under Mr. Seale's by-line, also repeated this misinformation. After almost five months of operation under the new rules, surely the persons reporting the proceedings of this house should know that second reading merely allows the referral of legislation to a committee and nothing else. However, in view of the fact that most members of the newspaper editors' fraternity in Canada appear to consider this debate to be almost totally unnewsworthy, perhaps one should be thankful that at least the people's broadcasting system deigns to mention it more or less in passing if only in an inaccurate way.

I should first like to deal with some of the most glaring trouble spots in the bill. The first of these is clause 13 (1) which says that a bilingual district may vary in size between a census district and a school district. The important thing to note here is that census districts are established by the Governor in Council and therefore can be quite variable in themselves. It seems to me that this bill has been presented to the public on the basis that bilingual districts will roughly correspond to the boundaries of federal electoral divisions even though it has been represented that British Columbia will have no bilingual districts and there would only be a few in the prairie provinces and Atlantic Canada excluding, of course, New Brunswick.

One could also ask what is the necessity of the establishment of bilingual districts at all in view of the proposed amendments to clause 9. The difficulty here, of course, is in the words "significant demand" because this is another area that is totally subjective so far as the administration of this bill is concerned. It is in the area of administration that the real troubles will arise because, as has already been pointed out by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), the bill is in large part a purely administrative one and, apart from the clauses dealing with the administration of justice, does not give the federal government any new powers.

Many Canadians are already objecting to and are fearful of the emphasis being placed on bilingualism in the public service. One has only to refer to the comments of the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) for confirmation of this. It is my feeling that this bill will merely increase the emphasis rather than modify it or put it on a more rational and functional basis. I say this because I believe in bilingualism in the public service of Canada on a functional basis, but not in a totally bilingualized civil service. After all, what is the aim? I have always thought the aim to be that service should be provided in both languages. This does not mean that everyone must know both languages. It means that in any particular office or facility there should be one or more persons to serve the minority public in that area. However, everything about this bill seems to deny this reasonable policy, and on the contrary, implies an open-endedness that will force the provision of a bilingual service where it may not be desired or required. In this connection may I point to the fact that once established there is plenty of room for the expansion of bilingual districts but no provision for their abolition if, through the mobility of population, these same districts should no longer qualify for establishment as districts.

There is no provision for the desires of the residents to be heard. An advisory board is contemplated, but of what possible good is such a body if its members do not go out amongst the people actually affected by the board's opinion? Surely the board should reflect the opinions of the citizens concerned, or is this board to be just another haven for tired, worn-out Grits, another last chance for participatory democracy?

• (3:20 p.m.)

The opinion of the editor of the Ottawa *Citizen* notwithstanding—and here I refer to

his editorial of May 22—the provisions of the bill concerning the administration of justice are particularly offensive to any understanding of our constitution, which of course places the responsibility for the administration of justice on the provinces. In its original draft, which is all we have before us officially, the provisions contained in clause 11 are flagrantly unconstitutional. How can this parliament impose a duty on any provincial court? To attempt to do so is to fly directly in the face of the doctrine of the division of powers and the supremacy of parliament—doctrines which are basic to our constitution. I suggest that the proposed amendment to 11(4) does not in any way get around this objection because it does not remove the duty mentioned in subclause 1 from any of the criminal courts of the common law provinces—that duty being to receive or take evidence in either of the official languages, depending upon the request of the accused. Surely the only effective way of curing this fault would be to make subclause 4 apply to subclause 1 in full.

No matter what the government says about clause 11, Mr. Speaker, and in particular about the way in which the subclauses are interrelated, there is no doubt in my mind that subclause 4 does not have any effect on subclause 1 by the interposition of subclause 3, because it is merely permissive in nature. In my opinion this is of particular importance in view of the coyness of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) in suggesting that it would place him at a disadvantage if he were called upon to defend this bill before the Supreme Court of Canada if he were to reveal his constitutional authority now.

The House of Commons is the highest court in the land, whether the Minister of Justice knows it or not, and I believe the minister is in contempt of this court by refusing to behave in an adult and mature manner in this regard. One would almost think he fancies himself as a Perry Mason type of person, saving all his legal expertise to the last possible moment. Speaking of expertise, one thing which is evident about this bill is that no drafting expertise went into it at all.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn to the social implications of the bill. We have heard references made to melting pots and mosaics. Personally, I do not accept the melting pot theory as exemplified by the United States experience, as I believe the great significance of Canada is the tolerance displayed by the whole for its many parts. Of course, I speak as a member of that group of

[Mr. Schumacher.]

Canadians whose background is neither British nor French. It may be, therefore, that I do not feel any guilt for any of the alleged sins of my forebears because, quite frankly, I do not feel guilty about any injustices which either the French or British allege may have been perpetrated on them by the other group in the past. Perhaps it is because they lack this guilt feeling that the people of western and most of Atlantic Canada cannot be said to be exactly in love with this bill. In these parts of the country it is looked upon as a central Canadian solution to a central Canadian problem. The only objection is that it has national implications and national repercussions totally outside the ambit of the Dominion civil service.

If one wants to look, plenty of evidence can be found that the Dominion government continues to believe it has the constitutional right to abuse its spending power, as it did with medicare, to impose its ideas on language and culture on the individual provinces. It would be interesting to know what economic or money lever was applied to the new premier of Alberta, Mr. Harry Strom, popularly referred to as a nice guy, to quieten that province's official if not actual doubts about this measure—doubts which were so ably set out by the hon. E. C. Manning in his letter to the Prime Minister of October 29, 1968.

Apart from constitutional or social questions I believe this bill raises questions important to Canada's economic future. While it is glib to say one cannot put a price tag on bilingualism because, according to its proponents, they have a monopoly on ideas for nation saving, I submit that there certainly is a price tag involved.

I referred earlier to the melting pot theory. In my view this bill will go a long way toward the imposition of the melting pot theory in this nation but with two pots instead of just one. This is twice as bad as having one. The bill before us will merely serve to weaken both the French and English languages in this country. I have had English speaking proponents of the bill tell me that it is a good bill because it will help to break down the relative immobility of the French speaking population of Quebec and get them out into the English speaking ocean of 220 million North Americans where they will be swallowed up and assimilated.

A further aspect of this bill which has not been considered, apart from the tremendous cost, is the inefficiency which it will cause.

This will make Canada, as a nation, less competitive in the world marketplace. I would like to refer here to what G. A. Blackburn, the man responsible for the federal service language training program, had to say as reported in the Montreal *Star* for April 16, 1969. I am reading from the report.

Becoming bilingual through classroom teaching is impossible, says the man responsible for the language training program in the federal civil service.

A second language, G. A. Blackburn said here yesterday, can only be attained by one who is prepared to work on a full-time basis in a second linguistic and cultural milieu for a long period—a year or more.

The need for the second language is particularly doubtful in the technological and scientific fields. I would seriously ask why these areas of the public service are not specifically exempt from the operation of this bill because surely it must be apparent to everyone that the average Canadian has absolutely no contact with these areas of the government. I believe it is also true that the French language has now become quite inadequate in these areas. It certainly cannot be argued that it is necessary to impose compulsory bilingualism on scientific and technological personnel in order to carry out the stated aims of this bill or to preserve and strengthen the cultural fact of the French language in this country.

I would like to make reference to the question of representation abroad. It should be apparent to everyone that for the next decade at least, if present policies are continued, more and more of the public service will be made up of persons whose first language is French. This will be one of the facts of life, because it is impossible for the rest of Canada, bearing in mind the facilities we have and the fiscal resources available to us, to produce anywhere near enough bilingual persons whose first language is English. I would again like to refer here to the comments of Mr. Blackburn as reported in the Montreal *Star*:

He admitted, however, that in his opinion the truly bicultural person is virtually non-existent. Even the bilingual person was "at an enormous disadvantage if he has to do intellectual creative work in a second language."

Stressing the differences between bilingualism and biculturalism Mr. Blackburn pointed out that England and the United States may speak the same language but they form two distinct cultural groups.

"They have most words in common, but the words do not necessarily mean the same thing."

Since language reflected the background and the experience of the people, communication between two individuals was effective only when they were of the same culture or when each of them had a thorough understanding of the cultural background and experience of the other. "Failure to take this concept into consideration produces many translations which do not convey the intended message," Mr. Blackburn said.

He suggested that Canadian companies serving a clientele made up of both French and English "need a team representative of both cultures" with each member of the team "free to do his creative work in his own first working language."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the question has to be asked: should not some attempt be made to define "bilingual" in order to relieve against this problem, because most of our representation abroad is of necessity conducted in the English language? Is it not poor practice to have policies at home which require our representatives abroad to work primarily in their second language? Will this policy give us our most effective representation where, as a nation which must trade to live, our interest is so vital? In other words, Mr. Speaker, will this policy help sell our timber, pulp and paper, fish, wheat and oil, or will it be a hindrance?

• (3:30 p.m.)

I believe the thoughts of one J. W. Ritchie of Victoria, British Columbia, are appropriate here, as he expressed them in a letter to the editor published in the *Albertan* of May 20, 1969. He says:

As the government has brought the new official languages bill before the House of Commons, and as there seems to be every indication that some appointments in the civil service, the armed forces and other federal agencies, will depend on a bilingual qualification it is essential that the term "bilingual" is clearly defined. The above definitions—

These are some definitions of bilingualism set out at the beginning of the letter to which I did not refer.

—are from two recent editions of French dictionaries, published in Quebec and in Paris. Three contemporary English dictionaries mention or infer equal facility, or fluency in both languages.

Complete fluency in both official languages will not be easy to find in this country; we must accept a degree of difficulty with idioms, the construction of sentences and some grammatical errors in that language which is not our native tongue. The Canadian of French parents often retains an accent to a greater or lesser degree which indicates his upbringing and background. Similarly, most English Canadians who have been taught French do not develop a true accent. Limited vocabularies and different grammatical constructions compound the problems. If one uses French with an English accent, some grammatical errors, a limited vocabulary and a lack of familiarity with French idioms, speaking only as well as some of the French federal cabinet ministers stumble through their television interviews in English, is one bilingual?

*Official Languages*

True bilingualism would be most difficult to achieve in this country, but practical bilingualism must be defined in the official languages bill to be equally fair to those seeking appointments where bilingualism is considered essential, whether their native language is French or English. Proficiency must be based on a standard, clearly defined ability to communicate regardless of the mother tongue of the individual.

Perhaps the most important aspect of the problem is forbearance and sympathy to someone who is seeking assistance, advice or direction in that official language which is not his mother tongue.

The Minister of Justice has stated that it would be tragic for Canada if this bill were referred to the Supreme Court for a test of its constitutionality. All I can say is that it is almost criminal for the minister to be promoting this bill and legislation such as the omnibus Criminal Code bill at a time when large areas of this country are suffering from what is in fact an economic depression due to the non-existence of an effective or aggressive grain marketing policy and abysmally poor administration of the grain movement machinery, while other areas are suffering from abnormally high unemployment compounded by the problems of runaway inflation and an inadequate housing program. I say it is almost criminal for him to be diverting our attention from these problems when he has so little faith in the legality of what he is promoting. After all, what would be so tragic about the Supreme Court of Canada declaring that this bill is perfectly within the powers of the government of Canada? I am sure we would all feel a lot more comfortable if that statement were made.

Even if the bill were clearly constitutional, since it deals with language it should be in our constitution, in the same way as religion. If there is the support for this policy in the country that the Prime Minister believes there is, and if he has the mandate he alleges, why is he avoiding its implementation through entrenchment in the constitution? He has already passed up the February, 1969, constitutional conference, and he could have used the one that is going to be held within the month for this purpose. Why is he ignoring that method in favour of using his parliamentary majority to force his ideas on the country?

In my view the people of Canada did not give the Prime Minister a mandate for this legislation at all. This legislation is really based on the two-nations concept which the Prime Minister never tires of saying was rejected by the people of this country last June.

[Mr. Schumacher.]

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, I am not usually hesitant about entering a debate in the House of Commons, particularly on a controversial matter, but in this case I am. My reason is a fairly simple political one, namely, that I probably represent more French Canadians outside of the province of Quebec than anywhere else outside that province. The other day the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy) spoke on this measure, and I have been prompted to rise today because my interpretation of what has happened in that area over the years is considerably different from his. I had the opportunity of living in Timmins for many years. There are many people living in Timmins today who worked with me in the mines, having arrived in Canada from countries whose tongues were strange to that area. Many of these people now speak English with a broken accent. Many new Canadians came to the area from Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, the Ukraine, Hungary and many other countries, and they learned to speak our language very quickly because they had the obligation and the opportunity to do so.

The population of Timmins was a very heterogeneous one. People spoke their native tongue when they assembled, and I found Timmins a pretty good place to live because there was absolutely no discrimination on the part of anybody. It is interesting to note that the left wing and the right wing of each organization had its own hall and newspaper, but in the main the population of Timmins was fairly heterogeneous. Very little was said about language or religion, and very few were ever asked what was their ethnic origin.

I remember a survey carried out in a class that one of my children attended. According to that survey the largest ethnic group in the school, which I might point out was in the Italian section of the town, was Ukrainian, followed by English, Italian and French. Each of the following groups consisted of less than three pupils because there were only three Ukrainian children in the class. The teacher came from Africa and there were students from China, Japan and many European countries. I do not think the children found much of a problem in that area.

I worked for many years with these ethnic groups in Timmins and I found that their problems were identical with mine. They wanted more money. They wanted the boss to treat them better. They wanted a pension plan. These were the same things I and everybody else wanted. So in fact language

was not really the problem. If the hon. member for Timmins found things to be different, then I suggest that he made them different; it was not that they were different. I suggest that if you really want to find a problem you can always find one; otherwise there is no problem.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I am opposed to the attitude taken by a number of people in the province of Quebec, an attitude that is now spreading to Ontario and which I think will cause a great deal of grief to those sponsoring it. I refer to the establishment of unilingual French institutions in both Quebec and Ontario. If you go to a school in my area where French only is spoken, you have great difficulty in furthering your education. There are three institutions only to which you can go if you wish to take academic courses. But they are growing very rapidly and have too many students. Problems are developing in northern Ontario particularly because Laurentian University will not be enlarged quickly enough to admit all students seeking entry. I notice that the University of Ottawa has discussed this matter also. I read an article in the *Globe and Mail* saying that the university is not interested in becoming a unilingual institution but is happy to remain bilingual.

It is said that French speaking Canadians wish to remain unilingual in order to preserve their language and culture. Maybe that is correct; maybe it is not. English speaking people certainly do not have this attitude. I could, if I so wanted, include the letters U.E.L.—United Empire Loyalist—after my name. Seven or eight members here are United Empire Loyalists. It is therefore safe to say that English speaking Canadians are not of purely English descent in the sense in which our French speaking Canadians can trace an almost purely French descent. Our French speaking Canadians do not wish to belong to France but are conscious of their French heritage.

I was particularly impressed by the speeches of two hon. members, one of them being the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette). Over the years I have disagreed with his political views but I have always given him credit for representing the people of Quebec as I know them. He speaks for them, represents their aspirations, and when he says his constituents want to remain within the Canadian nation we should listen to him. If they are to be Canadians they cannot belong to another nation. That is the sense of his remarks, although the translation I heard may have been of doubtful quality. He has said in English that the people of his area are interested in the development of Canada as a nation. That means that there is not much separatism in his constituency.

When the Minister of Justice was presenting a number of amendments to this bill the other day the hon. member asked him if he was as well informed about the attitude of English speaking Canadians as he was about the attitude of French speaking Canadians, and the minister said he was not. At least, that is how I understood his answer. It is difficult for us to know really what French speaking Canadians are saying, and an election in Quebec will not make us wiser. Although two or three new parties will contest future elections in that province, we will not know how the people really think on this issue because each party represents a different point of view. The people there are divided on some issues, and this is part of the problem.

In some ways the present government is dangerous. The Prime Minister, who is an academic, puts Quebec first. That has been his attitude for many years, I believe, and that has been the attitude of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) and, no doubt, of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). Everyone is entitled to his position and I am condemning no one for taking sides on this very emotional and contentious question. But it is dangerous for these persons to take such a stand because no one is really clear about some of the things Quebec desires.

In my constituency there are some French speaking communities whose members are interested in exactly those things that interest all English speaking Canadians. French speaking farmers want exactly what English speaking farmers want. Last night I attended a meeting with French speaking and English speaking farmers. Both linguistic groups were concerned about a provincial Department of Highways program which was taking land from their farms. They all had exactly the same problems and faced them in exactly the same way.

I am afraid of the discrimination this legislation may promote in this country. The Prime Minister said that even elevator operators would need to be bilingual. Perhaps elevator operators need to know how to say "good morning" or "good afternoon" in both languages, but that is about as far as it goes.

If an operator is surly he need say nothing. Printed instructions and directions could be nailed to the sides of elevators, and no one would have to ask the operator for directions. In any event, it may not be a good idea to talk too much in elevators. People talking in the elevators may be slowing the service in the parliament buildings. I make these comments because some employees in Ottawa are worried about recent government actions.

In my constituency there are several communities in which French is spoken predominantly, although most of the people can speak and understand English. These people do not live in a ghetto. I mention these communities because I am pleased to see that the minister has recognized in the amendments he introduced how necessary it is to prevent the establishment of French speaking ghettos. In any event, establishing linguistic ghettos in this country would run counter to the spirit of the recommendations of the B and B report. When I visited Lac St. Jean recently and had a chance to refresh and enjoy myself I found no difficulty in communicating with the inhabitants. Therefore, why should ghettos be set up? It is unreasonable to expect older people to learn a second language. I have a neighbour who is French speaking and is proud to be French. She said to me at once, "You know, I was lucky to be born French." When I asked her why, she said, "Because I was forced to learn French. If I had not been forced I never would have learned it." Strange to say, her little son is doing poorly at school in French, finding it difficult to master.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The Minister of Justice mentioned another criterion which struck me as being very odd. I would like to see it pursued when the bill reaches the committee stage. The minister named a number of Canadian universities and gave the number of graduates who had made applications for employment by the Civil service. The figures indicate there is employment in the civil service for university graduates. The minister should have mentioned how many of these positions carried a restriction of bilingualism. I would like Canada to be a bilingual nation but it is stupid to suggest that by tomorrow this country will be bilingual.

The government should change its attitude toward the constitution. The manpower service got more deeply involved in federal aid to education under program 5. When the present Minister of Regional Economic Expansion joined the cabinet the program was scrapped. The education now provided by the provinces in this field is not nearly as satisfactory. The federal government should decide what education is required for the jobs available.

If the provinces are interested in establishing bilingual education, the federal government should make money available for this project. The government could start realistically providing opportunities for bilingual jobs in the civil service in 15 years' time when these students are qualified to do these jobs, but most persons trained in Ontario in the last 15 years are not capable of being bilingual. They may do as well as some of our deputy ministers who were trained at a cost of $45,000 but they will still follow the normal procedure of translating from one language to the other.

The Secretary of State says that federal education is unconstitutional and cannot be done. If the provinces were approached by the federal government with an offer to pay for bilingual education, I believe it would be accepted. When it is economically feasible, children of ethnic backgrounds should have an opportunity of learning more than two languages. When the government makes certain jobs available to bilingual people only, this is discrimination. If the federal government does not enter into some arrangement with the provinces to provide bilingual education, it will be discriminating against 85 to 90 per cent of our population.

The Minister of Justice stated he was in favour of the federal government providing financial assistance for bilingual education, but more than that is required. There must be an interest on the part of the Canadian people. Not all Canadians will be able to learn a second language. Some may even object to it. Most of us have prejudices of one kind or another. A child six years of age will have less prejudice than at 25 years of age. This is why it is important that bilingual education must begin in kindergarten. I suggest that four classes a day could be taught in one language and four in the other.

I strongly oppose the idea of hanging on to the province of Quebec as just a sop. When I say this I am speaking of the province and not of the people of that province. I am not in favour of the government making concessions merely to save its own skin. I have enough faith in the people of Quebec to know they will make up their own minds when the time comes. I suggest their decision will be based

on economic reasons. Those who want to separate Quebec from Canada suggest taking away the family allowance and other advantages. It is not necessary to discriminate against the rest of the country because of the province of Quebec. I do not know their attitude toward bilingualism, but I imagine they think the matter is being handled in a ridiculous manner. French speaking Canadians do not believe that bilingualism will really be put in effect. They feel it is not true bilingualism and are therefore not interested. English speaking Canadians will not be interested if their jobs are going to be in jeopardy.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) made some very good pronouncements respecting labour in the last few months. I am sure the minister agrees that a man is being violently discriminated against if jobs that might be available to him are not red-circled. His ability to develop six hands or four legs will be curtailed. Until a creature with four legs is available that job should be red-circled or everyone who does not have four legs will be discriminated against. This also applies to linguistic ability which cannot be developed overnight. If this legislation does not provide red-circle protection for jobs that require particular training, there will be discrimination that will apply to 75 per cent of the civil servants.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I believe that the federal government can make Canada a bilingual country. The only difference between us and the Americans is the Johnny Canuck atmosphere that we have maintained through the Don Messer show, the maple syrup jamborees, the Quebec Carnival. These are the kind of things that make us different from the Americans. Most of us feel proud of the image presented by the plaid shirts and the steel-capped boots of the lumberjacks. We have gained considerably from it.

I would be very surprised if any member of parliament disagreed with the theory that we should start bilingual education in kindergarten for future generations. I am sure that many members of parliament, and there are many who share some of my prejudices and have others of their own, would support this legislation if they were not certain it was going to move Hull into Ottawa and displace many of the English speaking people now working in Ottawa. This is the fear of many people. For some reason not many of my English speaking friends are bilingual. The only people who are truly bilingual are the French speaking who have learned English. Thus we are faced with a major problem regarding employment in the federal civil service. I do not know that any of the senior English speaking officials are bilingual.

I am surprised at the attitude of some Liberal members with regard to some of the things that were accomplished in the past. It was not much to put bilingualism on cheques, but some laughed at the former prime minister because his regime accomplished that. I only wish they would stop to think of how things were when I first came to parliament. That is not long ago but even then, when a French Canadian stood up and spoke French in the house nobody listened, and it was four or five days later before his speech in French was printed in *Hansard*. Until the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) introduced the simultaneous translation system a French person did not speak in this house in French because by the time his speech was translated the debate was over.

Credit should be given for that action. It was an advance in communication. The reason I pay attention to my Social Credit friends who do not speak English is that now I can understand what they are saying. These have been worth-while steps. But no one should be of the opinion that we have to take all the steps at one time or we are not doing anything. Credit should be given where credit is due, and I am pleased to say that my experience shows there has been great tolerance shown in Canada to people of various ethnic backgrounds who came to this country. The only part of my ancestry that did not have any problem in coming to Canada contributed the small percentage of Indian blood that I have in me, but even those Indians of an earlier era would have felt out of place anywhere else except in the small territory they knew.

There are emotional reasons why some people can support this bill wholeheartedly and others cannot. If its only purpose is to create division, to give advantage to a particular group, we should not support that position. I also suggest that any government that hides behind the constitution and does not have the guts to stimulate bilingual education with federal support, direction and encouragement is being dishonest in sponsoring and passing this limited type of legislation. This legislation will make it very difficult for all adults today who speak only one language, and for all children going to school today in areas where bilingual educational facilities are not

available. Many of the people who have not supported this bill wholeheartedly have taken that stand because of their prejudice, but many of them have indicated that their children are going to schools where they will gain the advantage of becoming bilingual.

When my children were available for summer work they did not work in Ontario. They worked in Quebec. I have one son who worked in Quebec for four summers. When he went there to work on a job with 40 or 50 men, only the cook and the foreman could understand him in English. Surprisingly, after he worked there four summers everybody could understand him in English but he could not understand them very well in French. They had all learned English but he had not been able to learn French. So I sent another son to work in Quebec, and as he had learned his French in school he spent most of his time correcting their grammar. But at least we have made the effort. I am sure many people are willing to make the effort on behalf of their children and grandchildren.

However, these same people are disillusioned by a government that introduced this type of legislation out of bias and prejudice without simultaneously introducing legislation giving bilingual opportunities to all Canadians. I hope that before long the Minister of Justice will have his way in cabinet. I am sure the Minister of Labour and a number of his other English speaking colleagues will support that position and provide an opportunity whereby the provinces can take advantage of federal assistance to establish a bilingual educational system for all their people. I strongly urge the government to explore the possibilities of supplying the kind of financial assistance that will allow the provinces to make bilingual education an accomplished fact in all of Canada.

**Mr. Barney Danson (York North):** Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), and I too would be upset if the spirit of this bill were that all this was being done for the province of Quebec. In my opinion, sir, this is something that we are doing for ourselves, for all of Canada. I think it is a milestone in the development of our country and an indication of our maturity.

As the hon. member said, it brings out a certain amount of tension, some of it based on prejudice, but most of it based on a determination to make this country work. There is a degree of sensitivity, which I think is understandable and healthy, between the two main language groups because we are being sensitive of one another and to one another, and this is a natural part of the whole process as we grow and mature.



This bill recognizes the basic duality of our country, and this is fundamental to our future progress. At the same time we cannot forget what is sometimes called the third force which emphasizes the multi-cultural of our country. I believe that in making this conscious decision to recognize our duality, to respect our differences, to respect differences in language and culture, we are enlarging our horizons so that we can also respect those from many other backgrounds who make up the great mosaic of Canada.

Those of us whose antecedents came to this country from other lands, other cultures, from eastern Europe and other parts of the world, must realize that they came here because of the type of country it was, built basically by the French and English and further enriched by those of other cultures. They created a land good to live in and good to come to. Our future cannot be determined by what was really a minor battle on the Plains of Abraham between two rather inept generals who managed to get themselves killed. It must be based on a Canada as it exists today, not as we would like it to be but as it exists, and this is the reality of the situation.

• (4:10 p.m.)

In that sense this bill is basic to our national fabric, and on that basis I think it is of highest priority. Though I might question comparing this priority with other national and urgent needs which are not mutually exclusive, it is fundamental to our development. Like the rules of this house, I do not think it can be force-fed. This is not something that can be imposed upon the people. It has to be done basically by consensus and understanding with the realization that this is for our own good and the betterment of the entire country.

The greatest possible danger lies in the destructive narrowness of prejudice for political purposes. The latent emotionalism involved here could be inflamed by demagogues to their discredit. This could appear while they tear their parties and conceivably this nation apart. But these same tensions can be healthy tensions, these same emotions healthy emotions, helping to bring us together.

I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in his opening address in this debate deserves credit for his reasonable

approach based, I am sure, on honest instincts. As I said, there is a high degree of emotionalism, some of which is healthy, much of which is based on friendship—friendship with individuals—and some based on a love of this country as it is, as it has been, and what we hope it to be.

I have lived in Quebec, where I brought my bride from England. I have fought side by side with French speaking citizens of this country during the war. My brigade was a half French speaking union of Le Régiment de la Chaudière and the North Shore New Brunswick Regiment. I have joined in the political activity of this country, as well as in business and private life, with our French speaking compatriots. I have done these things with men with names such as Métivier of St. Damien de Bellechasse, Lainesse of St. Hyacinthe, Tessier of Toronto, Létourneau of Montreal, Beaudoin of Valcourt, Leclaire of Granby, and Huel of Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan. Like the hon. member for Timiskaming, my children have worked on the roads and in the factories of Quebec. They too have very close friendships and certainly we are all proud of these friendships.

Today I serve with men like Pilon, Laniel, Clermont and Dr. Isabelle, and under men like Pepin, Marchand, Pelletier and Trudeau. I serve also with men across the chamber such as Caouette and Latulippe. Perhaps I do not agree with them all the time. But I respect them and the quiet dedication of the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin), with whom we all mourned in his recent tragic loss. To be unemotional in such circumstances would be less than human, but anything that lessens such associations I oppose with all my vigour and anything that brings us closer together I cherish and revere, and I will fight continuously for these things in this house.

While this bill represents a milestone it also represents opportunities not suggested in the bill itself. It represents an opportunity for mutual enrichment, for dignity and for a distinctive Canadianism. I was rather interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Témiscamingue. We think of ourselves as a nation and are respected as a people throughout the world. We have this great magnetic force in that great nation to the South whose people are our great friends, allies and business partners. Yet there is something special about being a Canadian. We have rejected the melting pot tradition they have adopted, and maybe this is a natural evolution in view of the fact that our great immigration took place after theirs.

In my own area of Toronto, which is a great centre of massive immigration to this country, there is no thought of calling people names based on their origin, as happened in pre-war times. We used to comment on their accents, but today we take pride in their existence here. We enjoy the opportunities which exist for mutual enrichment and we enjoy their traditions, their restaurants, their churches and their parties. This is a shrinking world because of modern transportation where by people of this country can be in another country or another continent or environment in a matter of hours.

We must always remember the advantages that may accrue to us as a result of bilingualism. This may not be true of many of us, but many of our children will become bilingual and many will become trilingual as a result of the language of their parents. This will not only make us a favored people as world citizens but more favoured in this country. It will be of assistance to our economy in the world, and our children welcome this bill.

The people I have spoken to across this country from east to west have certain reservations for themselves in this regard but no reservations for their children. I have yet to meet a teenager—a schoolboy or schoolgirl—who does not welcome this as an opportunity. These are the ones we are really working and talking for today.

In the short time I have been here I have found that progress comes slowly. It is important, however, that we continue to make progress in view of the opportunities that we have. We think of the opportunities for travel our children have as a result of the supersonic and jumbo jets now coming. Our children will spend their weekends or vacations in various areas of the world. We must remember the advantages our children will have in speaking another language when visiting other parts of the world. This will be of tremendous advantage to them.

I must say in passing that if the future unity of this country was dependent on my ability to speak the French language we would be in deep trouble. I will be taking a total immersion course beginning next week and I fear I may drown, but I hope that following it I will be more conversant with this language. At least we are trying. Many members of this house are making an effort, and this is very important.

These great things will not happen as a result of the passing of this bill, but by surpassing this bill. The conscious decision that we should accept this as a fact of Canadian life and as one of the advantages and enrichments of life in this country sets the stage for future development. This is not going to happen immediately, as I said. It might not happen in our lifetime. We may not see bilingualism during our time, but hopefully we will see progress to the point that in another generation 20 per cent of the non-French speaking population will be bilingual. Perhaps in still another generation there will be a 50 per cent improvement over the situation as it is now. This conscientious decision we make now sets the stage for the future.

This decision will require patience and tolerance not only on the part of the English speaking but also on the part of the French speaking people. We often think we are the ones being asked to show tolerance, but I believe there is another side to that coin. If we show determination and sensitivity we will enjoy progress. There are those within the province of Quebec and outside that province who want to see change overnight. I do not think any reasonable person in any part of the country expects that to happen.

This whole change could be endangered by carelessness and intemperance within and outside the House of Commons, statements on this side of the house as well as on the other side, by backbenchers as well as frontbenchers. There is sometimes a brittleness involved in our approach to this matter which we should avoid at all costs.

We must make the right choice and adopt the right attitude not only for ourselves but primarily for the new generation. We must think in the future without reaching into the past. Talk of 100 years of oppression is no more constructive than talking of 100 years of introversion. It is mutual respect, mutual interest and mutual opportunity such as is being shown at this time which should motivate us. We are dealing now with the basic rules of the game. The rules of the game combined with wise government and the implementation of this type of thought can weld us into a vital and unique nation. We must develop a nation that utilizes the very best within us and utilizes all of us to the maximum of our potential. We must develop a nation where by mutual affection, respect and enrichment, with sensitivity and determination, we can set an example for our future generations and an example for other nations to emulate.

[Mr. Danson.]

• (4:20 p.m.)

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I tell you frankly that I had not expected to participate today in the debate. I have been absent for two or three days because of a little trouble with my throat, and I intended today to listen to the eloquence of other members while preparing myself for the opportunity to make whatever contribution I can to the assurance that Canada's unity shall be preserved and maintained.

I intend to deal with this bill with compassion and tolerance and, above all, with a recognition that only in unity can we preserve this nation and assure that its destiny will be attained. I shall make some very serious criticisms of the bill. There is one portion of it that has not been dealt with which requires to be thoroughly examined, namely, that concerning the appointment of a commissioner, a course of action which on the basis of an examination of the clauses of the bill before the house will constitute an abrogation of parliament beyond anything that has taken place in any generation in our country excepting during the days of war. I shall come to that in due course.

I am sorry that on an occasion when we have a bill before the house that is described as one that will preserve confederation, the house is honoured to have present only four members of the cabinet.

**Mr. Horner:** There are only 14 members on that side.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** To me this does not indicate that degree of responsibility which the house and the country have the right to expect from the government. I would be unjust if I did not immediately pay a tribute to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) for the manner in which he presented the amendments to the bill, which up to that moment was the most unusual bill in all history. It was a bill full of clauses, with none of us knowing which ones were going to die during the period of the sittings of the committee.

On the other hand, I must say that the attitude of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) deserves particular reference and will receive it. He travelled through western Canada. He has spoken abroad. He has been a travelling member of this cabinet to a degree that even among all the other travelling, peripatetic members has achieved for him a preferred position. He went to western Canada. The speeches that he made were not designed to be beneficial to Canadian unity.

They were abrasive, provocative; they were filled with all the arguments that one has heard through the years from those who have opposed everything about English Canada. His idea of responsibility as Secretary of State was set out in a speech delivered in Montreal on October 28 when he said:

> I personally hope to make the Department of the Secretary of State the department whose mission it is to protect French speaking minorities which are, moreover, the most numerous and the most underprivileged at the present time.

I cannot accept that. I think one of the major reasons for difficulty in the province of Quebec has been the failure of this nation to assure a reasonable degree of economic benefit and welfare. Now, when these people say, "Give us action", we have the Prime Minister flying a kite that baby bonuses are going to be reduced, removed or in part obliterated. I do not understand the philosophy of this government.

The other day the minister denied a quotation made by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). He said he had never seen it; it was not in his record and it was not in his speech. I have the speech here. Charles Lynch in his column in the press pointed out that what the member quoted the minister as having said was right, entirely and completely.

**Mr. Pelletier:** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. The Secretary of State has risen on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Pelletier:** Mr. Speaker, I have to say that part of the responsibility for the right hon. member being misled and Mr. Lynch being misled—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That is no question of privilege.

**Mr. Pelletier:** —rests with a translator. I never spoke the words actually, and the translation is wrong. I can establish that at any time.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I did not put out the translation, Mr. Speaker; it was put out by the Secretary of State. Isn't this something! He is now caught deceiving parliament and says it was in the translation that the mistake took place. Let us read what he actually said.

**An hon. Member:** Read it in French.



**Mr. Diefenbaker:** With all the evasiveness and all the backtracking, surely from the heights of Olympian wisdom he does not think parliament will be fooled by such an explanation. The minister put out the speech; he put out the translation. I would like to hear a better explanation than that, because I have the document here. It is headed "Notes for a speech given by the honourable Gérard Pelletier before l'Association Canadienne Française du Manitoba, December 7". Yet the other day in the House of Commons the Secretary of State denied this in words that cannot be misunderstood when he said:

> On a question of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. The text of this speech exists. I can hand it over to the hon. member and he will not find the words he has just quoted.

Then he said:

> I do not know from what he is quoting. These were not improvised remarks.

He wants us to believe that the translation put out by his own department, dealing with metaphysical things, was wrong. I suggest that with the staff he has at his command, and with his knowledge of English, the explanation he has just given will receive the attention it deserves. In the same speech he also said:

> We intend to restore full citizenship rights to the two linguistic majorities.

What are the lost citizenship rights that are going to be restored? Restoration implies existence, usage and alteration. I would like to hear him clear that up when he speaks. He said again on another occasion, "We will restore full citizenship rights". He also produced that old chestnut that he used during the days of war—I will not quote him any more unless he wishes to challenge me—when he spoke about the siege mentality of French Canada as a result of the attitude of the rest of Canada. I never saw that siege mentality. French Canadians have served during both the first and second world war with distinction and greatness. What does siege mentality mean? Was that designed to be tolerant and objective?

• (4:30 p.m.)

He has been known to be the sworn enemy of anything in our country that is in the British tradition. That has been his attitude throughout. Do you know what he calls it? He has one of these intellectual words for it. He calls it "euthanasia". He says there are things

we should not have around that are like certain structures that have outlived their usefulness. So the best solution is euthanasia. That is the explanation for his attitude to our British traditions. That is the explanation of the attitude which he has toward those who believe in the monarchy which gave to French Canada under the British Crown, and before it was in any way the Crown of Canada, equality of religion. When it was denied in the United Kingdom it was given by the Crown in Canada in 1775, and those people who but 20 years before had found themselves under a different monarch saved Canada for the British Crown in 1776. We see all the time this whittling away and cutting away at British traditions while we hear such phrases as "let us be tolerant, let us be reasonable".

I have here another statement which he will say was translated incorrectly. This is really a phrase which caps them all from a department from which translations have become untranslatable. It is a Museums of Canada press release entitled "Aboriginal Art". It reads:

> A magnificent exhibition of Canadian aboriginal art will go on display at the Musée de l'Homme in Paris on March 25—
>
> Canada will be represented by an official party headed by Secretary of State Gérard Pelletier who will open the exhibition. The party will include both Canadian and French cabinet ministers.

Was that wrongly translated? The silence gives the answer.

I wish the presentation had been made by the Minister of Justice. As I said a moment ago, he knows parliament. He does not look down from the heights of ivory towers on ordinary human beings. He meets parliament as parliament should be met. The Minister of Justice presented his case and the house listened. I am not in agreement with several of the arguments he made, but he treated parliament as though it was parliament, not as though it was a place in which to be taught of the new Canada.

We are dealing with this matter at a time when there are economic problems facing Canada the like of which we have not faced. Yet our time is taken up by the government of Canada with homosexuality, abortions, and now with this bill, a large portion of which has already been carried into effect long before it was ever brought before the House of Commons.

The same thing is happening all over Canada. There is the most callous disregard of western Canada by this government. They



laughed at western Canada when the Prime Minister said: "What do you expect me to do, sell wheat?" The wheat piles up. The position of farmers today has never been worse since the darkest days of the drought and lowest world prices. The government tells us, "Just give us time. We are thinking about it. We are waiting for a report from someone." They do not know what the western farmer wants. This is how serious the situation is. This is what was written in the latest issue of the *Western Producer:*

> We charge the Trudeau government with callous neglect of the problems of the farming industry, particularly in the prairie region. Action should have been taken weeks ago, at least on such policies as might have provided farmers with a few clues as to how to carry on and what to grow. There was enough evidence to justify such action, long before the agricultural committee toured the west, but the opportunity has been missed.
>
> There are, of course, possible moves that will be of some help to some farmers. But unless something is done quickly the ruination of thousands of farmers is a certainty.

While the farmers are in this situation the government produces a bill that, so far as the bilingual portions of it are concerned, had been put into effect all along the line before it ever received consideration from parliament. Think of the old soldiers, commissionaires, who were thrown out. Think of those who, having served for years in the civil service, stand in deep fear.

A budget has been promised for the beginning of June. The resolutions based on the last budget have not been put before the house and the government has been unlawfully exacting taxation for all these months. What manner of people are they? Are these our masters? There are two or three of them who understand parliament, and two of them are in the front row now. Some of the others do not. I will not restrict it to those two, but they happen to be in the front seats, and there are only three others so it would not take very long to gather who they are by elimination.

Surely the government must bear the yoke of responsibility for its failure to act. It is taxing illegally month after month and now it is getting ready for another budget. We are getting them so often now it is difficult to say which is which, particularly when those which have been introduced have not yet been passed. My point is that this bill was not needed and that the government has played fast and loose with the introduction of measures that have not received any support from parliament.

I will not attempt to cover any of the ground that has been covered. One of the benefits of being in bed is that you have time to read everything and you know all the arguments that have been advanced. I do not intend to repeat them except for the apologia of the Minister of Justice on whether or not this bill as a whole is unconstitutional. He said: "It is constitutional, the Prime Minister says it is." On the other side there is that former Liberal minister, Mr. Thorson, an apostle of Liberalism through the years who occupied the second highest position in the judiciary of Canada and who says it is unconstitutional. What does the minister say to that? He says: "It is not. Pierre says it isn't. Why should we go to the courts? Why should the matter be submitted to the courts? Language is a matter of politics, not law." But the right to language is a matter of law under the constitution, and the reason they have gone about it in this way to bring in a bill which is not what the B and B Commission recommended—that institution has had $8 million worth of sittings and came out with the recommendation that there should be a constitutional amendment—is that they could not get such an amendment.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I do not know who the person was—and I would not think of looking around, even to one who does not pay attention to what is being said—but I have come to the conclusion that whoever produced certain portions of this bill must have had a wide knowledge of Machiavelli.

I intend to deal for a few moments with the major portion of this bill, the clauses dealing with the commissioner, that is to say, clauses 19 to 34. Somebody asked me: What is the principle of this bill? Mr. Speaker, the principle of this bill is the coercion and intimidation which can be practiced by this man who will occupy the position of commissioner—I was about to say commissar. But no commissar was ever given greater powers than this commissioner is to receive.

He is to be "the Commissioner of Official Languages for Canada, hereafter called 'the Commissioner'." That was the recommendation of the B and B Commission. He was to be an ombudsman with the conscience of Canada in his possession. Well, if they had appointed a man like that I could not have any objection. But let us see what his powers are to be. It will be interesting to see who will be recommended, because there has been a search on. It would not be hard to find a person here who has a dictatorial bent, to assume the post provided the salary is as promised. Let us examine the way in which the appointment will be made and how it is to come about.

The bill says that the appointment shall be made by parliament. And that is the end of everything. When parliament appoints him, the belief will be held among the people that, after all, his position will be like that of the Auditor General who, incidentally, does not enjoy a very high reputation in Liberal circles as a result of some of the findings he has made. This man will have powers the like of which have never been given to anyone before. Parliament is to appoint him, provided he does the job the Secretary of State wants him to do. Then the Secretary of State, or the government on the recommendation of an order in council, may remove him during the period in which parliament is not sitting and appoint someone else for a period of six months.

> In the event of the death or resignation of the Commissioner while Parliament is not sitting or if he is unable or neglects to perform the duties of his office, the Governor in Council . . . may appoint a temporary commissioner—

Is this man going to enjoy independence, Mr. Speaker? Can you imagine the Secretary of State, with that beneficient attitude he has shown, saying to this man: "We do not agree with what you are doing but we are going to keep you on"? There is a right to replace him at any time between sessions.

What will his powers be? This is tremendously interesting, too. He may appoint such officers as he deems proper and fitting, provided he has the consent of the Treasury Board. He can appoint temporary staff without the approval of anyone. He will be all-powerful and completely independent, except that if he does not act in the way the government wishes, out he goes.

I must quote to you, Mr. Speaker, what the Prime Minister had to say regarding this man and the way in which he is to carry out his duties. The right hon. gentleman said: "He has to look after not only the law but the spirit and the intent." Well, when you begin to get into these spiritual fields, that is far beyond the law. This official will become the grand inquisitor of the realm. At his own discretion—and I shall refer in a few moments to the clauses themselves so that those who have not looked at them may begin to see something of what this powers are—he may launch into the widest of investigations. He may investigate any government department

or agency of the government, the R.C.M.P., the army—or the Canadian Armed Forces; I do not know whether it will be necessary to be completely bilingual in order to serve in the Canadian army once this bill has been accepted. He has sole discretion. How many of you appreciate that parliament itself can be investigated by him? At this sole discretion he may investigate the administration of parliament itself. That is in the bill. He is authorized to enter any person's office, or the offices of any department or Crown corporation or agency under the authority of parliament or under the administrative authority of the Speaker.

One would think these powers were wide enough, since he can do virtually anything. But the bill says, in addition, that the commissioner may carry out such other assignments and engage in such other activities as may be authorized by the Governor in Council beyond the powers and duties specified in the bill. What is the idea of this? What dictator could ask for more than these powers which are being sought from the parliament of the people? At his sole discretion the commissioner may regulate the procedure to be followed in carrying out investigations. He may disclose in his reports only such matters as he alone decides shall be disclosed. Sir, such powers have never at any time been asked for previously. Those opposite have not had the effrontery to do so. I can understand now why it was not the Minister of Justice who introduced this bill.

There are other clauses here to which I should like to refer. There is the clause which gives the power to investigate parliament. Let us get ready to make a salaam to this almighty voice we are setting up in this legislation. Remember, you are all asked to vote for this; you are all to get down and say yes to this legislation in the interest of Canadian unity. It does not matter what we give away; we must support this bill because if we do not the Secretary of State will say we are bigots.

Let me go on. It says this:

> The Commissioner shall investigate any complaint made to him to the effect that in a particular instance or case the status of an official language was not or is not being recognized or the spirit and intent of this act was not or is not being complied with—

> If, in the course of investigating any complaint it appears to the Commissioner that having regard to all the circumstances of the case any further investigation is unnecessary he may in his discretion refuse to investigate the matter further.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Here is one; when we read of Mr. Justice Stewart's judgment the day before yesterday, in which he dealt with the legislature of Ontario, we find it is child's play compared with this. The next provision is:

• (4:50 p.m.)

> Where the Commissioner decides to refuse to investigate or cease to investigate any complaint, he shall inform the complainant of his decision and may, if he thinks fit, give his reasons therefor.

This man is being put upon a pedestal. He may be removed by joint resolution of parliament, yes; but which of the members supporting the government of Canada would ever vote for his removal, no matter what he did? He becomes the "Charlie McCarthy" for the minister, who will be the head of this particular phase of our development. We know that the minister is the Secretary of State because the government wants somebody who understands everything but parliament.

That provision includes the words "if he thinks fit". People used to complain about the Star Chamber, but we will have no cause to complain at all if we vote in favour of this legislation.

The next provision is:

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

How many members have read the powers that we will be handing away, however estimable the objective and generally acceptable? Then, clause 28 (2) provides:

> It is not necessary for the Commissioner to hold any hearing and no person is entitled as of right to be heard by the Commissioner—

And hon. members are going to vote for this! How many of them have read the major portion of this bill? The provisions to which I have just referred indicate that, however thick the gloss that has been put on the bill, its principle is that of coercion. Let me read on. After the Commissioner has made his mind up, it is provided:

> —he shall, before completing the investigation, take every reasonable measure to give to that individual, department or institution a full and ample opportunity to answer any adverse allegation or criticism—

So first the Commissioner finds a person or a department guilty and then he says: "I want to be fair; I should like to hear your side of the story." I ask hon. members whether they are going to grant him such powers.

Then in order to make it possible for him to expand beyond all limits, though I cannot

think of any additional powers that he would ask for, it is provided:

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

Clause 30 provides:

The Commissioner has . . . power

(a) to summon and enforce the attendance of witnesses and compel them to give oral or written evidence on oath—

The Commissioner is not satisfied with that because he is then given power—

—to receive and accept such evidence and other information whether by oath or by affidavit or otherwise as in his discretion he sees fit—

What manner of men are these who produced this document? The Commisioner may receive evidence under oath or not under oath. Even when he has evidence under oath he is able to take into consideration outside information which he may get and use that information in coming to a determination. Mr. Justice Spence of the Supreme Court of Canada must have been taken as the example for the exercise of the powers of the Commissioner.

Not satisfied with that, Mr. Speaker, clause 31 provides:

This section applies where, after carrying out any investigation under this act, the Commissioner is of the opinion that an act or omission that was the subject of the investigation is or was or appears to be or have been

(a) contrary to the provisions of this act;—

That I can understand.

(b) contrary to the spirit and intent of this act but in accordance with the provisions of any other act of the Parliament of Canada—

This would mean that even though a department of government were acting pursuant to an act passed by this parliament and in effect, the Commissioner could repudiate and condemn action taken. Hon. members are being asked to vote for this provision. This kind of thing cannot be justified. I do not care on which side of the house an hon. members sits: those regulations deny the fundamental rights of an individual and can only lead to witch-hunts across this country of such magnitude that McCarthy would appear almost a novice by comparison—and he certainly is an unlamented memory.

Clause 33 (2) provides:

The Commissioner may disclose in any report made by him under this section such matters as in his opinion ought to be disclosed in order to establish the grounds for his conclusions and recommendations—

In other words, the Commissioner does not include in his report anything with which he does not agree; that power is his. I can just visualize this cabinet when it met. The Minister of Justice had gone through western Canada and had spoken with the various Attorneys General. I do not know how they do it, but the press always seem to know what is going on, and they reported that there was an awful fight in cabinet. Finally, the Secretary of State agreed to some amendments. The amendments that the Minister of Justice placed before this house were as nothing. They were minor and unimportant and may only serve to convince some of the provinces that invasion of their rights so far as courts are concerned is ended.

The next provision I wish to refer to is clause 34 (3) which reads:

The Commissioner may, instead of making a separate report to Parliament . . . include such report in his annual statement to Parliament . . . unless, in his opinion, the nature of the report is such that it ought to be brought to the attention of Parliamen without delay.

Finally, clause 35 provides:

The Governor in Council may make such regulations as he deems necessary to effect compliance with this act in the conduct of the affairs of the Government of Canada and departments and agencies of the Government of Canada.

This bill places in the hands of a commissioner who will be the puppet of the government the power to do all these things. If the commissioner does not do these things to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State, then as long as parliament is not sitting somebody else may be substituted. Somebody might ask: Do you think they would really do that? Well, I have just read what the Prime Minister said at his press conference, as reported in the *Ottawa Journal* of October 17. The Prime Minister was asked what would happen if an English speaking civil servant said he was unwilling to learn French. As reported in the press the Prime Minister said:

• (5:00 p.m.)

We'd say fine . . . We'll keep you running elevators where there are no French Canadians.

It is said that the Prime Minister made this comment frivolously. Under the laws of evidence, and we follow the British common law, ejaculations are always taken as evidence, even when they are hearsay, as indicative of the thinking of the person making them.

Some one asked what would happen if the commissioner does not act properly. Well, the

Prime Minister said his commissioner should go about things "discreetly". How could anyone be discreet with powers like these? Any of the saints with these powers could not help abusing them. The press report goes on to say that if discretion fails to produce results the government will have to move in to correct the state of affairs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the right hon. gentleman but his time has expired.

**Some hon. Members:** Carry on.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Does the house give unanimous consent.

**An hon. Member:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Papineau.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ouellet:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** The hon. member for Papineau on a point of order.

**Mr. Ouellet:** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all young Canadians who are fed up with that kind of speech that have been served to them for several years, I object to the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) carrying on such a despicable speech.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

**Mr. Ouellet:** He used his time giving us a vaudeville show, but the show is over.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Nesbitt:** There is the commissioner.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, since there is objection I will not go ahead. Not for all the world would I think of shocking the finer sensibilities of the hon. gentleman. Does he object?

**Mr. Ouellet:** I object.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, though I disagree with much of the right hon. gentleman's speech I think, considering his experience in this house and his former position as Prime Minister of this country, that the house might grant him unanimous consent to finish his remarks.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.



[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ouellet:** I have already registered my objection and I wish to repeat it.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. There is not unanimous consent.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That is fine. They cannot take it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. The Chair recognizes the hon. member for Red Deer.

**Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of my remarks may I remind the hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) that the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), when he was Prime Minister, introduced into this chamber facilities for simultaneous translation so that hon. members of both linguistic groups could understand each other and so that the country could better know what is being said here. That action brought about a greater degree of unity here.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Thompson:** It is important to know the background of certain things because I think all hon. members on both sides of the house wish to see a greater degree of unity in this country. We all want our peoples to live together and work together as Canadian citizens. Certainly there is great need for us to communicate with each other in this country in order that we may better understand and appreciate each other's attitudes and feelings.

A little story may illustrate the point I am trying to make. A close friend of mine has a son going to university and during the summer months the young man worked with a construction crew, shoulder to shoulder with those who labour in trades so necessary for the construction industry of our country. He was under a foreman who did not speak English very well. The foreman said to the lad: "It really does not matter. In this job there is only one word that counts—shovel." According to the story the foreman said, "When you say 'shovel' I will give you the shovel, but when I say 'shovel', you use it". I think that story illustrates how our peoples must communicate with each other and understand one another. In my opinion all hon. members, regardless of where they sit, wish to see a greater degree of unity in this country and want our peoples to communicate better with each other.

I do not think that Bill C-120 will unite this country. I believe it will divide us further and therefore I find it very difficult to support. I have French speaking and English speaking friends as well as friends in most other ethnic groups across Canada. I have travelled the length and breadth of this country and consider myself a loyal Canadian. I wish to see the country united and strong, and I wish all Canadians to understand the necessity for our unity and strength.

I agree that the Prime Minister has some claim to a mandate in introducing this bill. He did not talk very much about general policy in the election campaign, but he did talk about language policy. He also tried to condemn the Conservative party for a two-nation theory, saying that theory would divide the country. Yet I do not believe he has a mandate to flout or override the law of this land as expressed in our constitution, the British North America Act. I am not a legal authority but I know that some of our best legal brains, as well as provincial premiers, have questioned the legality of this bill. It troubles me to see the Prime Minister adopt inflexible attitudes based on the constitution when it comes to questions of housing. He was willing to see the deputy Prime Minister resign from the cabinet as he invoked constitutional arguments on questions of housing. However, when he comes to this bill he ignores the constitution he has previously upheld so firmly and tries to convince us that it does not really matter, that we need not consider whether this bill is legal, and that we need only be concerned with making passage of this bill politically possible so that we can have two official languages in this country.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I do not understand this attitude. It troubles me. I believe there is a very special and unique place in Canada for the French and English languages in the historical sense, but to establish French and English as the two official languages must be done through constitutional reform. Having done that, if necessary certain legislation could be introduced to verify it so far as the laws of the country are concerned in interpreting the constitutional aspect. I believe that would be in the best interests of this country. I say, with respect, to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) that we are being forced at this time, for whatever reasons or motives the government may have, to deal with a bill that raises serious questions so far as the constitutional legality is concerned.

I say again I am not against English and French being the official languages of this country. I wish it were possible for every Canadian citizen to speak both French and English. I do not happen to belong to either one of those two language groups, speaking the language of my father which I learned as a boy. In my foreign experience I have had the opportunity to learn and use several other languages to the extent that I am fluent in understanding and using them.

In some parts of the country there is no opportunity to receive an education in French and English at the time when it is most effective, in childhood. Some Canadians do not have the opportunity of becoming fluently bilingual. This is true for both French and English speaking Canadians. To enforce this legally through legislation will divide us, not just in western Canada but also in Quebec. Many of my colleagues in this house who are from Quebec speak in favour of this bill, but many of my friends and acquaintances in Quebec have no real enthusiasm. I have not seen nor heard anything to indicate that the present government of Quebec intends to force this bill with all its implications even though it specifically relates to the federal government.

There are reactions in other parts of Canada as well, not only from those who are English speaking but also from those who are French speaking. There is very little support for this bill in French speaking communities outside the province of Quebec. In fact the contrary is true. Many such people are fearful that the enforcement of this bill in a linguistic way will take away from them the opportunities they already have at the present time. People who live in strictly English speaking areas of the country as well as those who live in strictly French speaking parts of the country feel this bill is not desirable because it will give a basis for a legal interpretation where at the present time there is a great reservoir of voluntary good will.

The English and French languages should be taught in such a way that when students finish high school and go on to university they will be fluent in both languages. My own family live in this city. My children attend school in this part of the country in order to become fluent in both languages. In western Canada there is a great dearth of French speaking teachers. Some people say there is

more antagonism to the use of French in Alberta than in any other province. This is not the case at all. There was a French language teacher training college in Edmonton before there was a similar institution in any other part of Canada, with the exception of the province of Quebec. Because the province of Alberta could not recruit sufficient French teachers from Quebec or teachers fluent in the French language from other parts of Canada, they began to train their own teachers of French. Alberta has even sent recruiting teams to France in an effort to recruit French teachers who would adequately and properly teach the French language in the schools of Alberta.

Our beloved Governor General grew up in and is a native of my city of Red Deer. He has told me that when he went to high school there was no opportunity to learn the French language. A short generation later when I went to school, French was being taught beginning with grade nine. My own children went to the same school and started learning French in grades four and five. This is progress—willing and substantial progress!

We have come a long way. Instantaneous translation in this house was a tremendous step forward to the effective use of languages in parliament. This is a constitutional right because it is outlined in the British North America Act. This is the kind of progress we will continue to make as long as we retain and develop the growing good will in this country at the present time in understanding the language, cultural and other needs of individuals in their various situations and backgrounds.

I feel this bill will divide rather than unite us. While I may agree with the principle stated by the Prime Minister and others as being the objective of this bill, I do not think we will move toward that objective nearly as effectively as we are now proceeding. It would be more effective to establish a constitutional change in a proper context respecting the use of languages.

In Great Britain students with a secondary school and university education have learned a second language. In fact, most people in Great Britain speak two or three languages, French, German, Scandinavian or whatever their desire may be. This is also true in France where most young people learn to speak English, Spanish, Italian or German. It is certainly true in the Scandinavian countries and in Germany, Holland, Belgium and even Russia. These people are doing this willingly.



We in this country have been backward in our outlook toward a second language, and this must and will change.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The foremost second language in this country must be French. There must be encouragement, incentive and motivation so that we may continue to grow and develop until we reach a position of being truly a bilingual people. I know it is not possible for everybody to learn a second language. One cannot gain mastery of a second language without using it, and there are parts of Quebec, western Canada and other regions where there is no opportunity to use a second language. Thus not everybody can become fluently bilingual.

There are some who say that civil rights must be applied to this bill because the real intention is to apply civil rights as they pertain to language by having a law such as this. If this is so then civil rights must be extended also to other languages such as Ukrainian, Polish, German and Spanish. We must have the civil right to use the language of our choice, but I do not think we can enforce the kind of civil rights that might be interpreted as being contained in this bill.

I am concerned about the provisions in the bill with respect to the definition of language districts. There is some detail in it which says that these districts shall coincide with municipal, provincial, federal or electoral districts, but there is no specific statement on the limit of a language area, or as to the authority who would be ultimately responsible for defining it.

There is another aspect of the bill which concerns me, relating to the Armed Forces and the R.C.M.P., an aspect that is brought out very clearly in some of the proposed amendments. Defence forces and the national police come directly under the federal government. Does this bill mean that in the future I or my children must be bilingual before we have the right to fight for this country? Does it mean that only those who are bilingual can be members of the R.C.M.P.? I do not see that the bill states anything to the contrary, even in the proposed amendment that is supposed to clarify the situation.

Since this is the interpretation given to the bill in layman's language I can understand that there are genuine fears throughout the country. These fears exist in and toward the civil service as well. People in the provinces

of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Newfoundland and elsewhere just do not have opportunities to become fluently bilingual even though they take French for seven years in elementary and high school, simply because usage is so important to bilingual fluency. I have no doubt that a very serious impediment will be placed upon those people in the civil service who are unilingual, and upon people who do not have sufficient fluency in a second language to be eligible for posts in the Armed Forces and other federal civil service branches.

I wish the Prime Minister had shown the same concern in taking steps to establish a national capital area to include the immediate area around Hull and Ottawa, an area which could be clearly specified as bilingual so that English and French speaking people coming to it would feel equally at home. If this were done it would go a long way toward achieving the degree of desirable bilingualism that we want to see in Canada, without interfering with provincial authority or bringing undue pressure on unilingual parts of the country.

In such a case I do not think French or English unilinguists could have any objection. It would also be a real incentive for the civil service, the Armed Forces, the R.C.M.P., crown agencies and all other aspects of federal administration. There are other ways in which we could move to encourage greater use of a second official language and its establishment as something practical, ways of encouraging rather than forcing people into a certain position. That is why I am convinced that this bill, instead of being one, as has been said, intended to unify and establish civil rights, is one that will defeat those very things which we all mutually agree are desirable in Canada.

The Prime Minister has warned against racial distrust and has said it would split the nation forever. I do not think the vast majority of the Canadian people really believe that this bill will remove that distrust and strengthen the understanding and communication we need. Despite our differences of opinion I believe that behind the thinking, motivation and objectives of all of us there is a desire to see Canada grow in unity. From my own world experience I often say to myself, if we cannot find the key to unity in Canada what hope have we in the world of having peace and understanding?

I am afraid that what is happening is that we are dividing and balkanizing ourselves, and instead of being the hope and example to the world we are falling far short of that objective. I appeal to all hon. members on both sides of the house to look at this bill objectively, to look at it from the standpoint of how it will affect unity in this country, and to understand that there are two sides to the question. If they can see the thing as I see it and as many others see it, some who have spoken and some who have not, then I believe there will be agreement that this is not the strengthening factor that others think it might be.

Confederation in Canada is a marriage. It is a marriage of peoples. The type of marriage that is based on legal interpretation of rights and duties will inevitably end in bickering and ultimately wind up in the divorce court. If we can persuade our fellow Canadians that for the sake of our homeland tolerance and good humour, forgiveness and understanding are the practical and essential needs of any longlasting association, then we will find an answer to the problems we face.

I think this is the answer to the question of language rights. It is only on this basis that we will reach that degree of unity which is necessary to make this country strong in the future, as she has been in the past, with a role to play that the world needs as an example. Again, Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I cannot see this coming about so far as language is concerned through Bill C-120.

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in some of the comments that have been made respecting this bill this afternoon because it seems that every member who participates in the debates, whether he is for or against the provisions of the bill, prefaces his remarks by saying that we all have to do something to strengthen the unity of the nation. However, what follows seems to be somewhat contradictory with respect to what in fact are the positive actions that will lead to a greater degree of unity.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) again displayed his mastery of the role of opposition, and I respect him for that. I think we have to recognize that what he tried to do, very unsuccessfully in my opinion but there was some reaction and response to his argument, was state the extreme. He tried to put the most extreme interpretation on the powers granted the language commissioner. Of course, the right hon. gentleman knows very well that if

you were to give the most extreme interpretation to any of the powers granted to those people charged with the responsibility of administering the laws of this land you could arrive at some of the almost ridiculous conclusions which he tried to advance in this house. Of course, part of the job of the opposition is to point out that such powers can be abused if an extreme interpretation is placed on these words.

I hope this bill will be sent to the committee soon so that the committee will be able to examine in greater detail, with the ministers who are piloting this legislation through the House of Commons, some of those things that will be needed to give effect to the principle that is involved.

I may say I accept the broad principle involved in this bill because, as I see it, the principle is that there be equal status for the two languages where there is reasonable need for it. I suggest that, unfortunately, the debate in the House of Commons on this bill has concentrated on these other interpretations, and as a result, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about the objectives of this measure. The most common misunderstanding is that the government of Canada is trying to force all Canadians to be bilingual. Perhaps even that is a little extreme. What the government is doing, in my opinion, is much more simple than that.

The aim of this legislation is to ensure that the English and French languages will have equal status throughout the federal government where conditions make that a reasonable requirement. What is even more important is that Canadians speaking either language will be treated in the same manner in their dealings with the federal government, wherever it is possible to do so.

What this means in practical terms as far as I understand it is that, firstly, in all parts of the country where there is a significant number of Canadians of both languages, the federal government will undertake to serve these people in both languages. I suppose the best example is in the national capital region, the Ottawa-Hull area, where people will be able to write or deal with a government office in either the French or the English language. In other words, they will have the opportunity to obtain service in the language of their choice.

If there are areas in Canada in which a significant part of the population wish to speak either one of the official languages,

[Mr. Olson.]

then the government will try to provide services in that language. In Alberta, for example, there is only one area which has more than 10 per cent who are French speaking. As I understand the bill, this is the only area of that province which this provision would affect immediately. However, there may be a desire to have the services of the federal government extended somewhat beyond that in the future. I suggest that all Canadians in all areas should be able to deal with the government in either language. However, practically speaking, that is not possible. So, I suggest, that in the proposed legislation the government is trying to balance practicality with idealism.

The government has also undertaken to ensure that persons may be tried in federal criminal courts in either of the official languages. This is essential in my view if Canadians are to be guaranteed justice, again taking into consideration what is practical and feasible. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) announced some amendments he is prepared to make to the bill in that respect when it gets to the committee.

At the same time the legislation provides, and this has been overlooked too often I think, that merit will continue to be the basis for recruitment and promotion within the civil service rather than only proficiency in both languages. There are positions, of course, and all members of this house know this, where it is essential to be able to work in both languages. Bilingual proficiency in those cases will be considered when these jobs are filled.

I was rather surprised to hear one or two members who spoke this afternoon indicate that there was some kind of discrimination involved in requiring at least a reasonable level of proficiency in both languages on the part of those people who only have capability in one language. If the position requires the use of both languages, surely this should be a requisite for employment or, indeed, a promotion to that position. I do not think this should be regarded as discrimination. If there is a requirement for someone who can type, surely there is no discrimination in not hiring someone who cannot type. If the federal Government has a requirement for someone who can operate a particular piece of machinery, surely there is no discrimination in not hiring someone who does not have proficiency in this field. When a position requires proficiency in English, French or both, then it is not discrimination in any way to require that

the person applying for that position be proficient in those areas. An individual should have that proficiency before being considered for the position.

There are many who are opposed to this legislation, as has been indicated during this debate and indeed in the debate going on outside this institution. I suppose that is to be expected. On the other hand, I would hope that this opposition would be based on an accurate rather than a distorted picture of what this legislation is trying to do. I would also hope that any opposition would be based on a reasonable position rather than on an extreme emotional interpretation. That is all we are asking, and I think it is important to understand what is in the bill before it goes to the committee.

It has been said a number of times that Canada is a bilingual nation historically and traditionally. The legislation now before the house is an attempt to make that history and constitution a living reality in Canadian life. In conclusion, I do not think I could do better than to quote a paragraph from the speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) who I think did an excellent job of summing up his attitude toward this bill. He said as reported at page 8794 of *Hansard* for Friday, May 16:

> I urge the government in the name of this country to make a serious effort to explain to the people of Canada what this bill means, what it does not mean, and to give the assurances to this country which are necessary for the administration and implementation of this measure. After all, we are trying to create unity, not disunity.

I think that is as good a statement of the position as one can find. Surely, this should be understood by those people who disagree with what is, in fact, the objective of the provisions of this bill. It is so important, as the Leader of the Opposition has stated, that the people of Canada understand what is involved. It behooves all of us on both sides of this house to explain the objective accurately to the people, without distorting it in any way.

• (5:40 p.m.)

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this bill, I realize that contained in it is one of the most important principles which the people of this country must face up to and resolve if our country is to survive. The deputy leader of our party, speaking on second reading of the bill some days ago, put the position of our party very clearly as one of support for the bill. I shall support this bill.

However, I want especially to take this opportunity to speak to it because, like so many other members from western Canada, I represent a constituency which has in it very few French speaking people. I represent a constituency in which the majority of the people are neither of French nor English extraction. More than 25 per cent of the people I represent are of Ukrainian origin, more than 10 per cent are of Polish origin and more than 10 per cent are of Jewish origin.

These people, as well as many Anglo-Saxons in my constituency and other parts of Canada, are dubious about this bill; they are worried and concerned about it. They feel very much as the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) feels about the bill. They feel, very much like the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), who spoke a short time ago, feels about the bill.

Despite that fact, I am prepared to vote for the bill. I want to explain today, as I have on every occasion when I have had the opportunity to speak to my constituents about this matter, why I feel that this kind of bill must be supported by the people of Canada. I do not think I can put my position in any better way than I did more than two years ago in response to a letter which I received from a man who was at that time one of my constituents.

I want, for a few moments, to read an exchange of correspondence which took place in March of 1967. I shall put on the record the letter I received from my constituent because it expresses the fears of many people in Canada. I shall also put on the record my reply because, as I have said, I do not think I can state my position any better today than I did more than two years ago. My constituent wrote me as follows:

> Dear Mr. Orlikow:
>
> I have talked to so many about how French is being driven down our throats these days. Everywhere you look or read it's in French and English, never just English anymore.
>
> In the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation office here in Winnipeg I asked the girl at the desk for some information forms and she asked: "Can you speak French?" I said no, and didn't intend to learn. She said that was all they had available at this time. I said: "What is this country coming to?" She said: "You don't know the half of it. I am going to lose my job because I can't speak French."
>
> I have a friend who works for Air Canada who is losing his job just because he can't speak French. We have so many different nationalities in Canada, why shove French down our throats?

I don't imagine anything can be done as all parties are strictly after the votes and will do the same thing but some day they may have to change if the people get mad enough about it. What can you do to bring Canada back to one language, like the Americans have?

I replied to that letter as follows:

Dear Sir:

The problem you raise in your letter is one of the most fundamental problems which this country will have to solve in the next few years if it is to survive.

I think that as a member of parliament whose ethnic origin is neither English nor French and who, therefore, understands the emotions which led you to express the views which you did, I am in a good position to explain what is happening in Canada and why, in regard to Quebec, I think we all have to realize that the French Canadians are in an entirely different position from those of us who are neither of English nor French origin.

When this country was formed in 1867, the BNA Act spelled out the rights of the French speaking people to use their language.

The French Canadians make up almost one-third of the population of Canada. They make up almost 80 per cent of the population of Quebec, and they make up about 45 per cent of the population of New Brunswick. There are very substantial numbers of French speaking Canadians in eastern and northern Ontario.

This being the case, it seems to me that we have to face the fact that whether some of us think that it would be better if everyone spoke one language or not, is really a theoretical matter because the fact is we cannot dictate such a policy to the five or six million French Canadians.

It seems to me, therefore, if we wish Canada to survive we must accept the fact the French Canadians, where they live in appreciable numbers, have a right to be dealt with by the government of Canada in the French language, just as English Canadians have a right to be dealt with in the English language.

This does not mean that every federal civil servant working in Winnipeg must be able to speak French, just as it does not mean that a federal civil servant working in a French community in rural Quebec must be able to speak English as well as French.

But it does mean that where there are an appreciable number of people who speak either English or French, they have a right to be served by government offices in their own language.

Now I would like to take up the specific cases in your letter. It may of course have been true that the CMHC office in Winnipeg was out of some form which you required in English, and that you were offered a form in French. I cannot however believe that a person working in the CMHC office in Winnipeg could have been serious when she told you that she was going to lose her job because she cannot speak French. There is no such government policy and there will be no such government policy.

If the girl is worried about losing her job and if she contacts me, I can assure you that within one day of receiving her letter she will have a statement in writing from the responsible minister that as long as she works in Winnipeg she can keep her job without knowing French. I can assure you that the same is true of your friend who works for Air Canada who you say is losing his job because he cannot speak French.

I gather from the whole tenor of your letter, you feel the French are taking over the government of Canada. Recently the government was asked for information about the top servants—how many are French speaking and how many are English speaking.

The reply covered all federal civil servants earning $17,000 a year or more. The answer, I think, disproves completely the suggestion that this country is being taken over by French Canadians.

Of just over 1,100 civil servants making $17,000 or more, 975 list their mother tongue as English and only 136 list their mother tongue as French. In other words French Canadians occupy just 10 per cent of the top civil service jobs in Canada while they make up about 30 per cent of the population of Canada.

These are the facts as they are, rather than the misconceptions which so many of us have picked up on this emotionally charged question. It may be that you will not be too happy with my reply, but I think that we have to ignore immediate political advantage and face the realities of the situation as they are.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Nothing has happened in the last two and a half years to make me change my point of view. If this bill goes part of the way towards implementing the principle which I enunciated at that time, I am prepared to vote for it whether or not I think that in the short run my support of this bill may hurt me politically.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I was very pleased by a series of articles which appeared recently in the Toronto *Telegram* under the title "Canada 70". The articles constituted a survey done in considerable depth about how the people of Canada feel about this and related questions. I was pleased because, having just said that I would vote for this bill whether or not it hurt me politically, I am, after all, like every other member of this house, a practical politician who would like to be re-elected. So, if I get evidence to indicate that the people in my area tend to agree with me, it makes me happy.

I would like to summarize very briefly for the house, and particularly for those members of western Canada who seem to be worried that if they vote for this bill they may be going against the desires of the people they represent, some of the conclusions to which

this series of articles came. The following is from an article which appeared on May 6:

In talks with more than 100 people, Telegram interviewers found goodwill towards the aims of French Canada—

The citizens of Saskatchewan revealed a desire to hold this nation together, although they wanted it to be a nation with a better understanding of the western problems. The article contained the following statement:

But Saskatchewanians were overwhelmingly opposed to the idea of joining the United States, with 96 per cent voicing disdain.

Farther on it reads as follows:

A notable revelation in this province with its heavily ethnic population was the fact that 53 per cent are prepared to regard the French-speaking as special—

A healthy 75 per cent opted for bilingual education in the schools.

This is an indication of how the people of Saskatchewan feel.

In another article we are given some of the thinking in British Columbia. The article deals with educators in British Columbia. It reads in part as follows:

And 18 of 20 leading, interesting or controversial West coast educationists and student leaders agreed that it was very important to them that Canada survive as a nation—

And three quarters of them thought French Canadians rate a special place in Confederation, a considerably higher ratio than that found in the overall West coast population.

In an article in which they deal with Manitoba, the *Telegram* says:

And it was in Manitoba that the highest percentage of people consider that French Canadians have a special place in Confederation.

The figure was 62 per cent compared with 53 per cent in Saskatchewan and 48 per cent in Alberta.

As I said a few moments ago, these articles made me happy because they made me realize that the position I have taken is one which is shared by a majority of the people in western Canada.

Having said that I am going to support the bill, I want to deal with what I consider to be some of the negative aspects of the government's position. We have heard repeatedly that this bill is just one more indication of the overwhelming support which this government gives to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Biculturalism and Bilingualism. It may be that in this bill the government is doing that. However, I want to suggest that this government and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) cannot, without jettisoning a good deal of the basic convictions of the Prime Minister, endorse all the recommendations of the commission.

I want to refer the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) to the second volume of the commission's report, the volume which deals with education. I want to read just a couple of the recommendations which the Secretary of State may find on pages 301 and 302 of the report. They read as follows:

We recommend a federal grant to official minority-language students to enable them to study in their own language at a Canadian university outside their province, when courses are not available in their own language within the province.

We recommend for these out-of-province students that a federal grant, equivalent to the normal provincial grant to the university, be paid to the host university or to the provincial government concerned.

We recommend that, pending the resolution of the constitutional problems involved, agreements be concluded between the federal government and the provinces concerned in order that these provinces receive the help required to meet the special needs of their French-language universities.

Most important is recommendation 26 which can be found on page 302 of the second volume of the report of the commission. It reads as follows:

We recommend that the federal government accept in principle the responsibility for the additional costs involved in providing education in the official minority language.

Members of this house from various parties may or may not agree with that recommendation. I want to suggest, however, that if this government were to accept the recommendation, this would be completely contrary to the Prime Minister's stated policy. I understand, although I did not hear him, that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) indicated in his speech the other day that he is prepared to accept that kind of suggestion. I want to say that everything the Prime Minister has said and written before he came to parliament on the question of the constitution, and of the relationship between the federal government and the provinces, indicates clearly that he was absolutely opposed to the federal government contributing to education in any shape or form.

Let me quote from an article which the Prime Minister wrote before he came here, entitled "Federal Grants to Universities".

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I apologize to the hon. member but it is six o'clock.

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF 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 Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Public Service—superannuated federal employees—request for increased pensions; the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Dumont)—Post Office—lower postal rates for *Montreal* magazine; the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—Post Office Department—effect of rate changes on non-profit publications.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

---

### AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

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

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen (for Mr. Trudeau) that Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, as I concluded the section of my speech which I made before six o'clock I was pointing out that the second report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism had recommended that the federal government assist financially in the promotion of education for minority groups, that is, for French people living outside Quebec and for English people living in Quebec.

I submit that the position of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) about which he spoke and wrote extensively both before and after coming into parliament is that he has always opposed the participation of the federal government in spheres of activity which are reserved to the provinces under the constitution. A book which was brought out a year or so ago under the title "Federalism and French Canadians" contained articles written by the Prime Minister. In an article entitled "Federal Grants to Universities" the Prime Minister quotes with approval the position taken by Mr. F. A. Angers who said, and I quote:

In general, the Canadian state is not the central government, but the central and the provincial governments taken together . . . in matters of education the Canadian state is the provincial state, and none other.

Later in the same article, the Prime Minister said:

Consequently, if there is federal legislation to grant taxation money for provincial purposes, this legislation is illegal for the excellent reason that the federal government cannot by law have money in its coffers which it then claims should be used for provincial purposes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if education is the responsibility of the provinces alone I find it hard to understand how the federal government can follow the recommendation of the B and B Commission and help finance the education of members of minority groups in the provinces. Having said this, I want to add that in my opinion the government should do so. If it did, then I submit the government could also assist the various ethnic groups in Canada by providing financial aid toward the maintenance and preservation of their cultures, their languages and their schools which they have developed on a voluntary basis.

If the federal government were to do this it would be following a line which the Prime Minister himself explored before he reached that office on the occasion of his visit to my own city of Winnipeg. In the Winnipeg *Free Press,* which, as I am sure hon. members are aware, is one of the most partisan Liberal partisan papers in the country, a report appeared on March 11, 1968, of an address to a meeting made by the Prime Minister in the course of that visit to Winnipeg. The title of the article was: "Trudeau Sees Four Official Languages if French Given Recognition". The report states:

Justice Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau said last night Canada may one day have a third and even a fourth official language in addition to English and French.

Trudeau, 46—

**Mr. Baldwin:** Forty-seven.

**Mr. Orlikow:** I am only reading the article. I cannot vouch for the veracity of every word.

—who becomes Prime Minister said official status should be granted any language spoken by a sufficient number of people.

The justice minister was addressing about 600 Liberals including representatives of Winnipeg's Ukrainian and other large ethnic minorities.

Trudeau rejected the common notion that French deserves official recognition in Canada because the French were one of the "two founding groups" which built the country—

The only justification for having French as official language was that French Canadians made up one third of the population, he added.

I would even be prepared to say that if in the immediate future or the far future a third important group speaking a third language wanted to use their language to communicate with the state, this third language will have to be recognized.

He said a fourth official language was also conceivable although "you can't go on forever." But Switzerland, he pointed out, functioned with four languages.

I suggest that the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) have a look a the recommendations made by Professor Rudnyckyj. I do not agree with everything that Professor Rudnyckyj proposes, but bearing in mind that in the Province of Manitoba from which I come more than 10 per cent of the population is Ukrainian, and further substantial parts of the population are of Polish or German extraction, to mention just a few of our minorities, I submit to the Secretary of State that it is just as reasonable for the federal government to provide financial assistance to help these groups and similar groups in other provinces to preserve the best of their culture, of their language and of their ethnic press which lately the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) has gone a long way to destroying. The Secretary of State might well consider giving these organizations financial assistance of the kind already given to the association in Manitoba which is concerning itself with the retention and promotion of the French language in the province of Manitoba.

Earlier in my speech I said I supported the principle of bilingualism and biculturalism, and that in these circumstances I would vote for the bill. I said, and am happy to say again, that in my opinion the majority of the people of Manitoba and western Canada generally will support the principle of this measure. They do so because they realize that this is part of the price of being Canadian; that it is part of the price of having a country extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. However, they know that Quebeckers and the French people of Canada are not the only ones with problems. They know the people of the western provinces have problems, as do the people of both urban and rural Manitoba. They support this bill, I submit, expecting that just as they are prepared to co-operate and support it as part of the price of being Canadian, so will the federal government give some consideration to their problems and needs.

• (8:10 p.m.)

To date I submit the government has not done so. If any member on the government side doubts that, I suggest he read the lead article that appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star* last Saturday, May 24, written by Peter Regenstreif, in which he analyses the result of a survey that he and his associates conducted for that newspaper. The headline of the article reads: "Trudeau is 'only fair' as P.M., voter survey indicates". I should just like to put on record a couple of paragraphs from this article:

After one year in office, Pierre Trudeau gets an "only fair" or "poor" rating from most of the Canadian electorate for the job he has been doing as Prime Minister, according to a national survey.

The public is disappointed with his handling of basic issues such as high taxes, the cost of living, housing and poverty.

Later, the article says:

Only 6 per cent gave Trudeau an "excellent" rating for the job he is doing as Prime Minister; 29 per cent gave him a "pretty good" rating, 34 per cent "only fair" and 23 per cent "poor" with 8 per cent not sure.

In every region, more people rated him as "only fair" and "poor" than graded him "excellent" and "pretty good." He is weakest on the prairies, strongest in Quebec and the Atlantic provinces—

Trudeau received very low grades for the job he is doing "keeping taxes in line" with 65 per cent giving him a "poor" rating. Another 65 per cent feel he is doing a poor job "controlling the cost of living".

His performance in "getting more housing and less expensive housing" and in "closing the gap between rich and poor" is ranked as poor by 54 per cent in each case. And 41 per cent says he is doing a "poor" job "alleviating poverty."

I think the result of that survey goes a long way to demonstrate precisely the point I am making. We are approaching the end of this session of parliament. There is no provision in the rules or statutes which decrees we must finish this session on June 27, yet we are told that this will happen. But what will we have accomplished at this session of parliament? We will have passed the omnibus bill amending the Criminal Code, a bill that we in this party supported almost unanimously. I presume we will also have passed this official languages bill that we are now discussing, and which we in this party will support. But having said that, I have said just about everything that could be said.

I do not want to misrepresent the facts or let anybody miscontrue my feelings, because these are two important pieces of legislation, measures that were long overdue for passage. But as far as the ordinary citizen of Canada is concerned, regardless of province, whether he is English, French or a member of what we call the third force, these are not bread and butter issues. Since the government was elected last year it has refused to deal with basic issues, such as the increasing cost of living and the galloping inflation with which we are faced.

What is the Prime Minister's solution to inflation? He has gone back to Herbert Hoover, perhaps even before Hoover. His answer to inflation is to cut government expenditure. Apparently it does not matter how important those government programs are; they are going to be cut. At the same time we permit builders to build fancy office buildings, oil companies to build a filling station on a corner where there are already three other filling stations, and every grocery chain to build another supermarket, even though in Ottawa there is but five minutes' walk from one to another. We permit these people to do exactly what they please while we try to beat inflation by cutting down government expenditure.

The Secretary of State once worked for a trade union and used to know, if he does not know any more, how ordinary people live and work. The kind of issue I suggest the government ought to be dealing with relates to the fact, hundreds of thousands of people are living in dilapidated housing, in housing that is a disgrace.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I have been listening to the hon. member fairly carefully and I have great misgivings whether his remarks at this time are really relevant to the motion before the house. I would invite him to return to the bill we are dealing with at this time.

**Mr. Orlikow:** Mr. Speaker, I am glad you rose to tell me that you thought I might be out of order rather than that my time had expired. I suggest I am dealing with this bill in precisely the same way as any number of speakers have dealt with it. For example, the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was castigating the government this afternoon for dealing with this bill instead of with the problem of the wheat farmers of western Canada. I suggest that if you want to put this type of check on members you should start at the beginning of the debate rather than with me.

I have already indicated that I and the members of this party are going to support the bill. I am not saying as some members have said that we ought to have dealt with other legislation before passing this bill. But what I am saying—and in view of the fact that I am going to vote for the bill I think I have the right and responsibility to say this to the members of the government and to the Secretary of State who is piloting the bill through the house—that I hope we do not end this session of parliament when we have simply passed this bill. I hope that we will go on to deal with some of the "gut" and bread and butter issues that are facing the people of Canada.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I want to outline very briefly what I think are some of these issues. I have made reference to the inflationary spiral. As far as housing is concerned, I am not as acquainted with the maritime cities as I am with those in the rest of Canada, and this I regret, but I do not think there is a city in Canada that has a larger number of slum dwellings and dilapidated houses than Montreal. Before parliament adjourns for the summer I hope the government will bring forward legislation to ease the problems of those living in houses that are a national disgrace. We should help those millions of people who are paying substantially more than they can afford out of their income for rental accommodation or living in houses they were forced to buy which are much too expensive for them to carry.

And what about the unemployment situation, Mr. Speaker? I have not looked at the figures for the last two days, but I believe that almost six per cent of our working force is unemployed. What will the government do about the workers of the Vickers shipbuilding company at Montreal who have been thrown out of work and have no prospect of employment in the near future? How is the government to help them?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I appreciate the point the hon. member made when I intervened earlier. I have allowed him considerable leeway, wishing to interpret the rules as generously as possible. But I submit he is now going so far beyond the scope of the bill that even with the most generous interpretation of the rules I am capable of exercising I think he has gone too

far astray. I must now ask him to return to the specific subject covered by the bill.

**Mr. Baldwin:** The unemployment figures are bad, no matter in which language you read them.

**Mr. Orlikow:** My hon. friend says that the unemployment figures are bad in either language. Or perhaps he said that they are bad in all our languages. Certainly, if that is the case I agree with him. Of course, unemployment is worst for those speaking the original languages of Canada, the Indians and Eskimos.

May I conclude by saying that this bill is part of the legislative proposals which we recognize are necessary to build a united Canada in which persons of any race, creed or colour can be proud to live. We support the government in this objective, and will vote for the bill. We would support any government seeking to foster these aims. Since this bill is a step in the right direction, we will support it. Nevertheless I plead with the government to heed those problems I raised which Your Honour ruled out of order, because their solution is most important for the people of our nation. I hope the government gives thought to those problems affecting Canadians from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I hope it will implement most of its promises designed to unite Canada, so that all our people may be part of one Canada, a Canada in which they are proud to live in equality and freedom.

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I wish it were possible to confine ourselves closely to the text of the bill. In itself, as my colleague, the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), said the other night, it is not a controversial or revolutionary measure. But naturally we must deal with the spirit of the laws, as the philosopher might have said, and with the important values in our society which underline and surround the introduction of this particular piece of legislation. It struck me—and perhaps this is an over-simplification but I think not—that this particular legislation reflects an extension of something which we have had in our political society for over a century. In their wisdom the Fathers of Confederation created a bilingual parliament. It would be strange indeed if the central institution of the federal apparatus should remain uniquely bilingual. It would be strange indeed if the bureaucracy upon which that parliament rests—or it might be vice versa—did not also reflect the bilingual structure which was very fully and properly, I think, written into the structure of the parliament of Canada. Therefore, this legislation strikes me as an emanation of that which we have had for a long time.

Some may say that it might be cheaper and easier for all of us if we were a unilingual country. That argument would have to be taken up with our political ancestors who have been in their graves for about a century. Perhaps the fact that there has been a long period of inequality as between the two languages has made it seem that our present day advances are coming along a bit too rapidly. For too long in this parliament the languages were not equal; neither were they used equally. My colleague from the N.D.P. this afternoon referred to long delays in obtaining French documents.

I noticed the other day, when the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) with his usual courtesy asked an hon. member on the government side about the introduction of simultaneous translations in this house, the hon. member from the Liberal party replied "Peanuts". This is the kind of unhelpful observation we can do without.

As some colleague from the N.D.P. said the other day, until 1959 hon. members had the right to speak in French here, but they had no functional right to have their remarks heard in French. I, therefore, say that this most important translation facility was certainly not "peanuts".

I also recall that for a good many years after I first came here—and that was not a hundred years ago, only eleven—Beauchesne, a most difficult work, was available in English only, although having been written by a man who was obviously not a Scot nor an Anglo-Saxon. That work was printed in four editions before being translated into French, a most shocking situation.

God knows, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne is difficult enough to understand when he is read in one's native tongue. How difficult must it be for those who speak other languages. There now seems to be an excessive rate of movement towards bilingualism of the institutions of the federal government. In part perhaps it appears that way because the rate of progress in the past was slow and uneven. Also, concerns and anxieties have been developing in Canada because of ill-advised statements which have been made. This afternoon the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson)

spoke of our responsibility in trying to present the case as to what this bill means and what it does not mean, and quite rightly he pointed to the fine example of the Leader of the Opposition in this regard. I say without rancour but with deep conviction that statements of the Prime Minister of this country about unilingual civil servants having to be relegated to positions as elevator operators did more injury to the cause of bilingualism among thoughtful Canadians than almost anything else could have done and undid much good activity on the part of the B and B commission and others. That kind of viewpoint does no good and may do a great deal of harm. There are times when I am worried about the stance of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) and about certain of his utterances. As Duke Frederick said to Orlando, there are times when I would that this bill had been the son of some man else, since it seems now to have become the child of the Secretary of State.

This is a most important, highly emotional and, therefore, sensitive matter and I think the remarks and conduct of the hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) this afternoon were not helpful. Many are concerned about incidents taking place at St. Leonard. It is easy to focus one's attention only upon that which is happening or not happening there and to overlook the long record of the government and people of Quebec in providing fine educational institutions for minorities in that province. But in this sensitive area I think it behooves us all to be as careful and moderate as possible. I agree with my colleague for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) that there is not much that is new in this legislation and that much of the impact or import of it will be in administrative fields.

• (8:30 p.m.)

It has been said fully and well by people more qualified in the law than I that this legislation requires clarification. I feel it requires amendments and repair. Some of these have been forecast by the excellent addresses delivered earlier in this debate. The right hon. gentleman for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) and the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) touched upon important areas where improvements must be made.

It is clear the consultations with the premiers and attorneys general have produced a better bill. It is my belief that a careful study in a special committee will make further improvements. For that reason and with that belief I will vote for this measure to send it along to a committee for further study.

One of the amendments which I find rather interesting is the reaffirmation of the merit system. When I first heard of this I was surprised that such a value needed to be reaffirmed. The statements about the elevator operators and the firing of the gallant old veterans of the Corps of Commissionnaire are contributors to the anxiety among some of our public servants. We must never in our laudable, worthy and indeed essential moves to bilingualize the federal government institution overprize linguistic ability at the expense of general merit. This would be a very, very serious mistake.

I admire those with linguistic attainments. I envy some of my colleagues in the house who are fluent in both languages, but a flair for languages must not become the *summum bonum* of administrative competence in this country. This would be a grievous error. There was a time when it was the wish that philosophers should be kings. This was never attainable. It would not be wise now to suggest that the linguists should become the governors. Every person should be encouraged and assisted to strive toward perfection in both languages. This perfection will rarely be attained by those of us who, in the words of the Anglican prayer book, are of riper years.

Perhaps there are times when we must ask if elaborate, lengthy and strenuous language courses are the best utilization of the time of busy and important civil servants, or any civil servant. The emphasis should be on making a vigorous and effective effort to bilingualize, not the civil servant, but the service—the departments of federal government. We must all be on the alert to protect the rights of minorities. The same urgency extends to majorities. I would not support this measure at any stage if I thought it inhibited or diminished the rights of the vast majority of Canadians who are and likely will remain unilingual. I do not think it does so inhibit or restrict. I would resist vigorously any pressures on the individual who seeks to do his best for his country in its public service who is not and does not choose to become bilingual.

Possibly some of the current techniques toward institutional bilingualism are being misunderstood and might not be the most suitable for the attainment of our bilingual goals. Perhaps the drives to make individual public servants bilingual might sometimes be

replaced by other techniques. Possibly more translation and less immersion would be more practical, although I know that no translation can approach the original.

In the electric age of instant Telex communications, computers, data processors of great rapidity of transmission, we may be backward and out of touch with the modern world of communications when we cling to some of our bilingualizing techniques. Here I am trespassing on the terminology of my friend, the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans). The major problem is that of communication, the functional right, if I may use such a conglomerate, of citizens of Canada of both languages to deal in their language with the government of this country. This in essence is what this measure is all about.

There is another area of misunderstanding. Nothing in this bill should cause anyone from a linguistic group other than French or English to feel discriminated against, left out, scorned or diminished in any way. If this were the case, I would oppose this bill with every fibre of my being. The fact that two languages are the languages of the apparatus of the government does not indicate any value judgment as to the superiority of those languages. It is not a matter of superiority, but of historic development and practical recognition that not all the languages dear to us can be official vehicles of communication in governmental institutions.

I belong to a group of people whose ancestors did not speak English or French when they were brought to these shores long ago loath, unwilling and in some cases brutally, by their English "neighbours". If some of the descendants of Montcalm had hard views about General James Wolfe, some of us who are descended from the Highlands have much stronger thoughts about Colonel James Wolfe when he ravished the land of our forefathers and lugged some of our people over to the North American continent in chains. They were forbidden to dress or speak as Scotsmen.

I noted an interesting item in the Ottawa *Citizen* today with reference to this matter. I did not think the title was too good, "Jews Support Language Bill". The article states in part as follows:

> Canada's 270,000 citizens of Jewish faith support the official languages bill, Prime Minister Trudeau was told in a brief this morning by a delegation of the Canadian Jewish Congress.
>
> The Congress supports the bill because it is based on a concept of equal partnership between the two languages and cultures of the founding groups. It in no way diminishes the status of those whose origins are neither French nor Anglo-Saxon, the delegation's spokesman . . . told Mr. Trudeau.

This I think is essentially the case, as it should be. I repeat there are many possibilities for a misunderstanding. This is a sensitive issue. I quite agree with my leader that the Prime Minister could and should have done a much better job of advising Canadians what this bill means and does not mean. An expert at dialogue, he should have used his expertise more fully. The bill has many flaws. It is far from perfect, but its objectives are those which I cannot in conscience oppose, nor do I intend to.

There are dangers in Canada today. There is no immutable law which says this country shall and must endure as a federation. We cannot and we dare not be complacent that all will somehow be well, that hard choices do not have to be taken and painful decisions made. It was an act of faith which created the Dominion of Canada. It must be as a continuing act of faith that all of us from different regions, different parties, different ancestral cultures will preserve it.

• (8:40 p.m.)

The other morning I was on the streets of Hamilton—I must be careful of the phraseology I use—having spoken at the meeting of my hon. friend, the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), and was up early to catch a limousine to Malton airport. As I left my hotel at about 6.30 in the morning I looked down the street. I had a few minutes in hand, and saw the great statue of the great father of our country, John A. Macdonald, which the city of Hamilton, very wisely I think, has at its centre. And I thought of what John A. Macdonald had meant to this country. Having been in the company of my colleague from Hamilton West the night before my head was clear and my memory good.

I thought of Macdonald and of his greatness, of all his political cunning, and of the devices whereby he achieved and retained power. He was not a great philosopher, and heaven knows not a saint, but on one thing he had a record which I think was impeccable. He never, never adopted an attitude other than that of moderate understanding as between the groups which composed this country. As one of the greatest historians of

this land, Dr. A. R. M. Lower, a prominent Liberal and an old tutor of mine, wrote:

> His stand with respect to the race question was consistent throughout his life whatever the cost to himself . . . he refused to raise the race cry at a time when he was in low political water.

Then I thought of that famous letter of Macdonald's. Its language is quaint and the expressions are those we would not use today, but the message is clear and still sound. Sir John A. wrote to a friend in Montreal:

> The trouble is that you British Canadians can never forget that you were once supreme, that John Baptiste was once your hewer of wood and drawer of water. You struggle for ascendency. If a Lower Canadian Britisher desires to conquer you must stoop to conquer. He must make friends with the French without sacrificing the principles of his race or lineage. He must respect their nationality. Treat them as a nation; and they will act as a free people generally do—generously. Treat them as a faction and they will become factious.

Professor Lower summed up this letter when he said:

> —wise words, the beginning and end of our Canadian puzzle but by few indeed taken to heart.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was thinking of John A. Macdonald because I have the honour to represent the constituency which contains the cradle of confederation. It was the meeting place of men of various parts of the then about to become country of Canada, men with deep differences, men of different backgrounds and different languages, but men who in a great act of faith made worthy and noble compromises to build a nation which has endured in the face of many threats. Often it has seemingly been on the edge of dissolution, but has endured for over a century, has prospered, and has developed a notable degree of greatness which should make all of us very proud.

It would be in the tradition of the founders of our country, the founders of all our parties, if we, in an act of faith, were to make an effort to harmonize, improve and strengthen the relationships between those who speak French and those who speak English so that we can the better make this confederation work, and so that we can avoid giving one scintilla of assistance to those who would destroy it. There are in this land, Mr. Speaker, too many, alas, who would do that.

I am going to vote for this bill's passage to committee not because it is a perfect bill, but I am going to vote for it despite all its imperfections because although as a vehicle it is imperfect I think that the goal is not only a good goal but it is a proposition to which we must aspire if we, as believers in the continuing confederation which we call Canada, would serve our best purposes here as we apply ourselves to this important area of linguistic communication.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

**Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to most of the members who have taken part in this debate on Bill C-120, which is a bill respecting the status of the official languages of Canada. I state emphatically and very wholeheartedly that the use of both the English and French languages should be openly encouraged as fully as humanly possible in so far as our constitution calls for that from time to time. When it is felt by Canadians, both French speaking and English speaking, that our constitution has become outdated then it is the duty of those responsible—I refer to the government of the day—to take the proper initiative in conjunction with the provincial governments to make an orderly change in the constitution in the prescribed manner.

I find it quite amazing that so many of the members on the government side of the house have seen fit to make strong suggestions that anyone who may oppose this legislation in any way whatsoever is either bigoted, prejudiced, or unwilling to accept a change. The reason I find this so amazing is that, from conversations outside the house, it appears quite evident to me that these members are in many cases quite concerned about the divisive effect this legislation may eventually have on our great country.

I certainly do not intend to take issue with all of those who attempted to unleash their wrath on members of the official opposition who voiced justified concern as to what this legislation might do. However, I would like to suggest to the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Howard) that he might find it useful and educational to read his speech for a second time because I am sure he will learn, before he has been here too much longer, that speeches such as that have a habit of coming home to haunt.

He endeavoured to have his fun with the Tories, whom he attempted to brand as being violently opposed to change. Well, Mr. Speaker, if he finds it difficult to accept the fact that Tories have always been in the forefront when beneficial changes were called for, it may take a Tory candidate in the next election to prove the point. I would also like to remind him of two of the many great changes brought about by Conservative governments,

one of which changes is closely related to the legislation we are now discussing. I refer to the simultaneous translation system in this very house. This has been mentioned before on many occasions. However, those on the government benches have been saying that this was something which had to be done anyway. The fact remains that they and their predecessors in Liberal governments conveniently sidestepped this issue throughout all the years they were in office.

• (8:50 p.m.)

The other step was, for a large segment of our native people, the most significant one which has ever been taken. I refer to the time when the government of the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker gave our native people the right to vote in federal elections, a right which had been denied them throughout confederation. Had this move not been made, governments, politicians and the general public of Canada would still be unmindful of the deplorable situation faced by these first Canadians.

Let us now take a look at this legislation. The purpose of Bill C-120 is to write into the statutes of Canada the recommendations which the Bilingual and Bicultural Commission prepared as amendments to the British North America Act; to make permanent the B and B commission in a slightly different form, by appointing a commissioner with a staff of permanent and temporary employees; to set up federal bilingual districts. One of the primary purposes of the bill is to give equality to the French and English languages in all federal government departments, agencies and institutions in Canada and abroad and, with provincial consent, to do the same in the field of education and provincial courts.

This all sounds like a very reasonable format which all Canadians should whole heartedly support. I suggest that members read Bill C-120 and the B.N.A. Act, then decide which one they are most likely to support. In my opinion, you cannot support both the B.N.A. Act and Bill C-120 unless Bill C-120 survives a proper test by our courts.

Section 133 of the Briitsh North America Act, which has been quoted before and which I should like to quote again, reads as follows:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this act, and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec.
>
> The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages.

Bill C-120 goes far beyond this when it states in clause 2:

> The English and French languages are the official languages of Canada for all purposes of the Parliament and Government of Canada, and possess and enjoy equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all the institutions of the Parliament and Government of Canada.

Another section of the British North America Act explicitly prohibits the federal government from acting in certain spheres. Section 91(1) forbids the government from tampering with language questions. This situation was brought about by means of an amendment to Section 91 of the B.N.A. Act engineered in 1949 at the request of the St. Laurent government. In part the amended section now reads:

> It is hereby declared ... the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; That is to say 1. The amendments from time to time of the constitution of Canada except as regards ... the use of the English or the French language.

This amendment indicates very clearly to me that Bill C-120 contravenes the constitution of our country, and I say this in all sincerity without any thought whatsoever of prejudice. I happen to represent a constituency where there are many thousands of persons whose native tongue is neither French nor English, and among these there are many of our original citizens who have never had the opportunity to learn either of these languages. In some areas of northern Manitoba the native people speak Saulteaux, Cree and Chippewan. Now, it looks as though they must face the requirement of learning either English or French, or perhaps both, if they wish to become full citizens of our country.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) made what I felt was a very strong plea that the constitutionality of this legislation should not be tested in the courts. I thought this rather strange, as I am at a loss to know where else this important matter could be settled. Some members have expressed the view that there is nothing seriously wrong with tampering with the constitution. If one person tampers with it and is allowed to get away with that, the door is then wide open to any government having a majority of members in this house to circumvent the Constitution. No country

can remain strong, united and healthy in a situation such as that.

To be able to speak two or more languages is certainly a wonderful goal for anyone to achieve, and no one can deny this. However, the debate on this legislation has opened up a variety of points and arguments, some of which are extremely worthy of our attention. I am particularly curious as to why the government feels justified in asking Canadians to provide the millions of dollars the implementation of this measure is going to cost when we find so many of our Indians and Métis people living in such deplorable poverty. It is quite possible that the cost of this particular program in its initial year alone would go a long way toward providing sufficient housing for at least those of our native people in greatest need, and particularly those who should have some comfort in their declining years. If this program were not being demanded by the government at this time, the cost of it for five years would possibly provide all the required housing for our native people in Canada.

• (9:00 p.m.)

It is my hope that the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development will make a strong plea to the government to provide sufficient funds with which to do this job now. But I will believe that when I see it. Yet we are now being asked to provide a like sum for an official languages program which is not, in my opinion, necessary at this time. If anyone doubts this, he need only look back to the creation of the ill-fated department of industry, the empire building now going on in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the empire building going on in the offices of some ministers. It is not difficult to calculate how many $10,000 homes for our native people could have been built with the $46 million which the Arts Centre cost; and this project was originally supposed to be built for some $9 million to $14 million. Therefore, let us not say that this legislation will not cost the taxpayers of our country a great deal of money.

Some amendments have been introduced, one of which allows the requirements of this bill to be provided by the government of Canada, beyond the boundaries of bilingual districts which the legislation will set up, provided there is sufficient demand for these requirements; but there is nothing in the legislation which states what constitutes sufficient demand.

[Mr. Simpson.]

Speaking of the proposed federal bilingual districts, some government members have attempted in their speeches to list by provinces just how few of these districts there actually will be. I have had a starred question on the order paper for some time in respect of this very matter. My question asks for the figures which were provided to the government under the 1961 decennial census indicating how many districts in Canada have 10 per cent or more people who speak English. I asked where these districts were and the census division in which they occurred. I also asked for the same information with regard to the census districts in Canada in which 10 per cent of the people had French as their native tongue. This question has not yet been answered. Therefore, when hon. members say that there will be no districts in British Columbia, one or so in Alberta and maybe four in Manitoba, I wonder just where they get this information, in view of the fact that the government has so far been unable to answer my starred question although it should have been answered some time ago.

I realize that anyone who raises an issue vis-à-vis Quebec and the rest of Canada runs the risk of being branded a bigot, and automatically anti-Quebec in the opinion of some people. However, people like our present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) tend to perpetuate this situation by their contradictory actions. It therefore becomes necessary for many of us to run the risk of such charges, merely to keep the record straight.

As reported at page 8907 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) used these words when quoting the Prime Minister:

> —Canada had to survive as one national state. Within this state there is no room for special status, and there is no room for a degree of autonomy granted to any province that is not available to any other province.

Last week we listened with a great deal of interest to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) announce the agreement between the federal government and the government of the province of Quebec to establish a national park on Forillon Peninsula, in the Gaspé area. I am sure we were all pleased to hear that the province of Quebec had joined the other nine provinces in our national parks program. However, it was more than a little disturbing to learn that, unlike the other nine provinces which must turn the required land over to the federal government free of encumbrances

in perpetuity, this agreement placed the land at the disposal of the federal government for a period of 99 years and gave the province of Quebec the right to regain possession at the end of 60 years on repayment of expenditures incurred by the federal government. If the Prime Minister says this is not special status, then I would like him to explain it to the other nine provinces which have entered into agreements to turn over land in perpetuity.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say very seriously it is my firm conviction that this legislation contravenes our constitution. I therefore oppose it on those most reasonable and, I believe, solid grounds, and will be obliged to do so until the legislation is tested in the courts of our country.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have the opportunity now to comment on this bill which is extremely important. I am very glad to take part in this debate on the official languages bill which concerns all the hon. members and all the Canadian people.

As a representative of the province of Quebec, I will have the pleasure to put forward some arguments which have to be advanced in this house. In my opinion, it is not only a matter of principle which we are discussing at this time, but also the recognition of the French language on a national basis, the recognition of the English language having been secured already now for a number of years.

I would be remiss in my duty if I did not mention that before coming to this house, I worked within various nationalistic or political groups.

I have always been very happy to discuss the French-Canadian nation and to promote its development, not only in Quebec but all across Canada.

All the hon. members will understand that we have been and still are somewhat concerned about the recognition of the French language which, in short, is the recognition as we said earlier of the two founding groups, the French-speaking and the English-speaking groups

Since I encountered some difficulties in my work to promote that language and the Canadian nation, I made an attempt to get elected to this house so that I might represent here the French element. I thought it was the best way, without for all that thrusting myself on anybody, that it was here in this house that we should discuss very calmly the problems that exist in this country as a whole.

I am given today the opportunity to deal with this bill and to say very objectively that if we were granted bilingual cheques and simultaneous translation after 90 years, I would not like people to believe they were mere gifts nor think that French Canadians would be satisfied with bilingual cheques or simultaneous translation.

This debate has something to do with justice and those who represent the majority merely want to put justice into practice or appeal to it. That justice, we obviously have been hoping for it for a long time for it does not exist for the province of Quebec only but for all minorities.

• (9:10 p.m.)

We should, I believe, deal in an objective way with French-Canadian minorities in other provinces that have been waiting a long time for such recognition. I believe that as a member of parliament, even if it were only to stand up for minorities, I must take part in this debate in a constructive and objective way. Certain members find it somewhat difficult to recognize that principle, but I do not believe any one can refuse to recognize it for it merely means the recognition of the two founding groups.

I am in a good position to deal with difficulties and to tell you that in Quebec we know what difficulties are. Thanks to some progress made in the last ten years, we have more faith than ever in this common life, in the greatness of our country and in this involvement in federal politics.

It is difficult to have some members accept this bill which would seem to displease some minorities. But I think we must all admit this principle of the recognition of those two founding groups. I think we are right to ask for it because, in my opinion, that is in harmony with the history of our country and also because that is how we have managed so far to build a country which is nonetheless an object of envy for some in the world.

As for the various ethnic groups which make up Canada, it is understood that we do not wish to oppress the minorities which compose them. Far from it. We must first recognize the French fact and the English fact.

Our political leaders have perhaps lacked courage when it was a question of making the various ethnic groups accept and understand, when they came to settle in Canada, that they

should naturally—and I say naturally—integrate themselves into one of the two cultures. This does not mean that these groups must forget their language or their customs, but, to my mind, Canada will be strong and great if the two founding groups are recognized.

All those who came to Canada will be able to make their contribution, the effects of which will be most valuable while deserving our gratitude and appreciation.

We should recognize the principle that Canada was built by two founding peoples while acknowledging this diversity of cultures. As for those who would have us believe that we could become a multilingual country, considering the proportion of new Canadians here, let me answer that such a policy would simply help build a tower of Babel. It would be coward to encourage the dreams of the various ethnic groups in this respect and allow them to preserve their illusions.

It is therefore my duty, since we have to work in the most objective and fairest possible way, to request all members to accept once and for all this bill which will extend to the whole country the recognition of the French language and will allow the minorities, whether French or English, to express themselves and to participate in the business of the country in their mother tongue.

To those who speak of priorities and wonder if it would not be advisable to try to delay this debate by suggesting that adopting other bills might be more urgent, I shall answer that every law brought before parliament is indeed, important and the need for its adoption always pressing. But I certainly could not accept the opinion of those who would merely play politics and delay this debate by requiring the government to recognize other priorities or to introduce other legislations.

The best and most efficient way of working in the best interest of the country and trying to achieve, as soon as possible, this unity which we have so far never attained is to pass the bill and to proceed as soon as possible to the consideration of other bills likely to be also very useful to all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need to dwell very long on the bill, for it looks advisable to me that it should be passed. I do not think it is necessary to say that I support the bill for the pleasure of supporting the government. Let no one think that I want to please the government but, as a member of the opposition, I submit that we also have the responsibility of taking part in the adoption of valuable parliamentary legislation and it is my duty to participate in the administration of the government. The opposition has a part to play in forcing the government into acting more quickly, whenever the legislation is valuable and advisable. I sincerely think that, in the interests of all Canadians and particularly French Canadians, it is urgent, advisable and desirable to pass the bill.



On the other hand, if unfortunately this debate were to drag on, I would have to ask myself this question: what is there for me to do here as a French-speaking member of parliament? I am convinced that the majority of hon. members recognize the significance of this bill for the future of this country, for the sake of the kind of justice which we are recommending and for which we are working. In view of those circumstances, I think that we will be sufficiently objective and straightforward to get this bill accepted as soon as possible throughout Canada.

As I said, it is agreed that the intention of this bill is not to impose the French language to those who do not want to learn it. However, I believe it is designed so that those willing to do so will be able to learn and practice it as soon as possible.

Personally, I did not hesitate on my arrival in this house to speak a second language, with which I am not very familiar. The results may not be the most satisfactory so far, but at least I do my best to be able, in the near future, to talk with my English-speaking friends in their own language, so as to be better understood and to prove that in Canada the two founding nations can get along and seek the same objectives.

When we recognize these differences, whether we admit it or not, I think that we will then be in a better position to understand one another and, consequently, to accept one another more easily and to work together, while retaining our different mentalities, speaking a different language perhaps, in order to reach that ideal which is to build a strong, well-structured Canada, with strong provinces as well.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I did not want to miss this opportunity to take part in this debate, for my fellow-citizens in Quebec as well as the minorities in the other provinces have needs which must be met. Those people want greater opportunities. Indeed, as a result of a recent trip out west, I realized this. They should have, as soon as possible, a French television station

that would help them to maintain their language and feel increasingly at home throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I should like once again to say that I do not want to dwell unduly on this subject, but once and for all the importance must be recognized of the services this bill could render the Canadian nation. In addition, in view of the tenor of some of the speeches, an effort should be made not to reject the claims of the members from the province of Quebec whom I personally invite to foster or work for the passing of this bill. I felt that some members were rather surprised to know that, in the province of Quebec, there existed—I shall not say unfortunately—perhaps too often circumstances or claims that worried them.

But it is time that we should recognize that Quebec is a province different from the others, whether we like it or not. It is unthinkable not to recognize that difference when we know that there are more than five million French Canadians in that province.

It is a fact that the Quebec mentality is different. The history of Quebec being different, its needs and its aspirations are different also.

But the goal of Quebecers, as that of all Canadians, is for the vast majority to live in a well-organized Canada and a well-organized province of Quebec, while hoping for a similar organization in the other provinces. Quebecers are perfectly justified in demanding the recognition of certain rights and I do not believe that the representatives of the province of Quebec deny that there are also differences with the other provinces.

It is urgent to recognize those differences in that province, taking into account its mentality. But once again the objective of Quebec is to build a strong and well-organized province for the good of Canada. I have always maintained that that strength and the development of the provinces will assure the greatness of Canada.

The bill under consideration is surely supported by a majority of hon. members. Let all those who are worried be reassured. The bill is as important as all those we have already adopted, because it recognizes a language that has been forgotten for too long.

The bill asks for the recognition of the history of Canada, this country built by two founding peoples which were joined by New Canadians who are perfectly welcome in Canada and who have contributed to the country's greatness.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I shall be very happy to vote for the bill, not with politics in mind, but from the conviction that I co-operate in the passing of a measure that all French Caandians have long been waiting for, and that the majority will accept in the best interest of Canada. It will ensure better understanding and will best prove that we really want a united country.

[*English*]

**Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the debate this evening because I wish to register some points of view on the bill before us and to place certain objections on record. In addition, I wish to express what I believe to be a legitimate concern on my part as to the contents of this measure.

I am concerned about the reasons for this legislation. I firmly believe that this bill is a retrograde step as far as the unity of Canada is concerned. I think it is divisive in its effect, and that it will divide ethnic groups across the country. There groups will no longer feel themselves to be part of the Canadian concept. In my view the bill is unnecessary because we already have the freedom and the right to use our languages on a national basis. I hold this bill to be politically motivated and nothing more than an election gimmick.

I am further concerned as to the legality of this measure. On this issue I wish to raise only two points to strengthen the arguments put forward by my hon. friend from Churchill (Mr. Simpson). On November 12 of last year the Hon. J. T. Thorson, an eminent lawyer in the City of Ottawa, wrote a letter to the Prime Minister of this country (Mr. Trudeau) raising two points against the bill. He stated them as follows:

1. The bill represents an attempt to amend the constitution of Canada as regards the use of the English and French languages so that it falls within one of the stated exceptions to the legislative jurisdiction of parliament under section 91 of the British North America Act; and

2. Section 133 of the British North America Act limits the status and use of the French language in Canada so that any attempt, whether by parliament or by the legislatures, to extend the use of that language by legislation is repugnant to that provision and therefor *ultra vires*.

In his attempt to answer Thorson adequately the Prime Minister stated that Bill C-120 in no way purports to amend the constitution. He drew attention to the guaranteed rights of the French language under the statute, and I

agree with him in this respect. In his concluding paragraph, the Prime Minister, also an eminent lawyer, said:

> The government, as you know, hopes to secure a substantial consensus on the desirability of a constitutional bill; one that will operate to extend the provisions of section 133 for the benefit of all Canadians.

I am not a lawyer myself but it seems to me that when you amend statute law so that it means something other than what it meant in its original form you are to all intents and purposes amending the statute, in this case, the constitution. Section 133 guarantees the use of the English and French languages in certain instances. To broaden by statute law the use of these languages, as outlined in Bill C-120, to me means amendment of the constitution.

• (9:30 p.m.)

The hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Simpson) made reference to the setting up of these bilingual districts, whether under the 10 per cent or the 80 per cent criterion, but I do not think the government has licence or authority to bring forward this kind of legislation. I know that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) argues, and eloquently, that this measure is not an infringement of the constitution. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that if he is that sure of his ground, other legal authorities are equally sure that the government does not have the right to amend the constitution in this regard, in other words, to introduce Bill C-120. Hence, the refusal of the government to allow the Supreme Court of Canada to rule on the constitutionality of this bill before introducing it in this house is of some concern to me.

I think the motive behind this legislation is political. I think the Liberal party is thinking ahead to the next election. This languages bill, which amounts to nothing more than a carrot on a stick, will give some measure of support to Liberal candidates in the next election. At the risk of offending all of the other ethnic groups in Canada, Quebec's support for the Liberal party must be guaranteed. Heaven knows, there is not much hope for them in the west.

I want to put on the record this evening some of the views of ethnic leaders across the country. One of the more interesting documents that I have in my hand is entitled: "The inadequacies and injustices of the official languages bill", and contains remarks made by Russell Dzenick, L.L.B., a prominent Liberal in the city of Edmonton. He is also president

[Mr. Skoreyko.]

of the Ukranian Canadian Committee. These remarks were made at a panel discussion held during the Alberta provincial Liberal convention on April 25 and 26, 1969. He said:

> The latest step in the government's program in dealing with the future of Canada is the official languages bill.
>
> I propose to deal with the question of how the official languages bill and the B and B report affects the one third of Canadians with whose existence the government appears to be completely unconcerned—and which lack of concern has shown itself in all other facets of life so evident since the Pearson days and continued more boldly during the present Trudeau era.
>
> The official languages bill has completely failed to consider the existence of Canadians of non-English and non-French origin—the supreme example of the majority taking full and irresponsible advantage of its numbers to impose its will upon defenceless minorities by law rather than by usage and gradual development as is and should be the case in all democratic nations.
>
> The bill, in accordance with the bilingual and bicultural report proposes to set up "federal bilingual districts" dealing only with the guarantee of the use of both French and English in areas where there are 10 per cent of each group residing; but completely fails to propose any constitutional safeguards for the preservation and continued development of languages and cultures of those Canadian citizens who are not descendants of the English or French races. For example: If in a given area the Ukrainians, the Germans, the Italians or other persons of any other extraction constitute 80 per cent of the population, then it would nevertheless be deemed to be a bilingual area of French and English notwithstanding the overwhelming majority of citizens. The bilingual districts would leave Canada open to racial and political gerrymandering with Canadians of other extractions becoming mere pawns of the English and French Canadians.
>
> If bilingual districts are to be established on the 10 per cent formula, it should include other languages where population in such districts contains 10 per cent or more of people who are neither of French or English origin.
>
> In principle—I believe in a variety in association, languages and cultures. These should be recognized, appreciated and encouraged. It is most important that we recognize the value of multiculturalism in Canada. This cannot be done by the forceful promotion of two languages to the exclusion of all others.
>
> In lieu of the offensive language contained in section 2 of the proposed bill let us consider a substitute clause along the following lines: "English and French are the two major languages of Canada. Languages of Canadians who are descendants of other ethnolingual groups are also recognized as Canadian languages, fully equal in rights and privileges to English and French."
>
> There are several very important moral and material benefits to be derived from the recognition of languages rooted in Canada, of various Canadian racial groups, who, together, have built up different areas of present day Canada.

Firstly, the question of human dignity is deeply involved. If, by decree or legislation, or by constitutional guarantee the languages—and thereby cultures of only two of Canada's ethnic groups are selected for survival—while Canadians speaking other languages are singled out for virtual immediate assimilation—then such legislation offends human dignity and contravenes fundamental human rights. Such legislation is morally indefensible.

Secondly; the very basis of our democratic system is implicated. If preservation of language is important and essential to the survival of the French and English, it is equally essential to the Ukrainians, Germans, Italians, Eskimos, Indians and all others for the very same reason. In democracy one cannot apply one set of standards and moral principles to one group of citizens and a different standard to another group of Canadians.

Thirdly, there is also an important aspect of real material benefit. Recognition of language rights of any community is reflected in definite material benefits, while a restrictive regulation, whether of direct or indirect character, means exclusion of the community from access to those benefits. Recognition of a language means growth and development of the community. It evokes a greater sense of pride. Exclusion or restriction of language rights of the community means the negation and a narrowing of horizons in a community.

Finally, means for language and cultural activities are derived from taxation in various forms from all people who make up this nation. In the distribution of these taxation revenues it is only just to consider its source and make a sincere attempt to provide the services for cultural development of all communities.

When Mr. Dzenick made this statement before a large group in Edmonton, he was speaking on behalf of over 500,000 people, according to the 1961 census, who were very much concerned with the effects of this bill.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I have another clipping from the Edmonton *Journal* of February 20, 1969. I hesitate to express any personal viewpoint in this chamber because others who have done so have been branded as bigots and narrow-minded politicians. I think I can serve my purpose best by putting on record the views of some responsible ethnic leaders across Canada. The headline of the article in my hand reads, "What the 'other ethnic groups' want". It reads:

Spokesmen for the "other ethnic groups" in the Edmonton Area say they don't want special privileges for themselves.

They say they want to be Canadians, not hyphenated Canadians, in the multi-coloured mosaic of this nation's life. But by the same token, they believe French-Canadians are not justified in claiming special privileges for themselves.

French-Canadian demands are seen as reasonable in Quebec, parts of Ontario and New Brunswick, but the French-Canadians do not occupy a historically privileged position in Western Canada. On the contrary, their contributions to the life and development of the West are seen as much smaller than those of the larger other ethnic groups, the Germans, the Ukrainians and the Scandinavians.

This statement should in no way be interpreted as representing anti-French sentiment in the west. The newspaper report goes on to say:

There is no apparent anti-French feeling. The other ethnic groups say they just don't want to be "left out".

They fear that constitutional entrenchment of French language rights will result in "greater discrimination against minority groups that has existed until now," according to R. L. Dzenick, president of the Edmonton branch of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee which comprises the vast majority of Ukrainians in Canada.

W. R. Zeidler, president of the German Canadian Association which speaks for most German-speaking groups in central Alberta, shares Mr. Dzenick's sentiment.

They fear the "second-class status" which still clings to many ethnic groups will be brought into sharper focus through the entrenchment of two official languages into the constitution.

"In the past we have found many instances where it has been difficult to obtain employment because of background", says Mr. Dzenick.

"There were many instances of discrimination. Now, with a second official language being forced upon us, and it doesn't matter which language it is, the minority groups will again feel the greatest pinch when it comes to discrimination.

Rightly or wrongly, these people express a sincere viewpoint. May I put on the record a paragraph or two from a publication known as the *Ukrainian Voice* of Winnipeg, dated May 7, 1969. In their editorial they ask for a more equitable language bill and say:

In spite of the many assurances from high places that the French language will not be forced upon any Canadian citizen, it can hardly be denied that the creation of French-English bilingual districts, on a 10 per cent basis, will prove to be an indirect form of compulsion insofar as the local positions are concerned.

This would be most unfair in districts which might have the minimum requirement of French population, but where some other ethnic group would be much larger numerically. If a situation of this sort were allowed to develop, we will be in fact creating a divisive society, a society in which some citizens would be more privileged than others. This would hardly be in keeping with the principles of a free society.

If the government is irrevocably wedded to the idea of bilingual districts, it should tread very carefully in instituting them. They should not necessarily follow the boundaries of federal or provincial electoral districts, but should be delineated in such a way as to encompass a majority of French-speaking citizens. Otherwise, to avoid the divisive effect, similar districts should be formed for other major language groups where

they constitute a sizeable proportion of the population. Still another solution that lends itself ideally to stituations in western Canada would be to officially recognize the languages of leading language groups as regional languages.

There is also another area which should be discussed here briefly. While the bilingualization of the civil service is understandable and desirable in order that the citizens of Canada may be served in either official language, there is a danger in this process being pushed to the extreme. If the aim of bilingualization of the civil service is to enable the citizens, in their dealings with government, governmental institutions and crown corporations to communicate in either one of the two official languages, it is not necessary to require that each and every member of the civil service should be proficient in both languages. The knowledge of both languages should not be a prerequisite in every case for serving Canada at home or abroad. There should be no valid reason why the civil service should not accept a unilingual (French or English) applicant with exceptional talents, or those who have a knowledge of one official language and one or two other. Surely, a knowledge of some Slavic languages would be a decided advantage in trade and diplomatic missions to central and south eastern Europe, or the knowledge of Italian, Portuguese and Spanish in dealings with Latin countries.

If the language rights guaranteed 100 years ago need to be amended, Mr. Speaker, should we not in our amendment include English, French, and the languages of other ethnic groups across the country? Yet nothing like that has been done.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that not only have I expressed my own doubts about the bill but I have also expressed the reservations of responsible leaders of ethnic groups and associations in Canada. I have put those views on the record. In considering this legislation surely the government should have heeded the viewpoint expressed by various ethnic leaders and given expression to these viewpoints in the clauses of the bill, thus making this bill acceptable to all concerned. Of course, if the government is determined to push this bill through, and because of its majority we cannot stop it, one can only say that the people of Canada do not want to have this measure forced upon them. The bill is ill-conceived and has dangerous ramifications that could divide this country to the point of no return.

• (9:50 p.m.)

**Mr. H. A. Moore (Wetaskiwin):** Mr. Speaker, before saying why I object to this bill may I say this. No one is opposing this bill because of any desire to suppress the French language, or any other language in Canada for that matter. The rights of any group to any

[Mr. Skoreyko.]

language or culture should not be curtailed. In the western half of Canada, as in some other areas, Mr. Speaker, we do not feel any responsibility for or involvement in the old squabbles between the French and English in Canada. The fact that we speak English does not make us English Canadians. Most of us have neither French nor English blood in our veins. Many of us have studied French in school; some of us even became fairly proficient in it. On leaving school we immediately forgot most of it since there was no further contact with the language. Our mother tongue being English, regardless of our racial origin, we used the language of our area and had no reason to make an effort to retain any proficiency in French. Now, we are faced with a bill that might not say much but has ominous implications for us. The federal government will not employ people who speak only English. What does this mean? It means that only people from central Canada, who have been exposed to both languages from childhood, will get the jobs. We who always thought we were Canadians, and many who were willing to fight for Canada, find we still have the privilege of paying the taxes which pay the salaries of the privileged Canadians who, because of their ability to speak French, are eligible for the Civil Service.

What about those who are only English speaking and are employed in the federal Civil Service, especially in Ottawa? Their chances of advancement are nil. This situation, unfair as it seems to us, is by this bill to be carried into the armed forces and possibly to the R.C.M.P. Then, of course, there is the 7 per cent wage bonus for the fortunate. Is it any wonder we are concerned? There appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of Wednesday, May 21, the headline, "Merit Reinstated for Promotion in Public Service". What an admission! What a hope! This bill in no way makes provision for the merit system to be applicable to civil servants. I doubt this statement will change anything for the better. It in no way guarantees any rights to English speaking Canadians.

The question of language rights on a national scale is just a small part of a much larger question. That question is whether it is reasonable to expect that mere legislation can halt, let alone reverse, the tide of natural social evolution. I believe this is what we are seeking to do in this legislation and in other measures in the same area which may be brought forward at a later date for enactment. The aim of this bill supposedly is to

provide justice for a minority, and that aim rests on the guarantees provided to the people of French Canada by the British North America Act. No one could question such an aim. It is highly laudable. However, I have a feeling that there is a great gap between the aim of this bill and the situation that will be created by application of its terms. It may well be that this bill will be self-defeating, will aggravate the very situation it seeks to soothe. It may create new issues, fresh points of friction and thus drive a new wedge between the races rather than draw them closer together.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), speaking in this house on October 17 when the resolution was introduced, said among other things:

> I believe that there will be widespread agreement among members and their constituents in all parts of Canada that this bill can be of great importance in promoting national unity.

I am not among those who agree that this bill will promote national unity. On the contrary, I believe it will be destructive. No member is more anxious than I, Mr. Speaker, to see national unity strengthened and to bring an end to the wasteful and distasteful feuding between the two principal language groups in Canada. I simply cannot bring myself to believe that legislation is the means by which this can best be brought about. I will go further and say I believe legislation is the very worst way to go about it. Unquestionably, more can be done to ensure language rights to both French and English speaking Canadians on a voluntary basis than by means of legal compulsion.

In learning a second language, the learner must want to learn and use it. If he or she is compelled by law to learn it simply to prove a point, that compulsion will only breed a stubborn determination never to use the language if it can be avoided and, at least, to master it no more than is absolutely necessary. Compulsion will spread a slow poison that will ruin relations and postpone real unity indefinitely. Race relations and linguistic rights. Cultural recognition and mutual appreciation depend upon the human mind and spirit, not on intricate legal machinery, coercion and paper guarantees.

This bill is a breeding ground for resentment and bitterness. The setting up of special areas, the formal conferring of special rights and the establishment of the elaborate policing apparatus necessary to make these devices work, will only harden minor differences into inflexible opposition and open the door to endless wrangling.

The Prime Minister made another interesting comment in his speech of October 17. It is a remark that highlights the real facts of today's North American world. He said:

> The most important example of this diversity is undoubtedly the existence of the two major language groups, both of which are strong enough in numbers and in material and in intellectual resources to resist the forces of assimilation.

This might be true perhaps if we were considering the French language and the French community in terms only of Canada. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we can no more limit the question to an area within an arbitrary line, such as our international boundary, than we can stop air from circulating. Whether we like it or not, both English and French Canadians are an integral part of a North American, not a national, society. The inescapable effect of this is that that society is an English language society. In the North American society, the French speaking group represent only 2 per cent.

We can retain political sovereignty. We can continue to develop as a distinctive nationality and nation. But we cannot escape the overwhelming force of social, cultural and economic evolution that does not stop at international boundaries but covers all the continent.

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

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the sustained interest in the house on this question and the desirability of completing second reading stage and getting the bill to committee, I wonder if the house would be prepared to give unanimous consent to continue the sitting either until midnight or the debate shall be brought to an end, with the understanding there will be no vote taken later this evening? A vote would be taken following orders of the day tomorrow.

**Mr. Horner:** No unanimous consent.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** The hon. member for Crowfoot refuses unanimous consent.

**Mr. Horner:** As a result of that side of the house not giving consent earlier today—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please. It being ten o'clock it is my duty to put the questions to be debated at this time.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

PUBLIC SERVICE—SUPERANNUATED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR INCREASED PENSIONS

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 29, as recorded in *Hansard* at page 8102, I put the following question to the Prime Minister:

In view of the fact that within the past few days the International Nickel Company of Canada and Imperial Oil Limited have announced plans for increasing the pensions of their retired employees, will the Prime Minister, as head of the government, expedite the cabinet's consideration of the question of increasing the pensions of retired public servants?

I thought that was a direct question and I dared to hope the answer would be yes. However, the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) reply was as follows:

We are proceeding according to plan, Mr. Speaker.

• (10:00 p.m.)

I tried again with a supplementary, which was as follows:

In view of the fact the President of the Treasury Board indicated on January 8 to an organization representing these people that there would be a report within a few weeks, can the Prime Minister say when there will be a statement as to the progress that has been made?

Again, I thought I might get a straightforward reply, but the answer as printed in *Hansard* was as follows:

Mr. Trudeau: The plan is secret, Mr. Speaker.

I wondered at the time what those words meant. I think what the Prime Minister was really saying to me was, "Will you go jump in the lake." In other words, the government is getting tired of these repeated demands some of us are making for consideration of this terribly important question of what is happening to the value of the pensions of retired public servants, but I want to say to the Prime Minister and to the government that even if the member for Winnipeg North Centre were not raising this matter as often as he can, the issue would not go away.

It is here as a very real problem. Its extent is increasing. It applies not only to retired civil servants but to retired employees of the railways of this country, to retired pensioners in all walks of life, and it applies to the pensions that are paid under the Old Age Security Act. As prices go up the value of pensions goes down. As the standard of living rises and retired people are left with what they had, the gap between them and the rest of society grows that much wider. Something has to be done about this issue. It cannot be put off and off the way the government is doing.

In my question to the Prime Minister on April 29, as I have already noted, I referred to the fact that two rather large companies in this country have recently taken action with respect to their former employees, namely, International Nickel and Imperial Oil. Certain other companies have done likewise. Most of the provincial governments have taken action in this field. The government of the United Kingdom has recently, for the seventh time since the end of World War II, increased the pensions of its retired civil servants.

I was interested in the press release from International Nickel. I am grateful to that company for having sent me a copy of it, for this release indicates that the increase in pensions is not insignificant. The increase varies all the way from 4 per cent for those retired in 1964 to as high as 25 per cent for those retired prior to 1951.

In other words, the recognition is growing that this is a problem about which something has to be done. There is not a doubt in the world so far as I am concerned that the day will come when it will be accepted practice that pensions are escalated after they have been put in pay, and this will be done in proportion to the increases that take place in the wages and salaries of those who are still working. Why must this government wait and be the last employer to accept this principle? The time to do this is now.

The government should give a lead, not just to follow or even to fail to do that. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think my question to the Prime Minister on April 29 was a legitimate one and that it deserved a straightforward reply.

We have had this issue around for a long time. We have had a unanimous report of a special committee, presented to the house on May 8, 1967. We have had assurances and promises galore. All I asked the Prime Minister to do on April 29 was to give me his assurance that he would do his best to get his colleagues in the cabinet to expedite their consideration of this matter. I hope that whoever is answering for the Prime Minister tonight will give me that assurance, that an

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

effort will be made to get the cabinet moving on this issue instead of stalling the way it has done all this time. Some day something will have to be done. Some day it will be done. Most of us in the house for the late show period tonight believe the time for that action is now.

**Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the substantive argument being put forward by the hon. member is entirely different to the question that appeared in *Hansard*. It was really for that reason, when I looked that question over, that I was hesitant in replying on behalf of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) because of the implication that in replying I am by-passing the normal procedures of ministerial responsibility. However, because there is no substantive content to the question that appears on page 8102 of *Hansard* and that was posed by the wily, not devious, member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), I will say that cabinet consideration of this subject is, in the Prime Minister's own words, "proceeding according to plan." As the hon. member well knows, cabinet meetings are secret and until decisions are reached and announced not even the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre can be made privy to them.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** And you get extra pay for an answer like that.

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—REQUEST FOR REDUCTION IN RATE ON "MONTREAL" MAGAZINE

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I had also asked last May 8 a question which may be found at page 8471 of *Hansard*, and I quote:

> Following the increase in its postal charges from $28,000 to $55,000, the magazine *Montréal*, will disappear—

I was asking the Minister of Communications if he intended to grant a reduction in postal rates to that magazine which made Canada known throughout the world.

When that magazine was started in May 1964 the mayor of Montreal said, and I quote:

> I am delighted to introduce you to the first edition of this new monthly magazine which will be circulated throughout the world. At the same time, I want to extend to you warm greetings from Canada's metropolis.
>
> *Montréal '64*, published by the City of Montreal, is designed essentially for strangers to Canada's biggest city. Its purpose is twofold: To underline our desire for international co-operation and to show the true personality of Montreal.
>
> Through its location and the place it occupies in the financial and economic life of Canada, Montreal is the very symbol of Canada's spirit, its will and determination to be a pace-setter.

That was said in May 1964. Now, four years later, *Montreal '68* disappears. In 1964, you had the beginning of an era of progress; in 1968, you have the disappearance of a publication which did a lot to enhance Canada's image in the whole world. I might add that it seems impossible to me now to save that magazine. In that respect, I should like to quote these words:

> The bell has tolled. The prestigious magazine *Montréal*, published at first every month and afterwards every six or eight weeks by the city of Montreal for nearly five years, will no longer reach its 517,000 choice readers scattered in 148 countries in the world.
>
> It is folding up.

Why?

> In the past, the shipping costs for that luxury magazine were $6,000 per month. They were to reach $28,000 in November last and $55,000 as of April 1, 1969 . . . however, the magazine has not been published since the major rate increase.
>
> 310,655 copies were sent to the United States—

The publication was sent to Great Britain, France, Canada, including Quebec, North America, Central America, somewhat all over the world.

The minister recently claimed that to save those papers having difficulties, they should merely be given grants, and he was referring to papers such as *Le Devoir* and *L'Évangéline*.

Here is a list of cultural publications, including *Montréal* magazine, and some newspapers that are bound to disappear namely: *La Feuille d'Érable*, of Plessisville, *La Voix de l'Est*, of Granby, *Le Progrès de Thetford-Mines, La Tribune*, of Thetford-Mines, *Le Peuple*, of Montmagny, *La Terre de Chez-nous, Le Courrier de Montmagny, La Tribune de Lévis, l'Étoile du Lac, La Voix du Sud, La Frontière, L'Écho du Saint-Maurice, La Valée de la Chaudière, L'Éclaireur, Le Progrès de la Beauce, l'Enseignement, Liberté et Patriote*. Many English publications, the names of which I have not here, are also bound to disappear.

These magazines and newspapers will disappear because the minister said that the Post Office Department must pay its way. The government of a just society can build an Arts Centre costing $46 million, when the initial cost was to be $9 million, but for the

popular culture that reaches in every Canadian home and the remotest areas of Canada, for people who are unable to visit this Arts Centre, and who will have no right to this culture, the Postmaster General has decided that the Post Office Department must pay its way.

So, he offers subsidies. The minister should take notice, because I think that in today's *Le Devoir*, he got a proud answer from Claude Ryan, which I quote from text:

• (10:10 p.m.)

The idea of subsidies is contrary to all the standards which, in western countries, preside over the relations between the daily press and the political power.

And he added:

To offset such difficulties, the Postmaster General suggested special subsidies which could, on request, be paid by the Secretary of State.

Claude Ryan then said:

I'll have none of those hand-outs scattered right and left.

I agree with this journalist, who understands the problem which allows some newspapers to remain in existence, and causes others to disappear.

We have seen, for example, *Time* magazine and the *Reader's Digest* protected by the Postmaster General, but when it is time to save newspapers which inform the population of a constituency and of the farthest regions in Canada, the government refuses to listen to the opposition, who happens to be voicing the truth.

I repeat it once more, if we can spend $46 million to build the National Arts Centre, which was to cost $9 million, for the general culture of the people, for the general education of the Canadian population, let us allow the newspapers to survive and to that end let us grant them a special status for their distribution across Canada.

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I must first set the record straight with regard to some facts stated by the hon. member. He said tonight that postal rates increased from $6,000 to $55,000.

But when he first spoke, he talked of an increase from $28,000 to $55,000, and he was much closer to the truth at that time.

**Mr. Dumont:** Would the minister permit a question?

[Mr. Dumont.]

**Mr. Kierans:** The correct figure in October was $27,000. That is exactly what we received, and as a result of the increase in rates, effective April 1, it became $55,000.

But, Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the department has not received any request for a special rate for this magazine. Nobody contacted me personally or the department on that matter.

I can answer that question. The magazine *Montreal 68* ceased publication in October; long before the introduction of the new postal rates. In fact, six months before April 1, the owners had decided to stop publishing the magazine.

In fact, since publication stopped in October, the decision must have been made in July or August, a long time before the bill was introduced in the house, for financial reasons, perhaps on account of a $500,000 deficit.

It is easy to blame the Minister of Communications for everything. I am not at all concerned, because I am convinced that the employees of my department are devoted and ready to serve the Canadian people as best as possible.

**Mr. Dumont:** Mr. Speaker, would you allow me—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I must remind the hon. member that at this stage he cannot rise on a point of order or ask a question.

**Mr. Dumont:** Even if I did not use all the time allotted to me, Mr. Speaker?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order.

[*English*]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—EFFECT OF RATE CHANGES ON NON-PROFIT PUBLICATIONS

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, it is said that dialogue is the "in" thing, and the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) and I are doing a good deal of dialoguing. Whether or not he likes the fact that it is done at this nocturnal hour I do not know, but I love the hushed expectance of the crowded house at 10.15 p.m. This is why I often take up with him matters of concern to the Canadian people.

**Mr. Kierans:** It is always the same thing.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** I hear the minister interjecting and taking some of my seven minutes by saying it is always the same

thing, but when publications in this country stop going out of business I will stop talking about the problem that he has created for those publications.

I do not want to bring these matters to the minister's attention more frequently than is necessary, and so on this evening, in my discussion of publications I will be dealing only with the weeklies. I think the Postmaster General a few weeks ago told the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) that this was the category of publications least injured by his new rates. The Canadian *Weekly Publisher* of April, 1969, volume 52, issue No. 4, deals with the matter pretty strongly. They deal with it in a way which indicates that they know because they are suffering. The article is entitled "Post Office Costs Kill Weeklies". It reads:

> Postal rate increase that went into effect April 1, already is blamed for the demise of several weekly newspapers, according to information received at the national office of the Canadian Weekly Newspapers Association.
>
> CWNA queried its members on the effects of the new rates and some of the replies are reprinted below—
>
> Manitoba Weekly Newspapers Association reports four papers have folded in Manitoba since January, three of which became defunct due to postal increase—
>
> A small Alberta publisher complains that he has been forced to increase subscription rates—
>
> A British Columbia publisher reports that his second newspaper had to be suspended due to the increased postal rate—
>
> Another B.C. newspaper reports that due to increased postal rates "we have had to switch our circulation from mail to carrier delivery"—

There has been, of course, a consequent diminution of their service to the readers.

The same applies to Saskatchewan, western Ontario and other areas. In other words, what is happening now is what we forecast, namely, that publications would be forced to go out of business and that they would not be able to absorb the costs which are passed on to the subscribers. They have not been able to absorb the costs in the happy, casual way that the minister indicated would be possible when he brought in these very heavy rates some time ago.

This is part of the story all across the country. The dissemination of ideas through the printed word has been diminished and cut back, and the people of Canada are suffering in this regard. It is not anything that anyone can be proud of when, by a decision of the government, a newspaper has to go out of business. I noted the other day that a group of publishers in Quebec gave serious consideration to suggesting that something special be done to keep publications in business.

**Mr. Benjamin:** You are out of "time".

**Mr. Macquarrie:** My friend suggests we should join the *Time* magazine group, but I do not know how exclusive that organization is. I think perhaps it is not a case of open Sesame there.

**Mr. Bell:** It is quite loose.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** A humorist over there says it is quite loose. That is a good bit of punning for this hour of the night.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** All of us here are getting on the record.

**Mr. Macquarrie:** I want to conclude—and I hope the minister will notice that I am not taking my full seven minutes—by reading something that is edged in black in the old fashioned way in the Canadian *Weekly Publisher* of April, 1969. It is entitled "Out of Respect". It reads:

> The new postal rates for newspapers, and there is nothing second rate about them except the mail service itself, went into effect April 1.
>
> The black border around this announcement is out of respect for a number of Canadian weekly newspapers that ceased publication or curtailed it considerably as a result of this measure. We are afraid more will follow.
>
> It may be also fitting, that on the same day the Postmaster General, who master minded this measure, became the Minister of Communications.

Although that was edged in black, it did have a touch of humour, that he who, on the one hand, would become the great communicator, when it comes to the printed word, is the great excommunicator.

• (10:20 p.m.)

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General):** Mr. Speaker, I enjoy these evening sessions with the hon. gentleman and others who remain in the house at this hour. He is predictable. Whether he has been spurred on by one of his colleagues or whether he does so on his own initiative he will bring up the subject of *Time* magazine, with the implication that it is receiving some favourable rate. This is a distortion. *Time* magazine is paying exactly the same rate as all magazines in its class pay.

I find it a little presumptuous on the part of the hon. member that he should twit this government when it was his own government which established the O'Leary Commission to

investigate the whole subject of the printed word and related questions in this country. His own government appointed the O'Leary Royal Commission, but it did not a single thing about this situation.

The hon. member said four papers had folded in one class or another since January. To be fair, he might have compared this figure with the number which folded in the same period last year. Were there more or less? He cited the case of the poor weekly newspaper which was obliged to increase its subscription rates. I feel sorry it had to do this; I hope it did not lose any of its subscribers; I hope its readers found that the newspapers was worth paying the additional amount. One thing to which I do not subscribe, particularly in the area of weekly newspapers, is the view that the people of Canada, the general taxpayer who half the time does not know what he is paying for, should still continue, even after this increase, to pay for nearly 87 per cent—the actual figure is 86.8 per cent—of the cost of distributing these weekly newspapers. In other words, much as they are complaining they are still paying only a fraction over 13 per cent of the actual cost.

I am not proud to have been the cause of any weekly newspapers going out of business but I would be much less proud if I did nothing about the problems confronting the Post Office and let this country face a deficit this year of $130 million or a deficit in 1974-75 of $500 million. I would not be proud to be responsible for such a situation arising as a result of my negligence, or laziness, or desire to sit in the house late in the evening to answer such questions as have been posed tonight. I would be less than proud, because that $500 million deficit in 1974-75 would mean an increase in taxes or a decline in other government services.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10.26 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Tuesday, May 27, 1969**

The house met at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Ninth report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, in French and in English—Mr. H.-Pit Lessard (LaSalle).

[*Editor's note: The text of the foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

### THE BUDGET

TABLING OF BUDGETARY PAPERS

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies in English and in French of the usual budgetary papers and I ask consent of the house to have the papers printed as an appendix to today's *Votes and Proceedings* and also included as an appendix to *Hansard* of Tuesday, June 3 when I intend to present the budget.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING FAIR COMPETITION

**Mr. Fernand-E. Leblanc (Laurier)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-203, an Act to amend the National Transportation Act (Fair competition of railway companies).

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

**Mr. Leblanc (Laurier):** Mr. Speaker, this bill is meant to protect the private trucking industry against the intrusion of railways in road transportation.

It does not seem fair to me that railway companies that directly or indirectly receive subsidies out of public funds should use the amounts thus granted to compete with an industry which does not have the same advantages and which must pay its own way.

Moreover, in the public interest, it is necessary to have two separate means of transportation which can really compete, as is the case in other countries.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

29180—576½

[*English*]

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### WATER RESOURCES

POLLUTION—DISCUSSION AT FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE—INDUSTRIAL PREVENTIVE MEASURES—PLACENTIA BAY

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. When the federal-provincial conference convenes on June 11 next, will the Prime Minister give consideration to discussing with the premiers the possibility of setting up another federal-provincial conference no later than the early part of the summer to discuss and work out with the three levels of government in all parts of the country an effective co-operative program which can be started in the relatively near future aimed at ridding our waters of the pollution which is encroaching upon them at such an alarming rate at the present time?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** The question of pollution will inevitably come up when we discuss the division of powers between the two levels of government, and of course the latter is on the agenda. We do not expect it to be dealt with at the forthcoming meeting in June in any detail but we do expect at that time to receive reports on this matter from committees of officials and we will then know what next steps are called for in terms of future meetings, whether they be held in July, August or later.

**Mr. Hees:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In preparing for this conference would the Prime Minister consider making available to industry the same incentives as were found to be very useful in time of war in making it possible for industry to enter

into the war production program, specifically, low interest loans, fast write-offs and other financial incentives, to make it possible for industry to undertake the relatively heavy expenditures which are necessary in order to rid their waste of bacteria before it is dumped into the environment?

Mr. Speaker, I asked a supplementary question but the Prime Minister did not answer.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Kootenay West.

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** I have a supplementary question I should like to address to the Minister of Fisheries. About ten days ago—

**Mr. Hees:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I asked a supplementary question and the Prime Minister was rising to answer it. This has nothing to do with fisheries—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Perhaps we might have some order during the question period. The hon. member did ask a supplementary question but there was no reply and the hon. member for Kootenay West suggested he had a supplementary question to ask. I recognize the hon. member for Kootenay West.

**Mr. Hees:** On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was half way up to answer my question. I am sure he wants to answer it. Would you be good enough to let him answer?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Kootenay West.

**Mr. Hees:** So that is the great Liberal dialogue: One way; no answers.

**Mr. Harding:** This question to the minister has to do with the subject of pollution. About ten days ago the hon. gentleman promised to make a statement to the house on motions regarding the situation at Placentia Bay in Newfoundland and the problems arising from it. May I ask the minister when he expects to be in a position to make a full report to the house?

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Hees:** Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** I believe the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry was about to reply to the supplementary question we have just heard.



**Mr. Hees:** My question, Mr. Speaker,—

**Mr. Speaker:** Would the hon. member kindly co-operate with the Chair? I will give him an opportunity to ask a further supplementary question later. I am not sure whether the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry completed his reply to the hon. member for Kootenay West, but I will allow the hon. member—

**Mr. Hees:** May I address my supplementary question to the Prime Minister? I will repeat it. I know he wants to answer. When he considers the approach of the federal government to this question of pollution will he give consideration to adopting policies similar to those which proved very successful in the last war in inducing industry to enter into the war production program, namely loans at low interest rates and fast write-offs?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. That is not a supplementary question. It is a submission which the hon. member has now made known to the government.

## FINANCE

### ACTION TO PREVENT TAKE-OVER OF ROYAL SECURITIES CORPORATION BY U.S. COMPANY

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** May I address this question to the Minister of Finance? In view of the serious implications which could arise from a take-over of the Royal Securities Corporation by Merrill, Lynch and Associates, does the minister intend to take any steps to prevent this take-over or, if matters have gone beyond the point of no return, does he intend to take any steps to prevent further take-overs of Canadian financial institutions by foreign companies?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** This subject is, of course, one of considerable interest to the federal government even though power to deal with it lies mainly with the provinces, since the corporation in question is a provincial one and since the principal activities of the institutions involved come under provincial jurisdiction.

I met last Thursday, at their request, with the heads of the two firms to hear about their plans, but did not give them any assurances or warnings. The implications of this take-over are I understand under consideration by stock exchanges and by the provincial authorities. The officers of the Bank of Canada and of my department are considering those aspects relating to the money market

arrangements and the sale of government securities. I plan to make a statement on the matter at a later date after learning more about the views and actions of the stock exchanges and provincial authorities.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** May I ask the Minister of Finance whether Royal Securities Corporation Limited will continue to enjoy access to the rediscount facilities of the Bank of Canada if it is owned by a foreign corporation?

**Mr. Benson:** This, of course, is one of the matters being considered by the bank and by officials of my department.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister feel that it would be only fair to all concerned if the company that is planning the take-over knew what its relationship would be to the Bank of Canada and the financial structure of Canada generally?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is asking the minister to express an opinion. Such a question is not in order.

[*Translation*]

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

INQUIRY AS TO USE OF POST OFFICE BOX

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Communications.

Does he intend to make an investigation and take the necessary measures to prohibit the use of Post Office Box 1691, of the Montreal District 101, which is used presently to give rapid and courteous service to all homosexuals asking that documentation be sent to them at home?

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the question should be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

## IMMIGRATION

REGULATIONS CLASSIFYING JEWS FROM IRAQ, UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC AND SYRIA

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Will Jews now in Iraq, the United Arab Republic and Syria be considered as refugees if they apply for immigration visas?

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the persons to whom my hon. friend refers do not come within the ordinary definition of a refugee. They cannot be considered as such because they are still in their country of residence. Normally the accepted international definition of a refugee is a person who has left his country of origin and who is unwilling to return because of fear of persecution.

I would tell my hon. friend that we have had discussions with respect to the possibility of assisting the persons he has in mind. My colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs and I have been collaborating in our discussions with the Canadian Jewish Congress.

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is any consideration being given to setting out regulations on the subject of refugees, so that instead of dealing with each case as it arises there is a code to which reference might be made?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I think that would be desirable. We have expressed our intention of adhering to the international convention on the protocol, and perhaps when the act is revised there ought to be a clear cut clarification of our over-all policy toward refugees. It is true that from time to time special arrangements have been made that I think, on balance, were of great advantage to the persons affected, and there may be some advantages in flexibility.

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell the house whether United States deserters and draft dodgers are considered refugees?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I doubt whether that question is in order. If the minister thinks it ought to be answered, so be it.

**Mr. MacEachen:** The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

## AGRICULTURE

DAIRYING—FAILURE OF COMMISSION TO REPLY TO CREAM PRODUCERS

**Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I apologize for the roughness of my voice, but the nature of the question demands that I ask it in any event.

Why is it that the Canadian Dairy Commission is not replying to inquiries made by the cream producers, who after waiting several

months for acknowledgement are finally resorting to writing registered letters, in some cases two registered letters, to which no reply has been received?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I must take objection to the hon. member's raspish question, because I think it is argumentative. Perhaps the hon. member might rephrase it. He is putting it in an argumentative way and perhaps he might put it directly.

**Mr. Korchinski:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister why the commission is not replying to these inquiries from producers, some of whom are making re-applications? Is there any reason for this?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that there was undue time delay in making replies. However I shall look into this at once.

**An hon. Member:** Please do.

**Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. Will he undertake to review the present policy of the dairy commission as that policy applies to cream producers in Saskatchewan and other parts of western Canada?

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, the policy was under review before announcements were made for the 1969-70 dairy year. If however the hon. member is asking us to set up regional policies within the framework of the national policy to cover our differences, then I think we should have to consider very carefully the implications that might flow from that kind of policy.

**Mr. Gleave:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of the extreme hardship the present policy is working on the small dairy producer on the prairies in particular, and in other areas as well?

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, the dairy policy applied to the prairie regions is not different from the policy applied to other regions of Canada.

**Mr. Korchinski:** A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the people of some of these areas are importing butter not only from other parts of Canada but also from outside Canada, and since our producers are at the same time being eliminated, will not the minister review present policy with a view to arriving at some regional policy which may help in this situation?

[Mr. Korchinski.]

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, we have considered representations made on a number of occasions by those seeking the setting up of regional policies, or different regional policies. But when one considers the ramifications and implications inherent in such policy, in my view it becomes apparent that such a policy is undesirable.

## TRADE

### WHEAT—DELIVERY UNDER U.S.S.R. AGREEMENT

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the fear and frustration among western farmers who have large quantities of wheat on their farms unsold, and in view of reports that the U.S.S.R. does not intend to complete the taking of the balance of the wheat it has undertaken to take, is the minister now in a position to advise the house on this matter? A few days ago he was asked about it and said he would look into it. Can he now let the farmers know whether the millions and millions of bushels still to be taken by the U.S.S.R. will not be accepted by them?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, to be absolutely frank, I do not think I can answer that question by either yes or no. The information I have now does not permit me to conclude either that they will not or that they will take the wheat.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister is in that state of uncertainty, does he still consider himself optimistically inclined in this regard?

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question about the 135 million bushels of wheat which the Soviet Union is still committed to take under the three year agreement. That sale could mean some $270 million to Canadian wheat producers. Are negotiations going on with respect to this balance of wheat to be delivered to the Soviet Union, and when does the minister expect to have some definitive reply from the government of the Soviet Union?

**Mr. Pepin:** Mr. Speaker, I think I can say that negotiations are going on, but I have no indication of the time at which I can expect an answer.

**Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Since this government seems incapable of marketing wheat, will he consider turning this function over to the Conservative caucus?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

## WATER RESOURCES

POLLUTION—REQUEST FOR CONTROL AT HAMILTON BAY

**Mr. Colin D. Gibson (Hamilton-Wentworth):** I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act. In view of the urgent and desperately serious pollution problem at Hamilton Bay, a national harbour, as reported by the Ontario Water Resources Commission, will the minister take steps to enforce pollution control over this situation?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I am just wondering whether the hon. member might agree that the question is the type which might be considered at the time of adjournment.

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member will also have to come back at ten o'clock for his supplementary.

## POWER

FEASIBILITY STUDY OF MINAS BASIN TIDES

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** My question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Can the minister indicate when the house can anticipate the governments' receiving the feasibility study of Minas Basin tidal power and whether this report might be made public in whole or in part before we adjourn for the summer recess?

**Hon. J. J. Green (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I have no immediate information as to when the report will be ready, but I will undertake to make that available to the hon. member as soon as possible.

## HIGHWAY SAFETY

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON VARIOUS ASPECTS OF STUDY

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey):** I wish to address a question to the Minister of Transport. Bearing in mind the fact several hon. members yesterday asked questions dealing with the important issue of highway and motor vehicle safety in various aspects, will the minister undertake to make an early statement as to what the federal department is doing with regard to this important matter?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Such a statement is now being prepared and I will be glad to deliver it just as quickly as possible.

[*Translation*]

## AGRICULTURE

DAIRYING—RECONCILIATION OF GOVERNMENT STATEMENTS ON MILK PRODUCTION

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am violating the rules in asking this question, but in any case, I shall try to comply with them.

Yesterday, the Minister of Agriculture told me, if I am not mistaken, that the new policy was designed to hold down somewhat the dairy production, in order to reduce surpluses. Now, I would very much like him to explain why the purpose of the Canadian Dairy Commission is defined in the 1969-70 Estimates in this way:

> This program's objective is to encourage a strong dairy production of high quality and, in this way, to increase the income of the dairy producers.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):** And I explain myself.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. If the hon. member wants to know if his question may be allowed, he should ask his question.

**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Here is my question: How can we reconcile the minister's answer and the dairy policy of the government with the purpose of the Canadian Dairy Commission?

**An hon. Member:** Contradiction.

**Mr. Speaker:** It seems to me that the hon. member has stated an argument, and in this sense his question or his argument may not be allowed.

[*English*]

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

RECLASSIFICATION OF RATES AS REQUESTED BY ROYAL CANADIAN LEGION

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** My question is for the Postmaster General. Has the minister considered appeals

from various commands of the Royal Canadian Legion for reclassification of postal rates on publications so that they can maintain mailing to war veterans? If so, can the minister disclose his decision?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications):** We have handled all requests from the Legion in the same manner as requests from other associations. There is a very modest increase in the annual fee, sometimes 30 cents, sometimes 40 cents; and as was mentioned yesterday, 27 cents a year would recover all the increased postal charges.

## TELEVISION

"DON MESSER'S JUBILEE"—TRANSFER TO HAMILTON STATION

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** My question is directed to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact the city of Hamilton through CHCH-TV has shown its interest in the cultural life of this country by reviving the Don Messer show for the benefit of millions of Canadians, which interest also goes a long way to dispel the lunch pail image of that great city, will the Prime Minister use his good offices to persuade his colleagues that a firm commitment should be given to the City of Hamilton in terms of a grant, which incidentally has been promised, in order that the Hamilton Theatre Auditorium can be completed and this cultural interest be continued?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member's submission ought to appear on the order paper.

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** As a supplementary—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. There cannot be a supplementary because the question is due to appear on the order paper.

## GRAIN

PHASING OUT OF FEED GRAIN SUBSIDIES

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. On May 16 I asked a question, which because of the minister's absence was taken as notice, concerning the phasing out of various feed grain subsidies. Has the minister had time yet to consider my question and can he say when the house might expect a reply?

**Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture):** I will look into the matter, Mr. Speaker.

**[Mr. Marshall.]**

## AIR TRANSPORT

SHORTAGE OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. The other day the minister indicated that he would be prepared to make a statement on motions concerning the problem of air traffic controllers. I am wondering how soon he might be able to make this statement?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the meeting with the air traffic controllers, which I suggested was an appropriate prelude to this statement, is to be on June 4, and I would expect to make a statement within a few days after that meeting.

PENTICTON, B.C.—REQUEST FOR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

**Mr. Bruce Howard (Okanagan Boundary):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of another major collision recently at Penticton airport, British Columbia, I would like to ask the minister what action is being taken to establish an air traffic controller at this airport?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, the accident is being investigated at the moment, and part of that investigation is to determine an appropriate level of air traffic control in that area.

[*Translation*]

## SHIPBUILDING

CANADIAN VICKERS—EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Villeneuve.

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** For Temiscamingue, Mr. Speaker. I would like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

Did the government undertake negotiations with the provincial authorities of Quebec or did he receive suggestions from Premier Bertrand, concerning Canadian Vickers in Montreal, and are the two governments in a position to reach an agreement to assist laid-off employees?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have received any communication from Premier Bertrand in connection with that.

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

[*English*]

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question, but may I direct it to the Minister of Finance. Can the minister say whether the advertisement that reads "Canadian Vickers Builds Confidence" is allowed income tax deductibility, so that the Canadian people have to pay for this misleading advertising?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Okanagan Boundary.

## TRADE

WHEAT—FUTURE SALES—ALLEGED I.G.A. PREFERENCE

**Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Last Friday in answering a question put by the hon. member for Crowfoot the minister referred to the "bag of tricks" in the I.G.A. that was helping to make it inoperative so far as Canadian wheat sales are concerned. My question is based on the recent public statement that Canada and the United States did not read the fine print before signing the International Grains Agreement. Will the minister and his officials approach their counterparts in the United States with a view to renegotiating this important agreement?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, I have information on this subject. It is a bit long but it says that "destination" pricing clause for European wheats was also part of the previous international wheat agreement. The information goes on to say that in the present international agreement it is clearer than it was in the previous one. The information further goes on to say that this is part of the over-all discussion that is taking place now among exporters in order to strengthen the I.G.A.

## GRAIN

WHEAT—FIVE BUSHEL QUOTA

**Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the low quotas for wheat at many points on the prairies can the minister indicate what uniform quota may be expected by the end of July, which is the end of the current crop year?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce):** Mr. Speaker, apparently the Chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board said this morning he can only equalize quotas at the five bushels per acre level.

## SHIPPING

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON MERCHANT FLEET STUDY

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, the other day I asked the Minister of Transport a question regarding a study relating to the possibility of establishing a Canadian flag merchant fleet, and the minister said he would look into it and have a reply on a later occasion. Can he now advise the house what the situation is?

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I regret I have not had the opportunity to get the detailed answer for the hon. member, but I will do so as soon as I can.

## WATER RESOURCES

POLLUTION—INDUSTRIAL WASTE IN OTTAWA-HULL AREA

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. As pollution of the Ottawa River in the Hull-Ottawa area is obviously much worse than it was a year ago, and as both Ottawa and Hull come under the jurisdiction of the National Capital Commission, will the government see to it that industries in these two cities are forced to stop dumping their industrial waste into this important river, and by such an example start off, I hope, a national campaign in all municipalities across the country—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Hees:** —to make it possible for us to have fresh water in this country once again?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member has made a submission which is very much the same type as the one that was made by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth. My suggestion to that hon. member was that the matter might be discussed at the time of adjournment. If the hon. member wants to pursue the matter it should be done at the time of adjournment.

**Mr. Hees:** Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not know anything that is more

important at the moment than the elimination of water pollution and the right to ask a question about it, which I think is the right of all members of parliament.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I recognize that to the hon. member this is a very important matter, but the hon. member must also recognize that many important questions are asked on the order paper, and I suggest to him that this is one of them.

## AGRICULTURE

DAIRYING—GRANT TO CREAM PRODUCERS

**Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Would he consider taking away the administrative responsibilities for cream production from the Minister of Agriculture and transferring them to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion so that cream producers might receive a grant or other assistance for doing the very thing that they are told by the Minister of Agriculture that they should not do?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order.

## AIRPORTS

CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.—PROGRAM TO EXTEND FACILITIES

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the still unspoiled Minister of Transport. As a result of his recent visit to Prince Edward Island is he in a position to give assurance that there will be some acceleration in the long-grounded program to upgrade and extend the facilities of the Charlottetown airport?

**Hon. Donald S. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, this is one of the matters I discussed with the premier and other officials of Prince Edward Island yesterday, and we reached some very satisfactory conclusions.

## INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

**Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Has he received an invitation from that authority on music and world travel, Mr. John Lennon, and if so does he plan to participate in his peaceful lie-in?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

[Mr. Hees.]

[*Translation*]

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

LOWER POSTAL RATE FOR MAGAZINE "L'ENSEIGNEMENT"

**Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Communications.

Mr. Raymond Laliberté, president of the Quebec Teachers Corporation, recently wrote to the Minister of Communications to inform him that the periodical *L'Enseignement* would likely disappear because of increased postal rates. Would the minister consider granting a special status or a special rate to that publication, which is most important for Quebec teachers?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications):** No. Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I was about to suggest that I do not think it is in order to ask questions about every Canadian publication. Such questions should normally be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

## FINANCE

REQUEST FOR STUDY OF INTEREST RATES BY STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. David Lewis (York South):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of this morning's report that the Toronto-Dominion Bank had profits in the first quarter of this year some 25 per cent to 26 per cent higher than in the same period last year, will the minister give consideration to referring the entire matter of interest rates to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs for study and recommendation?

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, of course I will give consideration to any suggestion made by my hon. friend. I would suggest, however, that next week we will have a budget debate and that would be a perfectly opportune moment to express opinions in this regard, as undoubtedly hon. members will.

**Mr. Lewis:** In view of the fact that the debate next week will be on the budget, whatever that may contain, may I ask the minister whether it is his intention to take such action as may bring the interest rates in Canada down, either by re-imposition of a ceiling or by some other control over the climbing interest rate.

**Mr. Benson:** I very much doubt that the reimposition of a ceiling would have the effect of bringing down interest rates in Canada. That would simply make it more difficult for the ordinary person, such as my hon. friend and myself, to borrow. I have discussed the problem of interest rates which is a world wide problem and closely related to interest rates in the United States. The fact is that the way interest rates can be brought under control in the long run, I believe, is to control the rate of inflation in western countries.

**Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Finance consider conferring with the Minister of Finance in Australia to find out how that government finds it possible to make mortgage money available at 5 per cent?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has made a submission and can assume it will be considered by the Minister of Finance.

## WATER RESOURCES

PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—ATTENDANCE OF MINISTER AT MEETING TO DISCUSS POLLUTION

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Would the minister say whether he received an invitation from the fishermen of Placentia Bay to attend an emergency meeting tomorrow at St. John's, and if so is it his intention to attend. These are the fishermen who are affected by the pollution.

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, I am replying to the fishermen to the effect that I will be down there shortly. However, I shall not be able to be there tomorrow.

**Mr. Carter:** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. On the assumption that some officials from the minister's department will be attending, would the minister indicate whether specific directions have been given these officials to help alleviate the unrest and answer the grievances of the fishermen in the area.

**Mr. Davis:** These officials have been told under what conditions the money will be made available to the fishermen, the progress we are making in respect of pollution in that area and also, hopefully, that there will be a reduction of the area closed so that the fishermen will be able to commence fishing in some parts of Placentia Bay.

**Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate):** Due to the fact that the emergency meeting will number some 700 or 800 persons, can the minister say whether his officials have been advised what amendments will be made to the present arrangement which is the cause of the unrest.

**Mr. Davis:** The present arrangement is to bring the income of the fishermen up to the normal level. I thought that would be enough to cool the fishermen off a bit.

**Mr. Carter:** Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware of the dissatisfaction and unrest expressed by fishermen of this area with regard to the treatment accorded them by the officials of the Department of Fisheries.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is reiterating the same question.

## POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

ZONING PROCEDURE IN TORONTO

**Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General. Is it the intention of the Post Office to discontinue the postal zoning system in Toronto?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications):** Not at all. We have introduced the zoning system in Toronto and some other cities. We are suspending it in other areas until such time as we have studied very carefully the recommendation of a task force concerning the introduction of a national coding system. If we do introduce such a national coding system it will incorporate the existing zones.

OPERATION OF OFFICES ON SATURDAYS

**Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, is the Postmaster General giving consideration to keeping the main areas of post offices open on Saturdays?

**Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications):** We are giving some consideration to this. We are considering really either the increase or reduction of services presently being offered. We are examining both the upper and lower limits.

*Official Languages*

## NATIONAL PARKS

BONNE BAY, NFLD., LEASING ARRANGEMENT

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the hesitancy on the part of the province of Newfoundland to place the site of the Bonne Bay area of western Newfoundland at the disposal of the government for the establishment of a national park would the minister be prepared to enter into a lease agreement with the province similar to that entered into with Quebec for the creation of the Gaspé park.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would think the question should be placed on the order paper. The other day when we entered into a long series of questions about national parks across the country I indicated that perhaps it might be wise if these questions were placed on the order paper, unless there should be a specific urgency about the question. If I am wrong and there may be urgency in this case I would give priority to its being placed on the list of questions to be debated at the time of adjournment.

**Mr. Marshall:** Ten o'clock.

BOUNDARIES FOR WOOD BUFFALO PARK

**Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I wonder whether he could state when he intends to resume negotiations with the province of Alberta concerning the establishment of new boundaries for Wood Buffalo park.

**Mr. Speaker:** In view of my statement in respect of the previous question I would think this question might be placed on the order paper or discussed at the time of adjournment.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

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

The house resumed, from Monday, May 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen (for Mr. Trudeau) that Bill C-120, respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

**[Mr. Kierans.]**

**Mr. H. A. Moore (Wetaskiwin):** Mr. Speaker, when the debate ended at ten o'clock last evening I was attempting to point out the possible effect of this legislation on national unity. We cannot expect this legislation to somehow miraculously solve the problem of French-English relations within Canada. We in Canada are part of the life of the North American continent. We cannot stay the elemental force of North American social evolution.

Why should we spend public funds to preserve something that can never be more than a symbol? It would make just as much sense if we spent tax money to enshrine the historic rights of farmers by perpetuating the 100-acre farm. The brutal fact of economic life in North America today is that the 100-acre farm cannot survive as an economic unit. It might be argued that it is necessary as a social adjunct but in the world of today it would have to be entirely supported. That is my view of what is being done by means of this bill.

I recall the Prime Minister's recent flippant remark with regard to putting English speaking civil servants to work on elevators not used by French Canadians. He explained that one away as being merely a jocular off the cuff remark. It may have been only that, but it was too close to reflecting the real feeling that runs just below the surface of the whole racial and linguistic question in Canada. Always present is the implication of dominance by one side or another or of jobs in the civil service and elsewhere being more in the nature of the spoils of war than the result of an unemotional search for justice.

I often wonder what has happened to the rights of English speaking Canadians. Why are these never mentioned? After all, there are vast areas of this country where the problems of the French language group have no relevancy whatsoever. In his earlier remarks on this bill the Prime Minister said that English Canada should not attempt to crush or expect to absorb French Canada. That is true, of course, but most English speaking Canadians have never wasted time or energy considering such negative and fruitless policies.

The setting up of special language reserves and the passing of a mass of entangling laws and regulations will do nothing in my estimation to solve any problem, be it linguistic or some other kind. What we need most is to develop our country to its maximum potential, and to lay the foundation of prosperity

and growth which alone can provide the equality of opportunity and equality of return that is every Canadian's right. Let us, in the name of reason, not start rationing rights and apportioning reserved areas for any Canadians. We need to create new work and new opportunities in this country; we need to overcome regional disparities; we need to make this one nation in economic fact as well as in name. Only by these means can we assure every Canadian his rights and protect him in respect of them.

• (2:50 p.m.)

In my opinion this is unnecessary legislation that will create more problems than it will solve and will sow more division and greater animosity than we have at the present time. It is my belief that the only way to unite this country, with the diversity of its people, is by encouraging every Canadian, be he French, English or of any other racial origin, to want to speak the other languages, to want to share in another's cultural heritage, to want to see justice done and rights preserved. Only then will we attain our goal. We can never hope to meld our people into one distinctive Canadianism by legislative compulsion or by building new barriers within the country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is contrary to our political traditions to set up officials as enforcement authorities who, because of the nature of their task and the powers conferred upon them, will almost inevitably degenerate into policemen or, worse, coercers of the public. I am afraid that the language commissioner envisaged in this bill will be just such an official.

In closing I would like to observe that the atmosphere in which these discussions are taking place is certainly not one that in my opinion is conductive to unemotional and impartial judgment being passed. If we are all honest with ourselves, if we would only stop trying to be so delicate in talking about these matters, we would state plainly that this bill has come before us in a national atmosphere of racial combativeness and rivalry.

We have but to look at the province of Quebec, the heartland of French Canada, to see how popular bilingualism and biculturalism are there; we have but to consider the recent St. Leonard school crisis and its aftermath; we have but to listen to voices in Quebec City. Can anyone honestly say that we are seeking the same end, that we preach the same type of gospel in Ottawa as in Quebec? If the spokesmen for the province of Quebec are to be believed, their aim is to have a unilingual province or separate state where the non-French will have to conform in every aspect of life or go under. Their cry is "Masters in our own house". I believe it may now have gone beyond that and could be "Masters in yours, too".

In the light of all that has been said and is still being said, in view of the state of race relations at the present time and in recognition of the facts of North American life, we should drop this bill and get on with legislation which carries some real hope for the future of our country. I have a sincere belief that this bill will not accomplish the desired purpose and therefore I must vote against it.

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting for several days to take part in the debate and have been putting it off hoping that my cold would get a little better. However, it appears that the debate will wind up today and I would not like it to pass without putting my views on *Hansard*. We have had several days of excellent debate on the official languages bill which is currently before the house. As a member from western Canada, I feel that my views on the proposed legislation should be given in the House of Commons. Right at the start I can say that it is my intention to support the legislation. I shall outline my reasons for taking this stand.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate of the past several days. I greatly respect the views of those who have indicated that they intend to oppose the legislation. I frankly admit that they made some good and valid points, especially with regard to the powers of the proposed administrator. I believe that the government, and especially the minister in charge of the bill, should endeavour to bring in amendments so that some of the clauses dealing with the administration of the legislation can be made more palatable as far as the house is concerned.

However, the basic issue at stake is not whether there are several flaws in the bill; the big issue is that of Canadian unity. If by this bill we can take one small step toward achieving a Canadian unity, then every member of the house should support it. I have found that no matter where you go in Canada you will, with very few exceptions, find people who are unhappy with many aspects of the official languages bill, and they will tell you so. But if in the long run this is one of

the many measures needed to keep Canada united, they are prepared to go along with it.

I point out that there has been a great deal of criticism of the official languages bill from many sections of Canada, especially from the western provinces and the Atlantic provinces. In most cases I feel that this criticism has stemmed mainly from a misunderstanding of the purposes of the legislation. Much of it is due to the lack of a clear and concise explanation by the government of several clauses which certainly need clarification. It was quite obvious from the start—I could go back to last fall—that there was great public concern as to how the administration of the legislation would affect the civil service, the general public and all the provincial administrations. I believe that much of the current unrest and dissatisfaction in Canada could have been headed off by the government if prompt and clearcut explanations had been given months ago.

The official languages bill does not really grant any new, fundamental right which is not already granted by previous acts. I think we must make this point very clear. It does set out more specifically just what language rights the two founding races of Canada envisioned over 100 years ago. Clarification of those historic rights granted to both our founding races by the British North America Act of 1867 is clearly needed in 1969. Apparently these historic rights have somehow been overlooked in the teaching of history in our educational institutions.

• (3:00 p.m.)

I believe these rights must be respected, honoured and preserved by those of us who today are reviewing the decisions made by the Fathers of Confederation over 100 years ago in respect of the language rights of the founding races. I shall read section 133 of the British North America Act because I think it should go into the record. It is not too entertaining but I think I should quote it. In section 133 of the B.N.A. Act of 1867, I repeat, the intent of the current bill is clearly set out. The section reads as follows:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this act, and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec. The acts of the parliament of Canada and of the legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages.

[Mr. Harding.]

I think that language is very clear. It does not go into the fine details, which we do not expect to find in legislation of this type, but so far as I am concerned its intent is crystal clear. I view the current bill as merely setting out the above section in more detail. It gives equality to the two official languages of Canada insofar as the federal jurisdiction is concerned. There is nothing wrong with that. This was and is one of the foundation stones of Canadian unity. The bill indicates that both the official languages will be recognized and used by the federal government service in communicating and dealing with the general public. Every citizen will have the opportunity to communicate with the federal government in either of the two official languages. This, in effect, is the principle of equality of the two official languages as outlined in the B.N.A. Act.

The present legislation in no way forces English speaking persons to learn French, nor does it force French speaking persons to learn English. As I understand it, its bilingual aspect does not apply to the whole of the federal government service, and this has been indicated to us by several ministers who have spoken in the debate. It cannot force any of the provinces to teach French in their educational institutions. This matter is entirely up to the provinces and must be negotiated with them, although the federal government has indicated that it will assist financially any province that proceeds with additional French instruction.

I found in talking to people, many of them in western Canada, that there is a feeling among some sections of our Canadian society that the official languages bill will protect only those whose mother tongue is French. This is basically not a fact, for we find that in the province of Quebec alone there are well over one million persons who consider English as their official language. We must remember that the language rights of this group are also being protected in those areas which are predominantly French speaking, and we in this house must never forget this fact. One group is getting protection in on section of Canada, and other groups are getting protection in other sections.

As I said previously, I have found in the past two years that one of the most important issues in this country is Canadian unity, and let no member of this house dodge that issue. I have talked to individuals who are very much opposed to the principles outlined in the official languages bill, but when the chips are down, if it means strengthening Canadian

unity, they are prepared to go along with it. Even in this house I am certain that all members of all parties in their own hearts and in their own way desperately want this Canada of ours to remain a single unit. I have no quarrel with those who feel that this legislation is bad and might do more harm than good. That is the view they hold. We might quarrel over the direction to follow and the method of attaining national unity and of holding the various provinces of Canada together, but I know of no member of the house who really desires to see Canada split in two. I am convinced that the vast majority of Canadians in every province also wishes to see the bonds of national unity grow stronger and friendlier as the years go by.

In my opinion the official languages bill is not the most important move we can make in the lengthy process of strengthening the bonds of union within our nation. I believe it is only one of the foundation stones of Canadian unity. I trust that no one in this house or in Canada will consider that national unity has been achieved merely by the passage of this piece of legislation. Much more remains to be done if we are really to put Canadian unity on a solid foundation.

The government of the day has the political power to initiate those moves which will do as much or more for Canadian unity than even the present piece of legislation. I am referring to those grave and continuing social and economic problems which haunt a large section of Canadian society today. These pressing economic and social problems can do vast harm to Canadian unity unless they are dealt with quickly and effectively. In every section of Canada we find these economic problems hanging like millstones around the necks of governments and individuals alike. Any benefit gained from the passage of the official languages bill could be quickly lost if these unsolved economic problems were used as a lever by some unscrupulous politicians to try to separate some of the ethnic groups in our society from Canada.

Today we see most sections of Canada facing serious economic problems, and to me the alarming thing is that this government has done so little about it. I would like to mention briefly some of the problems, such as unemployment where we have a promise of action but no clearcut plan. The tragic housing situation, especially in the larger urban centres—its solution could go a long way toward solving the problem of national unity in this nation—can never be tackled by the anaemic legislation proposed by the present administration. The sharp increases in the cost of living, with their resulting erosion of the living standards of people on small pensions and low incomes, is just another example of inaction in a vital area. The poverty and insecurity of millions of Canadians, as outlined in the fifth report of the Economic Council of Canada, is another indication of lack of action by the present administration. These are a number of other fields where neglect by governments past and present is obvious. Our pollution problems, the heavy taxation loads on those who can least afford them, and the need for urgent pension reform are other areas which should be looked into immediately.

One thing of which I am sure is that all the points I have mentioned briefly, together with the official languages bill, add up to national unity. I believe it is safe to say that a contented, happy group of people, regardless of their ethnic background, with adequate living standards, is not apt to seek solutions to economic problems by separating from the unit which has given it these standards. This must be our objective as Canadians, and I feel that the time is too short for politicians to delay further the solutions to many of the grave economic problems which we all know exist and which we all know must be solved. We all know that these solutions will help to solve the problem of national unity.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I would like to say again, having in mind all the amendments which are to be made to the bill, that taking the bill as a unit I am convinced it is one step toward that great Canadian goal of keeping Canada united. Despite the many inadequacies of the measure I am prepared to support it. I trust it is just a start on the road to that real Canadian unity which the vast majority of Canadians desire and will work toward.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of regret and with some bitterness that I find myself compelled to speak in this debate on second reading of the bill respecting the official languages.

With regret, I say, because, having heard and read the exaggerated comments of some of the hon. members opposite, I have told myself that there are after all some prospective separatists who are not French-speaking and who are not from Quebec.

I find that there are in this country some blind people who wish to lead other blind people. I also find that some opposition members have been moderate, logical and reasonable in their comments, like the last speaker.

When I came to this house in September last, I was under the false impression—and I recognize it now—that the 28th legislature would be characterized by rapid progress in the field of social justice. Alas, the wailing we have heard from the opposition during this first session clearly indicates that in spite of the good dispositions of the government, some hon. members are bent not on working for the national interest, but on filibustering, embarrassing others and making a fuss about everything and nothing. But if I am a little disappointed by such behavior, I am still firmly convinced that the time is ripe to consider the immediate implementation of institutional bilingualism in Canada.

I had not intended to take part in this debate, for I do not have to be convinced of the value of the official languages bill.

[*English*]

I do not need to be convinced of the good to be derived from this bill. I am bilingual, yet I am a Canadian first and foremost. Nevertheless, I was born a French Canadian, and it did not just so happen that I am bilingual; my father was not fluent in the English language. Yet he was a tolerant man and had an open mind. I had the good fortune to be brought up next to an English speaking family. They learned French from us and we learned English from them. And we got along extremely well. Those were the days, Mr. Speaker. One of those English speaking boys next door today holds a master's degree in French and is a superintendent of schools in New Brunswick. And I, as a French speaking Canadian from the province of New Brunswick, was for some two years English announcer in Fredericton for the radio network of the C.B.C.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Corbin:** Thus, I have no problem in appreciating the importance of this bill.

My riding is also bilingual. At one extremity there are people who have never spoken one word of French and cannot understand the language. At the other there are French Canadians who do not understand much English; some of them do not understand one word of the language. Yet we get along pretty well because we respect each other and the cultural values for which we stand. We also respect the valiant citizens of New Denmark who have held on to their Danish traditions, their language and their songs of faith. Their sons marry our daughters and our women marry their men. We also respect, in Madawaska-Victoria, our native people, the Maliseet Indians of Tobique and of Edmundston, who undertook last summer, with the assistance of the New Brunswick government, to learn to speak their forefathers' language which had been forgotten by all but a fortunate few, and to pass it on to their children.



[*Translation*]

When I hear some opposition members speak in exaggerated and excessive terms, I can hardly believe that they have the country's interest at heart. As far as I am concerned, when I do not know anything about a particular problem, I let others enlighten me, but I agree it is their privilege to spread their ideas to the four cardinal points, if they want to. No doubt these mustard-seeds will be blown far away. However, it is sad to know that their prejudices will, even now, take root in the mind and heart of young Canadians, of innocent souls.

Fortunately, our democracy and our parliamentary system can preserve us for ever from a racial confrontation such as the bloody riots that happened at Caraquet, in New Brunswick at the turn of the century when the majority wanted to impose unjust laws on the French minority.

I took notice of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) who, as it happens, is absent at this moment. According to *Hansard* of Friday, May 16, here is what he said, and I quote:

• (3:20 p.m.)

I suggest that very little effort has really been made to ensure that the people of the country understand what this bill is about and that very little effort has really been made to remove the misapprehensions concerning what the bill will do. It is very important that the bill not be launched in an atmosphere of apprehension and concern in many parts of the country.

Then why such blame on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker? I cannot agree with him although he accepts the principle of the bill.

It is true that it is always possible to do more, to do better. It is also possible to do less. I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition, if he were here, that if he looked immediately to his right, to his left and on

the benches behind, he might start by putting his own house in order and by punishing the members of his own party who refuse to be sensible, before upbraiding the government unwarrantably, as far as I am concerned.

He says: "Little effort has been made" and this is true especially of his party within which, on the contrary, a great deal has been done to revive old prejudice, old grudges. Some take pleasure in this almost sacred house in confusing the minds, in subtly playing with racial feelings, in running down some important people.

I would be ashamed to call myself a Canadian if I had to sit next to those people during this debate. My whip forbid!

**Mr. Ricard:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Ricard:** I heard the hon. member say earlier with regard to my leader: Let him look immediately to his right, immediately to his left—I do not remember his exact words—but he wanted to suggest that I was one of those who sowed the seeds of discord, or who opposed the bill now under consideration.

I should like to ask the hon. member whether he intended to single me out when he said that?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member may not put a question to a colleague who already has the floor.

The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe rose on a question of privilege which to my mind is not justified. The hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria should go on with his remarks.

**Mr. Ricard:** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I feel that motives have been wrongly imputed to me; I have the right to ask the hon. member for an explanation to find out whether or not I am incriminated.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria.

**Mr. Corbin:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to add that I was not referring to the member for Saint-Hyacinthe personally whom I consider as a reasonable man.

I should like to urge, however, some opposition members, such as the members for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) and for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), to have themselves invited or to take it upon themselves to visit New Brunswick in order to see at first hand what goes on there in the field of bilingualism. I believe they would come back delighted with and informed by their experience, provided of course they go with an open mind.

Mr. Speaker, on May 18th New Brunswick, and more particularly Moncton University, had the honour and privilege of welcoming the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to award him an honorary doctorate.

The Prime Minister, at the end of the speech he made on that occasion, said this, and I quote:

> French and English Canadians of New Brunswick, you are showing, in spite of the tensions that may still exist in your province, a remarkable willingness to live together. As a result of your mutual tolerance and understanding, you represent in a way the crucible of the Canadian experience.
>
> On your determination and success may depend the success and future of Canada. For you will have shown the rest of the country that two great families, formerly divided, can unite and rediscover one another.
>
> Citizens of New Brunswick, you are laying the foundations of the Canada of tomorrow if, by common consent, we are all willing as you are through mutual respect, confidence and brotherhood, to try our luck and run the risk of experiencing a new and full life.

I said, at the outset of my remarks, that I would take part in this debate with a certain feeling of bitterness. I may have exaggerated, but I often think of the past. And if ever the past got the better of me, I might, like many members of certain opposition parties, give way to exaggeration and political abuses.

About six years ago and even before, I personally called for the recognition of both official languages in New Brunswick. I was neither the only one nor the first to do so. Indeed, hundreds of other young Canadians, English and French were calling for the legal recognition of their culture and their language. Numerous associations and groups have kept insisting on recognition so that today, in New Brunswick, English and French are official languages, and everybody is all the better for it.

Mutual tolerance which was practised in my own village of Grand Sault—in English down home we say Grand Falls—by both linguistic groups, tolerance and mutual respect for both cultures in New Brunswick can very well be transposed on the national scale with a tiny bit of goodwill.

I remember an incident which is still very clear in my mind, and goes to show how much progress we have made in New Brunswick, though it is hardly acknowledged.

In 1953 or 1954, the present member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. Flemming) was premier of New Brunswick. I shall not grudge him some respect for the high position he held then. He came one day to pay a visit to Saint-Louis College in Edmundston, where I was a student. All students and professors had gathered to meet the premier of New Brunswick. He was welcomed with great courtesy and even with some warmth. His first words were to apologize and to tell us that we had all his sympathy but that he could not speak French. I was very impressed at that time. I would even go as far as to say that I shall never forget it as long as I live. So there was the premier of an unofficially bilingual province who could not speak French but sympathized with everybody. It was the thing to do in those days to sympathize with such people.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to point out once again that in New Brunswick sympathy has evolved into an officially recognized bilingualism. Our premier is bilingual and so are a number of ministers and members. The legislature in Fredericton has simultaneous translation facilities, and our institutions, such as our two normal schools are bilingual, and not one head, except perhaps a pig head, had to be chopped in order to achieve this. There were no injuries or disorders. That is how far we have progressed in New Brunswick, my own province.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Why should not the situation be the same all over Canada? I am rather young, for I will be 35 soon. However, I wish I were still younger.

When that legislation has been approved by parliament and given royal assent, Canada, will enter, so to speak, a new era of confederation, brought about by the courage of the present government, under the aegis of its gallant leader, and tomorrow's confederation will be altogether different from that of yesterday.

As the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and many other members said so eloquently during this debate, Canadian youth is longing for this legislation on the official languages. It is only a beginning, but we want it, and that is what all hon. members should want. Even if many of us are bound to keep their prejudices and their grudges all their lives, let us have at least enough magnanimity to give today and to-morrow's youth the tools that are essential to build and strengthen the future of confederation. The hon. members who are firmly opposed to this bill should have enough intellectual and legislative integrity not to impose on young Canadians the yoke they themselves had to bear all their life.



It was thought that the debate on the Canadian flag had struck a death-blow to the very heart of opposition to true Canadian nationalism. But we still can see today that the beast is not quite dead yet. It will heave a few more sighs. All Canadians and all those who will come to settle in Canada will be able to breathe more freely, because the apocalyptic beast of separatism, of extremism, of prejudice, of fanaticism and of bitterness will be dead, as I hope and pray it will.

In this Canada week, Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude my speech by these words: Long live Canada.

Long live English Canada.

Long live French Canada.

Long live a Canada united from sea to sea!

[*English*]

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed thoroughly the speech made by the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin). I agree with much that he said and noted his remark that he had reached the ripe old age of 35. I think that is a very good age and I would be happy to be that age again. I can tell him, however, that by the time he reaches the age of 36 he may wish he had not made some of the comments he made today.

There are people in this house who hold very strong views on this issue and have expressed their views strongly and forcefully. Some of those views are not views I entertain, and hints I will drop as to how I shall vote on this measure will probably indicate this. Although I cannot agree with the contentions of some other hon. members in their entirety, that does not mean that I think that in making their comments they were animated by motives which would compel them to seek the disunity of this country. Any issue as emotional as this one, any issue affecting race, religion, language, or which take us back to the issues of our heredity and is thus hundreds or even thousands of

years old, affects deeply all those who sit in this house.

I think it is wrong to say that in making the remarks they made some hon. members were animated by a desire to see division in this country. I heard the hon. member talking about the visit the Prime Minister made to the hon. member's province. I only wish the Prime Minister had made trips to all other parts of the country during the last few months in order to explain this bill. This measure is not a matter of high-flown sentiments such as were recounted by the hon. member. This measure needed clarification and detailed and careful explanation. Obviously the message was not taken to many parts of Canada because many people still do not understand what is involved here. There is an onus or responsibility on a government introducing a bill of this kind to make certain the measure is understood, and understood well in all parts of the country. It is quite obvious from what I have seen and heard that the government has failed lamentably in discharging this responsibility.

Some hon. members have said they sit here as members representing eastern Canada, Quebec or western Canada. If I were to claim any geographic location I should probably call myself a northern Canadian. But having taken the oath of office before the distinguished Clerk of this house, I can only speak on this issue as a Canadian member of parliament.

In considering this legislation one must consider all aspects of it; one must consider its advantages and defects. With any piece of legislation, that becomes a complex process. Any hon. member who is to cast his vote on a bill must properly assess and evaluate his position and the approach he takes to the legislation. On the scales on which one weighs carefully the virtues and defects of a measure one can put on one side all those things about the measure which are good, on the other side all those things which are bad, and consider just how the scales balance. If one were to take this legislation on its own, without considering the very deep and fundamental issue we are involved with here, I would have to say this is not good legislation. But here, Mr. Speaker, it is essential to place on the good side of the scales the intangible and delicate substance of national unity.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Having done that and surveyed how the scales balance, I can come to no other conclusion than that I must support this bill and vote for it.

I will not traverse the ground other hon. members have traversed since, quite properly, Your Honour would rule me out of order on the ground I was being repetitious. Certainly in the last two or three weeks debate has been repetitious. Therefore, since I wish to remain within the four corners of the rules of the house I will not deal with ground that has been covered before. Nevertheless there are two particular issues having to do with this bill which require comment.

I think the Prime Minister and the government are approaching this matter with that degree of rigidity which, I am afraid, forms the basis of the government's approach to government business. It may well be that the right hon. gentleman will be known to posterity as the right hon. member for *rigor mortis*, largely because of his rigid stance.

One cannot legislate completely and effectively in the area we are considering here with measures of this kind. It is most difficult to do so unless you have the full co-operation and understanding of the people of the country. There is a fallacy abroad in many parts of the country that you can legislate virtue. If that were so you would only need one statute a year saying, "Be it resolved that all people must be happy. Anyone caught being unhappy is subject to a penalty and must pay a fine." The usual third clause would be, of course, "The government may enact all regulations, decrees and orders in council to ensure that everyone is happy."

But here it is not that simple. Having examined the issues, having read the bill carefully and having studied the constitutional background, I am convinced that we are enacting an administrative measure. Virtually all those things the government seeks to have us approve are things which the government of its own volition could bring about without the concurrence of this house or the other place. We might well have had, and I should have preferred this, a resolution of this house to the other place expressing the views of hon. members and saying that in their opinion there are two official languages in this country and that it would be desirable for the people of this country, so far as it lies within the constitutional jurisdiction of the federal government and in co-operation with the provincial governments, to work toward the greater acceptance of the two official languages. A resolution like that could easily have been concurred in.

In my humble opinion there would have been more willing concurrence in such a resolution than there is in some aspects of the more difficult legislation we are dealing with now. I think a resolution and certain administrative acts would have met the situation, and I believe something like that ought to have been done. However, it was not done and we are compelled now to deal with this measure as we find it. It will have to go to committee and a great many improvements will have to be made to it. We will be compelled to examine in committee ways and means of improving the bill. As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) stated, it must be carefully examined from the viewpoint of constitutionality. I express no opinion here. I have been away for some time and have not had an opportunity to examine carefully the amendments proposed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner); therefore I will not express an opinion at this time.

• (3:40 p.m.)

In committee there should be every opportunity for hon. members to hear expressed the views of the law officers of the Crown. They should be permitted to state their reasons for the foundations upon which they expressed their opinion to the government that the bill is intra vires. Provincial governments which still express doubts as to the legality of the bill should have an opportunity to state their case before the committee. Those who may have a genuine concern as to the effect this legislation may have upon the government service should also be permitted to express their opinions. Hon. members, including government members, should be given complete freedom to propose such amendments as they see fit. There should be no attempt to speed up the proper degestive processes of the special committee which will be dealing with this measure, as it is far too important for the future of our country.

The other defect I find in the bill is that it fails to take into account the tangible and intangible rights of other minority groups in Canada, including the Indian and Eskimo people. Until the end of the last world war, hundreds of thousands of people came to Canada from other lands where the mother tongue is neither English nor French. This is particularly true in western Canada and parts of northern Canada. A great deal of the opening up and development of the west is due to the accomplishments of people from European countries such as the Ukraine, Poland and Germany, and also the Scandinavian peninsula.



If one reads the history of the development of the west it will be found that for a period of time after the Hudson's Bay Company was persuaded to give up many of its holdings there was not that attention to the development of the soil and other resources of the west that was hoped for. It was only when shiploads of these immigrants came to Canada that development proceeded. These people had great resourcefulness, courage and determination. People such as those from the Ukraine were fiercely independent. They have a real culture and great musical talent. This country owes a great debt to these people who have helped to make western Canada the land which it is. I know that these people accept the fact there are two official languages in Canada. Practically all of them have opted for English as their working language. In many instances, inspired by their pride of ancestry and spirit of independence, they have retained their literature, language, art and culture. This has been recognized in some of the western provinces because I know that the Ukrainian language is now being taught in the high schools of Alberta and Manitoba.

I do not go along with the idea that there should be equality to the extent that the dissenting report of Professor Rudnicki of the B and B Commission suggested. However, I still feel it would not have been too difficult to have gone far beyond the modest scope of this bill which merely pays lip service and says in fact that if these people have another language than French or English they may continue to use it. This is most inadequate. Many of the problems now faced by this government and this country, because of the inability to understand and accept parts of this bill, arise from the fact that nothing was done in this instance.

For example, I think it would have been well to have accepted the belief that these people had made a contribution. It might well have been done in the form of a new preamble to the constitution. I sometimes wonder what dry legalistic mind conceived the present preamble to the British North America Act. The time is ripe when this parliament should delegate to literary and historical personages the task of writing a true and proper preamble to our constitution which will pay more than lip service, not only to the people who form the two great groups whose mother tongues have been official languages

ever since the B.N.A. Act was passed but to the other people, the original inhabitants and the other races who have come to this country and have done so much, particularly in western Canada, to bring about the tremendous improvement and development which we now see in this land. There should be more than a symbolic gesture such as is contained in this bill. It would have done a great deal to alleviate the anger, hostility and discomfort which has been aroused in the minds of many people of other than French or English descent, particularly in western Canada.

Before redistribution, of some 90,000 people in my constituency 18,000 to 20,000 came from Quebec more than 60 years ago, possibly 25,000 are people of mixed descent from Europe, 8,000 to 10,000 are of Indian and Metis background and the rest are of mixed nationalities. These people have grown up together and shared the common experience of finding, developing and opening up a new land. The people from the province of Quebec and those who have joined them have no difficulty in accepting the fact they are in an English speaking milieu. They have accepted the English language as the one used in the province, but they have also retained their original language, art and culture. It is because of this fact that in a new land, a pioneer country, we have shared this experience, have learned to understand each other, and have grown up together. French people speak French and the rest speak English. There has been a peaceful accommodation.

• (3:50 p.m.)

In my opinion the government has lamentably failed to take the situation in western Canada into account, an area where, to be realistic about it, there is a great measure of misunderstanding and some failure to respond to the proposals in this bill. In this respect the government must bear a tremendous burden.

However, having said all this there can be no doubt as to how I must vote now that the bill has been introduced and set upon the assembly line of the legislative mill. In my opinion it would create a greater measure of disunity, of lack of harmony, and would do far more to prejudice the prospects of this land becoming a country where for the first time there is an opportunity for people to live together in peace and understanding, irrespective of their different cultures, languages and races, if the bill were defeated.

Apart from some of the countries of Asia, the French, English and Slavic languages are spoken in tremendous areas of the world. Having in mind that here in Canada French and English are official languages, and that the Slavic language is retained and practised in many parts of the country, we have a tremendous opportunity to play a part in what I would like to think could be the ultimate bringing together of many parts of the world.

During the course of the last two weeks it was my good fortune to be present at the meetings in Strasbourg of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, comprised of 18 nations including most of the Common Market nations, some of the nations of EFTA, and some nations outside the ambit of those two bodies. As I say, it is a consultative assembly. They make no decisions. But it was interesting to us when we got there to find that the official languages of the consultative assembly were French and English. This permitted the delegation from Canada to fit into the pattern of the meetings and to participate effectively and well. I hope that the federal government will take its responsibilities and do something more than it has done, and more than is proposed by the B and B Commission, not only to preserve the rights but to enhance the culture and linguistic prospects of the third ethnic group in Canada.

I end on this note, Mr. Speaker, that if we in Canada cannot learn to live together in friendship, peace and understanding, what hope is there for the rest of the world? For this reason, despite the misgivings which some hon. members may have, I urge them to have regard to the over-all advantages and to the greater benefits which will arise from the continued unity of this country, to swallow their genuine reluctance, as I have mine, and vote for this measure.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, as I have no objection of any kind against this official languages bill, I approve it unreservedly, even if—in spite of the ambition of this legislation for the future—it cannot affect in any way the true problem of national unity.

I have no objection at all against the enactment of this official languages bill. The problem we are facing will have to be solved by the provinces themselves.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I want to deal with the real problem we are facing and which, as I said at first, is

not related in any way to the passing of this legislation.

If Mr. John Smallwood were to become Mr. Jean Petitbois, that will change absolutely nothing in the national situation of the country.

The French Canadian does not enjoy the traditional freedom of handing over his language and his culture without restraint. On the contrary, he must spend the best of his creative energy struggling constantly and consciously against huge difficulties to preserve that which is considered as quite natural in all normal societies, namely the free gift of language and culture.

History proves that his fight has not been too successful since his language and his culture are consistently declining and rapidly changing, or, if you prefer, degenerating. It takes someone who has taught for some thirteen years in the province of Quebec to accept those comments.

From the anthropological angle, culture can be seen as a gift of gods that is transmitted from one generation to another. It is the automatic transmission of creative efforts, of knowledge and ability resulting from experience and wisdom of previous generations to ensure the preservation of the group.

We cannot help being reminded of some old life or even survival patterns shaped through experience and tested over a long period of time. In short, the cultural structures contain the total historical conscience of a people. Culture is the sum total of preferences, propensities, aptitudes, specific objectives and aims of a people, its particular way of perceiving, feeling, thinking and reacting to objective facts.

I would like to stress how difficult and frustating it is to have to consciously analyse the rules of a language while we speak it. If there are any of those unfortunate in this house, and some are very unhappy about such a situation, such is the plight of most French Canadians, specially those who are bilingual. They have become experts in the difficult and frustrating exercise of consciously speaking their own language. Normal people, like the English Canadians, the French or even the Eskimos, do not have to worry about their language, they just speak it. Abnormal people, like the French Canadians, have to stop and think before they speak because the words they use automatically are misunderstood by society; they have to watch themselves and consciously change them quite often.

[Mr. Matte.]

• (4:00 p.m.)

The question of linguistic changes due to contact with other languages—another important source of external compulsions—can become really disastrous for the weaker language involved. In this case, French is the weaker language, not because its internal structure is deficient, but because the social dynamics prevailing throughout the country and even in Quebec is clearly to the advantage of the English language. It is clear to linguists, even if most people are unaware of it, that the French spoken in Canada, including in Quebec, its stronghold, is undergoing fast alterations as a result of pressures exercised by the Anglo-American culture and language.

Within the fortress of Quebec itself, one finds in Montreal the Anglo-Quebecker Trojan horse.

That is why thousands of French Canadians have been assimilated by the English throughout Canada, including the 50,000 on the island of Montreal. They can no longer pride themselves on being promoters of the French language and culture in Canada, even if they continue to eat pea soup.

What does the term "to feel at home" mean if not that the individual feels at ease within the linguistic-cultural framework which he knows and unconsciously understands, because he has been raised and educated within it and he adjusts perfectly to it, because they are made for him.

The linguistic-cultural environment is another one which feeds and develops human personality.

Language is the most important vehicle for the expression of culture and human personality.

It is the first means which permits to perceive the knowledge and the organization of the exterior and interior reality of the speaker.

Structuration of human personality, through formative agents of culture and language, is mainly a painless and unconscious process, and human behaviour as it is conveyed by language and culture, constitutes a range of unconscious mechanisms.

The linguistic-cultural environment prepares the individual to integrate himself easily and comfortably within his own structures so that he may live, work, think, feel, perceive, progress and act, in short, survive with the maximum of efficiency within structures where he feels at ease.

We can say that a society gives its full contribution and progresses normally when its dynamic internal forces help maintain a constant balance between its cultural and linguistic structures, having regard to the unceasing pressures exerted both from inside and outside.

Culture and language embrace all aspects of human life, all human institutions, among which religion, education, industry and commerce are not the least.

If we recognize the merit of those remarks, we are compelled to conclude that most French Canadians are strangers in the greater part of the Canadian territory, and even in their own bastion, Quebec.

A culturo-linguistic community, to operate normally, needs reasonably homogeneous structures and fundamentally self-animating, self-creating and self-regenerating social dynamics. Its institutions and national life must express their homogeneity and this internal functional harmony. Its inventiveness and creativeness should proceed mainly from interaction among all the forces at work within its structures.

It is recognized that no cultural change could occur without the creative activity of actual persons, sensitive to internal and external influences. However, if an extraneous influence overwhelms and supplants the interior dynamics, a serious unbalance results.

And immediately we can ask ourselves, if even a normal, homogeneous and self-creating society, as the French society, for instance, feels threatened by the influence exerted by strong foreign cultures, how could an abnormal, heterogeneous and imitative society as that of French Canada hope to survive? That is indeed a most timely question. However, one thing is sure: if we choose to answer in the negative, the solution to the French-Canadian problem becomes very simple. That solution would be to have all the French Canadians totally assimilated to the Anglo-American culture, as soon as possible, and to forget once and for all the dream of a bilingual and bicultural Canada from sea to sea.

French-Canadian society is an unusual society because its internal social dynamics or its self-generating forces are too weak to enable it to change while remaining itself, or to change without distorting too much the image it has of itself. It is terribly weakened by the heterogeneity of its linguistic and cultural structures which is a kind of Franco-Anglo-American hodge-podge. It is threatened at the very core of its Quebec fortress, i.e. Montreal, by a real Trojan horse, namely, the English Quebec which, in spite of its low representation in numbers, is infinitely more powerful than the French majority. Therefore, there exists, at the very core of this French-Canadian society, a foreign body whose dynamic social power permeates visibly, gradually and inevitably all the fields of the French life. In the modern world, industry and trade are very powerful structures that extend their tentacles in all the others structures which make up the linguistic and cultural environment. When a language, as is the case of the French language in Quebec, must continually express the structures of a foreign culture, in this instance, the English culture, together with what remains of its own cultural roots, it ill serves both groups and, indeed, is rejected by both ethnical elements involved.

It is exactly what is happening in Quebec at this time and in Canada as a whole. French Canadians themselves despise their own language because they realize it is neither fish nor fowl. They know it is a hybrid thing, a mishmash because it naturally springs from a hybrid culture. Did not the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) himself, describe it not so long ago, as a lousy French?

• (4:10 p.m.)

English Canadians, and more particularly English-speaking Quebeckers, have every reason to reject any idea of imitation or association with the monster that is French—or rather "franglais"—all the more as it is of their own making. Human psychology teaches us that sound individuals are not inclined to imitate or compete with weak or crippled people. The same holds true in respect of peoples' psychology.

In short, the French Canadian today is saying to himself: I loathe myself and I wander as a lost soul. I am just beginning to understand the dynamic forces that moulded me and, from the bottom of my heart, I wish for the transformation of those structures, so that, at last, I may be able to identify myself with my essential image. But fundamentally, the only real question boils down to this: Would it be that my cause is hopeless?

In that perspective, it is important to note the following facts. French-Canadian demographers forecast that within 15 years, the majority of the population of greater Montreal will be English-speaking, if the present birth-rate trend is maintained among French Canadians, and if the assimilation of new

Canadians to the English-speaking minority continues at the present rate of 95 per cent. If the French social dynamics, in Montreal, is already threatened with a French-speaking majority of 63 per cent, how can it be strengthened, in the presence of an English-speaking majority? Montreal is the vital centre of cultural and industrial life in Quebec. When a vital organ is endangered in the system, is there any hope left to the person concerned? The following argument is usually given to that assertion; But if everyone is bilingual on Montreal island, French will no longer be in danger.

Generally speaking, bilingualism concerns individuals rather than society as a whole. Collective bilingualism pre-supposes the existence of two social dynamics at work within the same society, in order to maintain and ensure the functioning and development of two distinct structures as regards culture, language and personality. Wherever that exists, one of the two structures must necessarily, sooner or later, dominate the other. The supremacy of a group of structures on another has always been true at the level of the individuals, no matter how they may have learned two languages. There are no exceptions to this rule, even in the case of the present right honourable Prime Minister.

It is clear that those who learn French in Maillardville, British Columbia, do not participate to the same extent in a strong French linguistic-cultural structure as those who were privileged to be born and brought up in Quebec City, which is relatively homogeneous, or in a very homogeneous centre like Paris.

Even if Premier Bennett offered a free education in French to the French-speaking minority of his province, from the cradle to the grave, he would not be able to change the fact that French is not part of the institutional and global life of British Columbia. The effect would be about the same as if the French Canadians were granted the same privilege in England, in Italy, or in Russia. This generous offer, at best, could only facilitate things, to a degree, for the French-speaking minority in British Columbia, And even if the high society of Vancouver became as truly bilingual as the English elite in Great Britain for example, it would in no way modify the absolute supremacy of the English element's dynamics in this Pacific province. One thing is certain, it would not help in the least the French-speaking element in Quebec.



The co-existence of two language structures within the bilingual language of French Canadians allows the English pronunciation to affect French structures, rhythm, intonation, as well as vowel length and accent.

But the most serious and perhaps most sinister invasion is taking place on the semantic level. It is subtle and destructive. The semantic confusion in the mind of most French Canadians is beyond description. The average bilingual person—I do not mean the elite—is truly handicapped in that he is seldom able to speak properly and consciously in either language.

In any language, every word has its own semantic contents, defined by various contexts, each having its exact meaning and shade. It is difficult enough to learn to understand the exact meaning of words or to separate them within one language, because the meaning of words is ever changing, let alone to master the fuzzy outlines of semantic fields in two languages, especially if one has greater stability, because of its greater use and creativeness, based on powerful social dynamics. This is not only due to a more frequent use of English, but because most new concepts originate in English, and every French Canadian cannot be expected to carry constantly a dictionary under his arm, which, in any case, would be of very little use to him, since it hardly reflects the environment.

Moreover, French Canadians are not born first-rate translators or interpreters any more than their English counterparts. The official qualified translators are like prisoners, chained to their pile of dictionaries from France which very often prove to be inadequate to translate Anglo-American facts of North America. Their translations are close imitations of the English style and way of thinking for translators themselves are not living in or do not come from a creative, homogeneous and dynamic French environment. Only the best among them succeed reasonably well in recreating in their translations the French style and turn of mind. For the worst of them, who are not in slight minority, their job consists in writing English with French words. The federal statutes, and even those of the Quebec national assembly, are classical examples of those awkward, clumsy translations which are obvious imitations of the English way of conceiving and expressing ideas. But even if all translations of English texts were perfect, let us not forget that the way to learn a language is not by reading but by listening. What we learn

To solve the problem of unity in Canada, if we must go beyond the confederation structures, we must not hesitate to do so. We are all mature enough and conscious enough to know that some day or other we must come to a conclusion in this regard and do so without any animosity, in the greatest possible spirit of charity, so that we might manage to shape north of the 45th parallel a country that is truly that of all Canadians.

**Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane):** Mr. Speaker, looking at the clock, I am afraid I only have a few minutes left, so I shall be very brief.

It is a pity, in a way, that the original concept of this bill which was to entrench the language rights in the constitution was not carried out earlier. Though the federal government is through this bill, legislating within the bounds of its jurisdiction, it remains that it would have been most desirable that the language rights be entrenched in the constitution, as the government said it intended to do.

However, when one hears comments such as those we have heard for the past few days from some opposition members, one tends to feel discouraged and to wonder whether this country has any future at all.

When one realizes that it took us 50 years of struggle to finally obtain, a few years ago, bilingual cheques, When we notice to-day's opposition to a bill whose only function is to allow the citizens to address themselves to the federal government in their mother tongue, I think we are right to have certain misgivings concerning the future of this country.

Obviously, there are several indirect ways to express what I would call bigotry and intolerance, such as saying that this legislation is not the best means to guarantee linguistic rights. It might be that some people have not yet understood the real scope of the legislation. But I think we must tell it as it is, whether this country remains or not united. If intolerance and bigotry supersede the highest human qualities, I think we shall have to resign ourselves to put an end to this political union.

When I think, Mr. Speaker, that today while I am speaking to you the French Canadians in the province of Quebec, in order to work for the federal government or for certain government agencies,—I am thinking especially of Air Canada—must learn English and must take courses in English; when I think that the French-Canadian civil servants who work in Ottawa can only do it in the language of Shakespeare and when on the other hand we hear people say that this is but a minor problem, that goodwill and mutual understanding are the remedies to these situations; I wonder Mr. Speaker if wool is not being pulled over our eyes. In other words, either we face facts, find solutions and pay the price for a union or we take a firm stand and put an end to a situation that would no longer make sense.

I would like to end my remarks by saying that in a hundred years from now, those who might read the reasons that have been advanced against this bill and detect the faint-heartedness the intolerance, the various forms of opposition sometimes blunt, more often subtle which were marshalled against this bill, will realize that there are still people who would like to impose an exclusively British way of life upon this country.

• (4:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe):** Mr. Speaker, at the outset of the few remarks I should like to make on Bill C-120, I have no hesitation in saying that I shall vote for this bill when the time comes. I do not mean for all that that this measure is entirely perfect, far from it. I am even somewhat inclined to think that this measure contains perhaps a political purpose much more than a real willingness to promote bilingualism.

Since we have to pass judgment on the measure now before us, I should like to speak as a reasonable and tolerant man, with the hope that the few words I will say will help to make our views better understood.

This measure is not perfect, Mr. Speaker, and one only has to consider the 41 amendments already before the house to realize it.

One might believe it was drafted hastily, without due consideration. That is what prompted me to say at the outset that there was probably a great deal of politics in this issue.

One must remember, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of this bill is to provide equality of status and rights to both languages in government services.

All those who have at least a little common sense will admit it is high time we considered this measure, because what it tends to correct is the source of misunderstandings and of various forms of unrest that we encounter every day.

Mr. Speaker, like many others I do realize that this bill will be extremely difficult to administer.

through books is essentially technical and not in common use in conversation; thus it is a specialized knowledge. Unilingual French speaking people themselves cannot entirely get rid of that heavy dose of English structures because, as everyone of us, it is from their environment that they derive their unconscious knowledge of the use of a language. So it is normal that the more people are bilingual the greater the risks of linguistic confusion and that general contamination which eventually will reach even unilingual people.

The net result of that linguistic and cultural confusion is that, on the whole, French Canadians suffer from what I would call linguistic and cultural maladjustments.

Such psychoses result from the inner conflict created by the image of the perfect French the French-Canadian elite has traditionally presented to him, especially at school and, more recently, also on radio and television.

Social science researchers agree that a child acquires the basic structures of culture, language and personality before he goes to school. The linguistic and cultural environment that moulds the French-Canadian child is more or less hybrid. When he starts going to school, there will be added to the usual psychological confusion that of seeing his speech subjected to a series of new rules, and that practically amounts to the study of another language for him. It is as if he were told kindly that the environment he comes from, is not worth much and that he shall have to submit willingly to a complete transformation of his personality, to a personality transplant, as it were. As soon as he leaves the schoolroom, he feels psychologically embarrassed for borrowing structures that are so radically different from that of his environment. In fact, he is asked to play every day the impossible role of the hero gallantly fighting for the defence of his mother tongue.

• (4:20 p.m.)

This task is beyond the possibilities of a single individual, because nobody can fight, every instant, by swimming against the current in a linguistic and cultural environment which, in all normal societies, is designed to assist the individual and not to swallow him. Thus, the French Canadian loses most of his creative energies trying to rebuild and recreate consciously his language, through personal efforts, seeking to accomplish things which, in all normal societies, come naturally as a gift from the gods. The burden often becomes so heavy that many French Canadians do not hesitate to adopt English, even among themselves. The disastrous effects of such an environment appear, even in our schools in Quebec, and the efforts made over the years to try and correct this situation unfortunately have not yet produced very tangible results.

I would like to conclude those remarks with a quotation from a first rate French Canadian intellectual a former editorial writer of the distinguished French newspaper *Le Devoir,* Mr. Jean-Marc Léger. He said:

> The most flexible structures, the best of balanced programs, the most modern and best equipped institutions, free complete schooling at all levels, will not prevent a people from remaining culturally underdeveloped, intellectually handicapped and socially outclassed, if some jargon replaces his language. A nation that does not master adequately a language, its language, and that does not live with that language is unable to express itself, to communicate, to invent, incapable also of deep and creative thinking: it is at best translating and imitating.

Mr. Speaker, this is just about the situation in which the French Canadian finds himself in Canada. It is for these reasons that I approve without any reservation whatsoever the bill on official languages. The same thing happened in Louisiana where they decided to adopt French, which is now taught in schools. I see no value other than that in the bill on the official languages. Still, that throughout Canada, in all the federal services, one should be able to use his mother tongue is quite an achievement which I should not want to be—I do not agree at all with the right hon. Prime Minister and the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier)—a partial or the start of a solution to the problem of national unity in Canada: the latter is an entirely different problem.

The problem of national unity lies in the need for the French Canadians to be themselves and to command respect as such, without necessarily being subjected to translation, or imitation; only by being true to themselves will they participate in the development of the whole country. That is why any conditional option or concept deserves to be studied.

A while ago I was listening to the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) whose opinion I naturally respect. However, if it should occur to anyone here that nothing should be spared for Canadian unity, and that this can be summed up by saving the framework of confederation as it now stands, there is a lack of goodwill.

I would not want to use the same terms as were used by hon. members opposite in an attempt to blame some western members who expressed their fears and their concern with regard to the administration of this measure.

On the contrary, I think these people wish to be of service to their people and they want to express the views of their fellow-citizens in the house. However, I do not want to suggest that I share entirely their views, but at least I give them the benefit of the doubt, namely that they are doing their best to express the opinion of their constituents.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this bill has led to all kinds of interpretations. Some have said: It is intended to impose bilingualism all across Canada, to force us to learn a second language, to force our children to learn a language which is not theirs. There are no such things in the measure now under consideration. All it intends to do, as I have said before, is to ensure a bilingual service within the government departments and the courts of justice.

Some even went as far as to suggest that there was a danger of domination on the part of Quebec over the rest of Canada. I immediately deny such a claim and I note that even though Quebec might want to dominate the rest of Canada, it would be physically impossible.

It is too bad some government members chose to speak the way they did during this debate. It is obvious they are seeking to provoke the members of the opposition, hoping to hear statements they could use as they see fit in their riding or at the next elections.

Some accused us of being against bilingualism and even evolution of the French fact. Some of my colleagues were accused of being hostile to the advancement of French culture in this country. Far from being opposed to a greater use of the French language in the country, we, as members of the opposition, want to do our best so that French Canadians will be at ease in the national capital as well as in all other cities and places where there is a sufficient number of French-speaking Canadians to deserve an adequate attention from the government.

Let us see, Mr. Speaker, what has been the attitude of my party towards a more extensive use of French. When I first came here in 1957, it was striking to see how very little French was used on parliament hill and in government buildings. Posters and signs on the doors of ministers' office were solely unilingual and not in French.

I then made a survey of the various anomalies which could be found here and there and I discussed them with the Speaker at that time, the Hon. Roland Michener. I discussed the matter also with several ministers and from then on, we started seeing bilingual signs and posters in the house of commons as well as on parliament hill.

It is a well known fact that the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm at that time, Mr. Breton, introduced, session after session, private bills to have simultaneous interpretation and bilingual cheques accepted by his Liberal colleagues. And we should be surprised, to meet the views of our friends opposite, to find that at the time, those requests made by a representative of the province of Quebec were either killed or rejected by a Liberal government. And today, those people are trying to blame us and to make people believe that we are opposed to the French language.

Who gave this house simultaneous interpretation, if not the Conservative government which preceded that of Lester B. Pearson?

It was the same government, that also agreed to have the "Parliamentary rules and forms" by Beauchesne translated and had it done; up till then it had always been published in English.

It is also the government headed by the right hon. John Diefenbaker that granted bilingual cheques and allowed the election briefs to be published both in English and in French.

It is the same government that elected a French Canadian as Governor General of Canada and that reached an agreement with the government of the Quebec province for the building of the transcanadian highway.

It is the Conservative government that also settled the matter of the subsidies granted to the universities of the province of Quebec, which, under a Liberal government, had been left pending for many many years. It was also this government that reached an agreement with the Ontario and Quebec provinces for the building of the interprovincial bridge which we may admire not very far from here.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to draw the attention of the house on the steps taken by our leader and on the statements he made about the French language. And those statements were not just made today.

I have here an excerpt of the 28th of August 1967 issue of the Halifax *Chronicle Herald* which reads as follows:

[*English*]

There is surely no reason why we could not have two languages and two cultures existing side by side and yet have an effective nationhood. English speaking Canadians should accept and welcome the French language and culture in Canada as a continuing fact. This involves no more than the acceptance of reality and the recognition that the French tradition is a great tradition which has contributed and will contribute much to our national life.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The speaker was the then Premier Robert L. Stanfield of Nova Scotia, and the time was not August, 1967, but April 6, 1964.

[*Translation*]

This statement from my leader clearly illustrates his stand.

I am going to quote another of his other statements:

The Canadian federation will work only if the French-Canadian people do not feel threatened in their development as such.

And also on March 10 last, he said and I quote:

Everywhere in the world, the citizen must pay a price for his right to citizenship. In some countries, he pays with his freedom—in others with his life—in others again with his pride and his peace of mind.

Compared to that, the price which the Canadian people are asked to pay is not so high. I believe that it is a price which we are prepared to pay.

Let there be no misunderstanding.

Should there be a Canadian who would divide this country further, I am not his leader.

There is the proof of my leader's position with regard to the language and the rights of the French Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to refer to some remarks, made during this debate because I believe they reflect on my province.

For instance, the Saint-Léonard affair was mentioned. Mr. Speaker, that is the only incident of that kind in the province of Quebec in the last hundred years. I could tell those people who fear that the same situation may become the rule in the province of Quebec that each time the Saint-Léonard case is mentioned with respect to Quebec, one can bring up hundreds of similar cases throughout the country that were directed against my fellow French-Canadians.

Reviving those stories will never bring about an understanding. It should be remembered that we, in the province of Quebec, are proud of the way we have treated the English-speaking minority.



In our province of Quebec, 38 per cent of expenditures incurred for education go to English institutions. And it must be noted that the English-speaking people of Quebec represent but 18 per cent of the population.

It must be mentioned also that McGill University, which is regarded as an English university, is subsidized by the government of Quebec in the ratio of 70 per cent. Needless to repeat that the large majority of taxpayers in Quebec are French-speaking Canadians.

Some have also said that capital was flowing out of the province of Quebec because of the uncompromising attitude of the Quebec population.

I should like to correct such an impression because it is entirely false and to inform the house that if some are afraid of the province of Quebec, many English companies have faith in it.

In fact, during the last months, Shell Oil of Canada Limited has invested $100 million and Golden Eagle, $70 million, in Montreal. Canadian International Paper has invested $50 million in Gatineau, Quebec North Shore Paper, $54 million in Baie-Comeau and B.A.S.F., $30 million. Donahue Bros. has invested $16 million in La Malbaie, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., $11.5 million in Valleyfield, General Foods Ltd., $7.7 million in Ville LaSalle, J. H. Normick, $2.1 million in La Sarre, Burlington Industries, $1.15 million in Granby, Canada Packers Ltd., $1,225,000 in Joliette, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., $1 million in Joliette, Chemcell Limited, $1 million in St. Bruno, and Simons Cigar, $1,029,000 in Sainte-Thérèse. I could go on giving the names of other companies which have invested millions of dollars in the province of Quebec.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this is sufficient to show that reasonable people, English Canadians who study reality objectively and advisedly, have confidence in the province of Quebec and want to continue to do their share in promoting in Quebec the interests of French-speaking Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, imperfect though the measure before us may be, I will vote in favour of it. It is possible, Mr. Speaker, to disagree with certain clauses of the bill, without having to condemn it as a whole. The bill will be studied in committee and I hope, as do some of

my colleagues, that the necessary corrections will be brought to it in order to improve it as much as possible. Until then, Mr. Speaker, let us show understanding and tolerance.

I am happy to say that this is the policy adopted by our party leader, who is anxious to see national unity preserved.

The one million English-speaking Canadians living in Quebec and the one million French-speaking Canadians living outside Quebec deserve to have their languages recognized in their respective environments and to be provided with the services they are entitled to in their own language.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for Bill C-120.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I will make a few remarks only in connection with the bill on the recognition of the two official languages, which is introduced by the government, and which, in my opinion, is quite timely, even if it is overdue. The introduction by the government of that official languages bill will probably not change much because finally the teaching of languages is for the most part the responsibility of the provincial government.

Above all I would like to deal with the following idea which has been discussed for some years, mainly in the province of Quebec, and as a French Canadian, I would like to say a few words about those who advocate, chiefly in the province of Quebec, the priority of one language, and who as soon as the topic is about finance, about administration and other things, at once wave the flag of dissatisfaction in connection with languages, which does not change the situation in any way.

To clarify the debate, I would like to give hon. members, this afternoon, a detailed account of the work accomplished by the Ralliement créditiste since it has been represented in the house.

I suggest that the French language is far from being about to disappear from Canada as some politicians, mostly French-speaking ones, who have few scruples when they speak about linguistic equality, would have us believe.

In my opinion, those politicians are irresponsible men and show by their words how independant they are and that they do not care at all about the common good of Canadians, particularly those in the province of Quebec. For them, it is enough to try to stir up panic within the Canadian people, to get them to quarrel and separate one day, so that they may carry out their design, which I would call false and dishonest.

All those demagogic detractors are feeding on their fellow citizens, either French or English Canadians. To achieve their goal, they think only of inducing disorder, and even disputes if at all possible.

Those politicians play hard on sentimental values, such as language, in the first place, religion, race, colour, and so on, thus dividing in order to rule, because they are not powerful enough.

At this stage, I would like to quote from an article by Mr. Viateur Beaupré published in *Le Devoir*, and I quote:

> The Great Pity of the So-called Mother Tongue
>
> "Those people are now justified in saying: What! You claimed to be French, and you do not know how to speak or write your language!..." Daudet, The Last Lesson.
>
> We have given them this right; we now have to take it away from them. There is a very simple but very difficulty way: learn how to write and speak our language. Because "as long as a people which has fallen into slavery holds on to its language, it is as if it were holding the key of the prison..." adds Daudet.
>
> We shall not break prison only with this tool of language. Culture is also politics, economy, arts, the taste of bread, the bouquet of wine, courteousness, righteousness, and everything.
>
> Even if we would shake ourselves free in all other respects, without mastering our language better, we would have that dubious comfort of being free barbarians.

Mr. Speaker, let us ask ourselves what are the views of those who have served in our armed forces since confederation, especially during the last world war. Should we not also ask ourselves why those men in the past wars gave their life to save Canada?

Did those brave Canadians ask themselves if they were fighting in English or in French? I say no! With the help of the Allies, Great Britain and others, they saved their country, Canada, with all its human wealth, irrespective of their language and culture.

Closer to me, there was my brother, Antonio Beaudoin, a member of the Fusilliers du Mont-Royal regiment who died at Dieppe, in 1942. He received five decorations, including the Victoria Cross. He was a gallant soldier and he died at Dieppe at the age of 22. He gave his life for Canada and the Commonwealth. He did not ask himself, I am sure, if he was fighting for English Canada or for French Canada. All he wanted was to save freedom, protect Canada of which he was so proud.

Mr. Speaker, now that we are done with external wars, we must come to grips with the internal ones, those that exist between the French fact and the English fact, as some are trying to make us believe. The two races are equal and, therefore, they must get along together.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The French nation must assert its rights without encroaching upon those of the English language and vice versa. We did our share and will continue to do so and I will tell you how. When one comes to think that in 1946-1947, not a single member spoke French in the House of Commons, except the present leader of the Ralliement créditiste (Mr. Caouette), one cannot but be amazed at the progress made by the French language here, in this very house.

Mr. Speaker, that is only the result of the long, tenacious and relentless fight carried on by the Ralliement créditiste for the enforcement of the French Canadians' rights.

At this stage, I will refer to an article published in the October 16, 1962 edition of *Le Droit*, signed by Mr. Maurice Huot and entitled:

"Excellent attitude towards the French language".

I quote:

If they keep it up, the Créditistes will have done more in a few weeks for the advancement of French in the House of Commons than all political parties since confederation.

The Créditistes from Quebec have not only multiplied their interventions in favour of French in government services, but have created the necessary climate that has prompted many members from other parties to use that language.

And the author says further:

It would be impossible to quote all the strong protests made by the Créditistes in order that the French language be respected throughout Canada—

The Créditistes are very much criticized in some circles, especially as regards their monetary doctrine and economic principles. The unfortunate aspect of it all in that those who try to heap ridicule on that party are sometimes people who share the same culture and the same language.

Say what you will about the economic doctrines of the Créditistes, one thing cannot be denied: their devotion to the French language.

Their absolutely legitimate nationalism, that is never carried too far, does them great credit.

The Créditistes are right in requesting that the standing orders of the house, the procedure in the house, according to Beauchesne, should be given to them in French.

Mr. Caouette was right in requesting French in all the services—

[Mr. Beaudoin.]

—in Canada, especially with regard to—

—Air Canada . . . Mr. Dumont was right in asking the services of an interpreter when he met with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hamilton).

The Créditistes have every right to ask for French in the parliament cafeteria. The Créditistes have every right to demand a perfect simultaneous translation service in parliament and not a halting French translation.

Some English milieus have started to understand, either through a sense of justice or in their own interests. It is not any too soon. But the other French-speaking people must understand as well and set the example first of all through practical actions similar to those of the Créditistes.

Mr. Speaker, the Ralliement créditiste asked and obtained a lot for the French Canadians. I believe the present government, through its bill, wants to help us with what we started in 1946,—as the article says—and I for one agree with this bill which may not give us exactly all we would have liked, but which does meet a good number of our requests.

I continue:

The Créditistes asked and obtained for French Canadians the complete translation in French of the procedures in the House of Commons; a complete french service on all Air Canada lines; the posting in French of all railway schedules; an adequate and accurate system of simultaneous interpretation in the House of Commons; interpretation services in all government services, in all federal government departments; French spoken in the parliamentary restaurant; a perfectly bilingual telephone service provided in parliament by the Bell Company.

This is what I wanted to quote. It was written by Mr. Huot.

If the province of Quebec feels frustrated in its rights and future, should it blame others or itself? If the province of Quebec has been unable to elect leaders in order to assume its responsibilities, who is to blame? If Quebec fell a victim to the charms of a few separatists, whose fault is it? If Quebec was unable to get to the bottom of things and preferred to practice a shameful patronage, who is to blame?

In my opinion, the fault lies certainly with government representatives here in the house especially the French-speaking ones who by keeping silent, or practically, caused the dissatisfaction prevailing today.

If the Quebec leaders or those of every province had been able to look after their own business, they would have required Canadians to respect each others' rights and we would not have reached this point in Canada. If there is now discrimination among workers or in any other sector, it is actually

because Canadians whether French or English, refused to learn the other language and because the governments blinked the facts, without requiring any effort from either side.

Why does Quebec want its independance? Because French Canadians cannot even be respected at home and even less elsewhere. It is high time, if not too late, to introduce a legislation through which all will be respected and, especially, the minorities. I hope that the minorities will, in turn, respect the majorities, as it is not yet the case in the province of Quebec since only yesterday, English was required in some areas, especially in a province which is essentially French.

This is only one of the numerous ways suggested to allay the fever that is mounting across Canada.

If we do not want to wake up one day bound hand end foot, it is high time, more than ever, that everybody assumed his responsibilities and took his destiny in his own hands. One does not solve a problem by creating another one. Let us look after our business before everything else. Let us not do as we did for the first 90 years of confederation.

Before looking for trouble elsewhere let us start by putting our own house in order.

In order that Quebec be itself within confederation, let us start by being ourselves in Quebec. Let us stop accusing the English of being damned English, the French of being damned French and let us recognize the fact that we belong to a bilingual country. Let us stand firm while so many others remain idle or sitting on the fence.

If we want to be respected, let us then start by respecting the others, that is the minorities, and this is how the English, the French, or the others will feel at home in Canada.

If the various linguistic groups that exist in Canada, are fully respected we shall achieve and consolidate Canadian unity forever.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*English*]

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the house ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

*Division*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. MacEachen, for Mr. Trudeau) which was agreed to on the following division:

• (5:10 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Asselin
Baldwin
Barrett
Basford
Beaudoin
Béchard
Beer
Bell
Benjamin
Benson
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brewin
Broadbent
Brown
Buchanan
Burton
Caccia
Cafik
Cantin
Caouette
Carter
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Code
Comeau
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Crouse
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
De Bané
Dionne
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Dubé
Dumont
Duquet
Émard
Fairweather
Flemming
Forest
Forget
Forrestall
Fortin
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gilbert
Gillespie
Givens
Gleave
Godin
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Grills
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hees
Hogarth
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lachance
Laflamme

*Division*

| | |
|---|---|
| Laing | Osler |
| Lambert (Edmonton West) | Otto |
| Lang | Ouellet |
| Langlois | Paproski |
| Laniel | Peddle |
| Laprise | Pelletier |
| La Salle | Penner |
| Latulippe | Pepin |
| Leblanc (Laurier) | Perrault |
| Lefebvre | Pilon |
| Lessard (LaSalle) | Portelance |
| Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean) | Pringle |
| Lewis | Reid |
| Lind | Ricard |
| Loiselle | Richard |
| Lundrigan | Richardson |
| Macdonald (Rosedale) | Roberts |
| MacEachen | Robinson |
| MacEwan | Rochon |
| MacGuigan | Rock |
| MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway) | Rodrigue |
| Mackasey | Rose |
| MacLean | Roy (Laval) |
| Macquarrie | Ryan |
| McBride | Saltsman |
| McCleave | Scott |
| McCutcheon | Serré |
| McKinley | Sharp |
| McNulty | Skoberg |
| McQuaid | Smerchanski |
| Mahoney | Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi) |
| Marceau | Smith (Saint-Jean) |
| Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo) | Stafford |
| Marshall | Stanbury |
| Mather | Stanfield |
| Matte | Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay) |
| Monteith | St. Pierre |
| Moores | Sullivan |
| Morison | Thomas (Maisonneuve) |
| Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys) | Thomas (Moncton) |
| Munro | Tolmie |
| Murphy | Trudeau |
| Nesbitt | Trudel |
| Noël | Turner (London East) |
| Nowlan | Watson |
| O'Connell | Weatherhead |
| Olson | Whicher |
| | Whiting |
| | Yanakis |
| | Yewchuk—197. |

NAYS

Messrs:

| | |
|---|---|
| Cadieu (Meadow Lake) | Moore |
| Coates | Muir (Lisgar) |
| Diefenbaker | Ritchie |
| Dinsdale | Schumacher |
| Downey | Simpson |
| Gundlock | Skoreyko |
| Horner | Southam |
| Korchinski | Stewart (Marquette)—17. |
| McIntosh | |

• (5:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on the Official Languages Bill.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

• (5:40 p.m.)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF 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 Papineau (Mr. Ouellet)—Administration of Justice—compensation to victims of criminal acts; the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault)—Air Pollution—coal dust from shipments through Vancouver Harbour; the hon. member for St. John's West—Water Resources—Placentia Bay, Newfoundland—attendance of minister at meeting to discuss pollution.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING BOARD MEMBERSHIP, REMUNERATION, ETC.

The house resumed from Wednesday, May 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen that Bill C-153, to amend the Historic Sites and Monuments Act, be read the third time and do pass.

**Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, it was my hope to be able to make a few comments on the bill which is now before us, namely Bill C-153 which deals with historic sites and monuments. As all members have undoubtedly noted, there are only two principles in the bill. The first is to provide for membership on the board of an officer of the National Museums of Canada, and the second is to provide that the remuneration paid to members of the board appointed by the Governor in Council for attending at meetings or to other business of the board is to be fixed by the Governor in Council.

These two principles regarding the operation of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board are open for consideration and discussion. That is why I desire to make a few comments on them. Over the years I have had a great interest in the work of this board, but I have been disappointed in some of the policies adopted by the board and also in the fact that greater support and money has not been made available to the board. I may say

that one of the reasons I have such a great interest in this matter is that I believe a properly supported board, whose policy would be a true recognition of the national historic sites and monuments, would build up what I am afraid we lack at the present moment in our country, that is a real understanding of Canada and a pride in being Canadian. I believe that more support for and more forward looking policies by this board would do a great deal toward the recognition of Canada as a nation and the encouragement of pride in Canada. I believe there are too many citizens of Canada who consider themselves as hyphenated Canadians, as English-Canadians. French-Canadians, Chinese-Canadians, etc.

It is my feeling that the majority of people whom I meet want to be Canadians and have a pride in being Canadians. I have had the opportunity over the years to travel in other countries of the world and have found a fantastic respect for Canada and Canadians, even more than we have for ourselves. I think that one way of getting over what might be called an inferiority complex is to proceed with greater speed toward the establishment of a policy recognizing the importance of national historic sites and monuments. In particular, we should try to overcome a failure of the past by encouraging the board to work in co-operation, co-ordination, liaison and partnership with provincial historic sites committees and municipal archivists.

I was most interested in reading the minutes of proceedings and evidence No. 12 of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development covering the meetings that were held on March 10 and March 11 of this year. At page 287 of the proceedings we have the evidence of Mr. Gordon, who is I understand, senior assistant deputy minister responsible for conservation. He had the following to say to the committee:

> The principal objective is to commemorate major events, persons, places and structures of truly national historic significance in such a way that history is brought alive for Canadians, students and adults alike.

I certainly agree with that statement and hope that with the addition of one member to the board, and a new approach which he might bring, we will see the achievement of the objective as laid down in the words I have just quoted. But if this objective is to be achieved, there must be, as I said a few moments ago, a greater recognition of the need for the national board to establish a more close liaison with provincial committees and municipal archivists, so as to better commemorate major events, persons, places and structures.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I should like to give an example of what I mean by co-operation, liaison and partnership. The city of Vancouver is the major city on the west coast of our great country. At the present time it is the third largest city in Canada. It is growing at such a rate that, in the near future, the population of metropolitan Vancouver will exceed one million. Yet, I found it absolutely impossible over the years to encourage action to be taken to recognize the historic nature of Vancouver. I should like to refer to what we in Vancouver East call New Brighton, a park which is under the jurisdiction of the park commissioners of Vancouver. It was in this area that the City of Vancouver was commenced. In this small area, in this corner of Vancouver East, the first wharf, the first hotel, the first post office, the first customs building were established. Sketches and photographs are in the hands of that famous archivist of Vancouver, Major Matthews. Yet it has been impossible over the years to obtain any recognition on the part of the national board that this should be a national historic site. With all the records which are available we could rebuild the first hotel, or at least the façade, the first post office, the first customs house, the first wharf, and so on.

The parks commission of Vancouver would be happy to co-operate in any way—to carry on the administration and to look after it—if there could only be a recognition of the case for preservation which, as has been pointed out, is really the objective of this body. Yet one cannot get anywhere.

Millions of dollars can be voted to rebuild an old fort in the maritimes or a fort somewhere else, but when it comes to a project of this nature on the west coast there is no co-operation, no partnership, because the founding of the City of Vancouver is apparently not of national historic interest.

I have used this case as an example. I am just as interested in national historic sites and monuments all across the Dominion of Canada. But I do have a strong impression that even the board itself cannot have this feeling of being Canadian, this feeling for recognition of our history, this feeling for building and reconstructing and marking in such a way that the people of our country, especially those who have come here in recent years,

may have a knowledge of our country and be proud to call themselves Canadians.

One way of imbuing this feeling of pride is by means of greater understanding on the part of the board and an extension of its activities. This, of course, means greater support not only by way of legislation but financially, in addition to a great educational program the length and breadth of the country. It is because of my strong interest in this matter, my strong feelings in this matter, my strong support for Canadian history coming alive through the medium of this board that I deign to get up and take the time of the house for a few minutes on this subject. Poorly as I may have expressed it, I hope the feeling I am trying to convey has got across to the minister and to the board and that we shall in the not-too-distant future see them lift their eyes, get a broader perspective and realize that we can do a great deal more than we have done in the past if consideration is given to what I term co-ordination, liaison, partnership with the various provincial bodies, both governmental and non-governmental. This country is rich in historical knowledge; we should have the sense to do something about it before it is too late.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, it being six o'clock, with leave of the house, I shall take only a few minutes to indicate that we support Bill C-153, that we are happy about it and that the minister should be praised for it.

However, I wish to remind him of a particular fact in connection with the Sir Wilfrid Laurier museum, in the city of Arthabaska, in the Lotbinière constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an important subject. I am not speaking as a politician or otherwise, since Sir Wilfrid Laurier was, as everybody knows, a great man of the liberal party as well as a great Canadian statesman. The members of our group and fellow-citizens of Arthabaska admit it readily. The latter have moved heaven and earth to achieve their goal—and that is why I think it my duty to rise in this house and put forward a claim—namely the restoration and the maintenance, often carried on on a voluntary basis, of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's house in Arthabaska.

I would like to tell the minister that thousands of people visit that castle each year. It is called a castle but really it is not really due to the state of the premises. However, Mr. Speaker, we believe that the government or that Board should study that matter very closely. I would like to make that request on behalf of the people of my city. This Board should institute an inquiry to subsidize in some way that historic site commemorating the coming there of a great statesman, Conservative, Liberal or of any other political affiliation.

Mr. Speaker, Sir Wilfrid Laurier was a man whose merit was recognized by everybody. My fellow citizens are pleased to recognize it also. We would be glad if the Historic Sites and Monuments Board would recognize it and do its utmost to undertake such restoration and to co-operate with the citizens of Arthabaska so that Sir Wilfrid Laurier's residence in Arthabaska may become an agreeable place to visit to commemorate events of the past.

I would not want to keep the house any longer. However, I would like the minister to take under serious consideration this request that I am making in the name of the people I represent. I ask him to give it special attention in order to come to their help.

Finally, I would like to remind him that the electoral district of Lotbinière has received no subsidy whatever during centennial year, and I suggest that the time has come to make up for lost time and, in this way, to give to the town of Arthabaska the importance it deserves, that is to commemorate the fact that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has lived there.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

## AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

## CRIMINAL CODE

### AMENDMENT RESPECTING PLACING OF BETS BY ONE PERSON FOR ANOTHER

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council), for the Minister of Justice,** moved that Bill C-197, to amend the Criminal Code, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions about this bill and I believe there is general agreement in the house to give the bill second reading without debate and refer it to the committee. This measure deals with the off-track betting problem that has been so much before the attorneys-general of the provinces in recent days.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** It that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

## CANADA SHIPPING ACT

AMENDMENTS DEFINING "AIR CUSHION VEHICLE" AND CLARIFYING OTHER PROVISIONS

The house resumed, from Tuesday, April 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Richardson that Bill S-23, to amend the Canada Shipping Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, Bill S-23, entitled "an Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act" was passed on March 20 by the other place. For reasons which I find questionable, the Senate places before us a bill dealing with something that does not exist any more in Canada, namely the Canadian Merchant Marine.

At the outset of the bill, section 1 deals with air cushion vehicles and I quote:

"air cushion vehicle" means a machine designed to derive support in the atmosphere primarily from reactions against the earth's surface of air expelled from the machine;"

The air cushion vehicle is called aéroglisseur in French, from the verb glisser, to glide. According to various dictionaries, gliding, skating, are related to playing, to fun and games. I imagine that it is in that perspective that the other place sent us this famous bill since there are in Canada, at the present time, but two air cushion vehicles, one in Montreal and the other in the Vancouver area.

In 1964, our country had but three units and among them there was an old cargo that was built during the second world war. There was also a tanker, where work was provided for less than 100 persons.





Bill S-23 contains 28 sections dealing with amendments, regulations and 15 and 18-foot boats. On the other hand, I did not find anything that would revive our sea-going fleet.

All countries in the world, even those who have a smaller coast-line than Canada, take pride in building and launching sea-going cargoes.

Niger, for instance, is a small country, considered by the Canadian government as an underdeveloped country, a country to which we grant loans without interest, subsidies. Yet, that country has ships navigating on our waters and carrying our own goods.

And that is not the only case. Numerous ships fly flags of all the countries in the world. All their crews were hired in their own country, which explains why so many unemployed people in Canada are disgusted at seeing so many foreigners earn a living in Canadian waters by carrying Canadian goods. Canada has 59,670 miles of sea-coast, almost three times the length of the Equator, the longest coast-line in the world. This country has nevertheless succeeded in creating unemployment and poverty in a sector territory once so properous.

We have huge cargoes of oil, grain, paper, wood, minerals, asbestos, stone, granite and other goods to move to the great world markets. Few countries have a more direct interest in shipping than Canada, since nearly 17 per cent of our gross national product is exported.

From 1957 to 1962, our exports represented 5 per cent of all world exports. If we leave out the world oil trade, and if we take into account the fact that solid cargoes moved by sea by Canada totalled 10 per cent in 1961, it is obvious that exports and the transportation of exported goods should be linked together and that the opposite situation, as a whole, will give birth to an economic crisis more or less dangerous and more or less serious.

Mr. Speaker, the variety and the quality of maritime transportation and the control of maritime rates are essential elements of a Canadian trade policy. Having a merchant fleet is indispensable to the establishment of new markets and could well be the decisive factor in maintaining those already existing.

Since the involvement of our country in the field of maritime transportation is almost nil, this situation cannot last without being detrimental to our commercial position in the world. This suggestion is most ridiculous

if we consider that, during the years 1875-80, our country was fourth among the shipping powers. As a shipbuilding nation during the last world war, our country was third, immediately after the United States and Great Britain.

Today, Canada ranks not only last but lags far behind a number of countries admittedly disadvantaged and underdeveloped.

Canada, who has won the war, has allowed herself to be outstripped by countries ravaged by war. The first place, in shipbuilding, belongs to Japan. That country is followed by Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, France, Italy and Poland.

As we know, Poland is a very small country—little Poland as it were—about a quarter the size of the province of Quebec. The population of this war-torn country numbered only 30 million people in 1964. Devastated Poland has built up again its economy after the war and in shipbuilding it now holds the seventh place in the world for ordinary ships and the second for fishing boats.

Canada, which was third during the war, is no longer aware of its present rank, since it has dropped so far behind.

• (8:10 p.m.)

And we hear the most amazing answers. As for shipbuilding, it is out of the question; we are quite content just to lend our experts abroad.

And here, I refer to an article published in the paper *Montreal-Matin* on Tuesday, April 15, and I quote:

Our experts invade Jamaica.

The director of the port of Montreal, Mr. Guy Beaudet, disclosed at a press conference held yesterday at the information bureau of the Expo, the conclusions of a three-week trip to Jamaica jointly with several Canadian experts.

Mr. Beaudet went there at the request of the government of Jamaica to make a survey of deep-sea and coastal means of transportation. The Canadian government, under its aid program, through the Canadian International Development Agency, recently granted a loan to Jamaica.

The director of the port of Montreal then dealt with the problems closely related to shipping in Montreal harbour. Mr. Beaudet pointed out that naval traffic would be increased by 12 per cent over the year 1968.

But what good is an increase in traffic? What an honour, indeed! It is not profitable, but the traffic increases. It reminds me of this old peddler who was selling clay pipes in the back country; he bought and sold them for the same price. He used to say that what gave him a break was that once in a while he bust one of them.



As for us, we have built the Seaway, and all it brings us is a little more traffic.

Mr. Speaker, while other countries are expanding and modernizing their shipyards, we in Canada are satisfied with repairs. Some of them might have been financially worthwhile as, for instance, the repairs to the aircraft carrier *Bonaventure*. But all repair jobs are not as big as that particular one.

As for ship-building, never mind that. We have seen the closing down of shipyards like the one at Lauzon; we have heard about discussions concerning the closing of the Canadian Vickers shipyard in Montreal, and when we ask the government to do something about that, the answer is that we are going through a crisis and that we do not have any money.

On May 13, 1968, a year ago, a Montreal shipowner declared, and I quote:

Foreign shipowners are said to have received $50 million from Ottawa in subsidies.

The Canadian government has helped foreign shipping companies, engaged in coastal trade, to the tune of some 50 million dollars over the last three years, which was detrimental to Canadian interests, according to the declaration made on Monday by Mr. Phrixos B. Papachristidis, well-known Montreal shipowner.

In his brief on shipping submitted to the Canadian Transportation Commission, Mr. Papachristidis maintains that since 1965, foreign shipping companies "enjoyed or are about to enjoy, for their lake fleets only, direct subsidies of about $20 million, while Ottawa extols spending restrictions—

Mr. Speaker, while such presents are made to foreigners, we are witnessing other meetings which are less generous for Canadians. I have before me a release from the representatives of the C.N.T.U. whom I consider somewhat as the moral heirs of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand).

According to their report dated May 16, members of the executive of the union, accompanied by officials of the Fédération de la Métallurgie, des Mines et des Produits chimiques, met the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in Ottawa on May 9. This interview had been requested on February 18, at the time the C.N.T.U. executive met the federal government. The minister then confirmed that the government had been informed by the company of its intention to give up shipbuilding. He said the government could not compel the company to build ships against its own will. He mentioned the possibility of awarding contracts for ship repairs,

explaining that it would not solve the problem.

He finally advised the delegation to communicate with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin).

In the same release, we find the following:

Since October last, 1,100 employees, almost all of them skilled workers, have been laid off. There remain only 400 workmen now assigned mostly to finishing two ships. That job will be completed by the end of June and no other start is foreseen at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, the shipyards of the Canadian Vickers rank second as to size in Canada and are among the best for the quality and the variety of the works they have achieved. They are the oldest modern Canadian shipyards, since they have built the first metal ships in 1910 and have managed to specialize in quite complex structures.

It is also important to point out that the Canadian Vickers shipyards are the only ones in Canada with building sheds where the work can go on in practically the same conditions as in the European shipyards which do not have to cope with a climate as harsh as ours.

In all technical publications on shipbuilding, it is often said that construction in building sheds is extremely advantageous. Highly complicated warships were built by Canadian Vickers, such as corvettes including the St. Lawrence corvette—great cargo ships for Colombia and Venezuela, lakers, the most modern ice-breakers, like the one built last year, and dredgers.

This diversification of labour enables the Canadian Vickers to undertake almost any kind of modern construction in conditions similar to those of any shipyard in the world, including those of Scandinavian countries.

Mr. Speaker, we remember that in a move beneficial to ships carrying the British ensign some Canadian boats were sold for peanuts to some individuals like Mr. Onassis who very quickly became millionaires and this while the Canadian government was applying a hand-out policy for shipyards, in order to let them make both ends meet and to ensure the construction of small warships or a few ice-breakers. Unfortunately, the decisions are always taken by a mere handful of politicians, while the directors and workers of those shipyards are left completely in the dark.

Mr. Speaker, I gave figures at the beginning of my remarks concerning the international position of Canada in the shipbuilding industry. Let me quote a few other figures regarding our rank as owners of ships. The data come from a brief submitted by the C.N.T.U.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I am sorry I have to interrupt the hon. member, and although in view of the present situation at the Canadian Vickers, hon. members can be easily tempted to talk about the shipping policy. I believe the bill we are considering right now does not concern any shipping company of Canada, nor the closing or opening of shipyards. I therefore ask the hon. member to confine himself to the bill before us.

• (8:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Godin:** Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by quoting a very relevant summary, because I wonder, if we fail to take the opportunity provided by this bill, when shall we be able to discuss Canada's merchant marine? It is a distasteful subject, but at any rate, I shall take the liberty of quoting very briefly:

What the federal government must do.

It is a suggestion of the C.N.T.U.

Build a Canadian ocean-going merchant fleet capable of moving a minimum of 40 to 50 per cent of exports and imports.

Increase the subsidies for the construction of ships built in Canada in order to prompt Canadian shippers to order new ships at prices comparable to those which they could obtain in the United Kingdom.

Pass a legislation favourable in a practical way to shippers, seamen, workers in Canadian shipyards, as well as to all industries supplying materials and equipment. Encourage the replacement of obsolete ships with fast cargo ships capable of meeting foreign competition.

Revise the Merchant Marine Act of 1934 in order to take into account present day conditions of water transport.

Denounce the Merchant Marine Commonwealth Convention of 1931 and abolish the extraordinary privileges granted to those countries in order to protect our shipowners against the competition of ships registered in Commonwealth countries.

Levy a 50 per cent tax on repairs to or purchases of ocean-going vessels or equipment in foreign countries, except in cases of emergency.

Close our coastal and inland waters to all but those vessels that are registered and have been built in Canada and to all but those firms that are truly Canadian.

We ask for the immediate construction of a powerful ocean-going merchant fleet, built by and for Canadians, to transport at least part of Canada's export trade.

In concluding, I repeat that I cannot see how an important part of our exports could be carried in the ships mentioned in Bill S-23, since those are boats 15 to 18 feet long.

[*English*]

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** This bill brings together a mixed bag of amendments to the Canada Shipping Act. Many of them are technical and many are just housekeeping amendments. I am interested in two major areas, the regulations concerning pollution from ships and the extension of the Provisions of the act to cover hovercraft. It is not my purpose to speak at great length. I think the bill should perhaps go to the committee for further study.

When the then Minister of Transport introduced this bill approximately a month ago, he admitted it was a housekeeping bill. He promised a complete revision and some major recommendations later. He did not say when these would be made, nevertheless we look forward to them. Many subjects in the bill require comment, such as the reaffirmation of the validity of certain pilotage by-laws. This bill will permit certain pilotage authority by-laws without reference to the governor-in-council. I think this is sensible. This bill implements some of the load line conventions of 1966 governing the maximum, cargoes for ships. Since the load line regulation concerns itself with the safety of the men so employed, it is an important portion of the bill.

Clauses 3 and 4 of the bill deal with the eligibility of applicants for certificates as masters, mates and engineers, provide for the inclusion of landed immigrants. The Canadian Merchant Service Guild is obviously very concerned about this. I wish to quote a resolution passed at their last convention which is contained in their newsletter:

> Be it resolved that the Canadian Merchant Service Guild strongly protest any move on the part of the Immigration Department or the federal government to open the examinations for certificates of competency for masters, mates or engineers to persons who are landed immigrants.

This resolution has particular reference to clauses 3 and 4 of Bill S-23. From this we can see there is some controversy with respect to extending this provision beyond British subjects. I am concerned about the almost general policy in Canada of importing skilled labour. We tend to import doctors, teachers and various technical personnel rather than training our own. This was confirmed by John Porter in his famous book "The Vertical Mosaic". He said that traditionally we have tended to import our skills, just as we have imported our capital, mainly because we have failed to develop sufficient training institutions in our country.



This is a particularly important section of the bill, although I do not believe we should be parochial. We should be concerned with the welcoming of immigrants to Canada. We want people to be Canadians and we welcome them on those grounds. At the same time, when people with special skills are brought in to compete with an over-supply of personnel, it must not be only the landed immigrant who has an opportunity for employment but also the Canadian citizen. When this bill is considered in committee, possibly this eligibility provision might have to be amended so that, the landed immigrant who is competent to fill this role will have to have his citizenship before he becomes eligible. This would probably satisfy the Canadian Merchant Service Guild.

I am concerned about this whole trend. There has been a great deal of concern expressed in recent months regarding university teaching jobs in Canada being made available to citizens from other countries. I will not elaborate further on that point.

There are other interesting items in this bill, some perhaps quite humorous. The bill contains certain set provisions for the protection of seamen which I consider to be archaic. I was very interested to read in section 272 that it is no longer necessary for a keeper of a tavern or house of ill-fame to report to a justice of the peace the names of all lodgers on the pain of a $50 fine. This is part of the archaic regulations that are to be dispensed with, and none too soon. Clauses 10 and 12, dealing with requirements for radio installations on ships, are sensible, as are the increased powers to investigate accidents on ships outlined in clause 25.

• (8:30 p.m.)

However, there is one matter of concern that I would like to mention at this time. It is that at present shipping does not come under the federal safety code. I think it is important that the federal safety code should apply to shipping, or at least that the Department of Transport should introduce a new safety code that would apply to those agencies coming under that department. This is something we will discuss in some detail at the committee stage, but certainly the provision for regulations respecting reporting of shipping casualties is an improvement.

I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that I was going to speak for a moment about the problem of pollution as it relates to ships. All of us are well aware of the *Torrey Canyon* incident, which may have stimulated the drafting of the pollution portion of this bill. Clause 23 is intended to extend the Governor in Council's power to make regulations governing pollution from ships. At present the Governor in Council is only able to regulate pollution from oil in inland waters. This clause would give power to regulate pollution from all substances, such as garbage, chemicals and sewage, in all Canadian waters, and this is a step in the right direction.

Clause 24 proposes to add new sections 495C and 495D to the present act. This concerns the unlimited liability of ships causing pollution. It is interesting to note that proposed new section 495D was struck from the bill before passage by the other place.

Proposed new section 495C would give the minister power to deal with a vessel that is in distress and is likely to pollute Canadian waters. The minister would have power to sell that vessel, and the proceeds from its sale and of its cargo would go towards meeting the expenses incurred. If the value of the ship plus its cargo did not happen to be enough to pay for the damage, then the proposed new section 495D, would apply. Section 495D was dropped by the Senate because it proposed unlimited liability and it was felt excessive costs would be involved in insuring the vessel.

If the charges arising out of pollution claim against a particular vessel were much greater than the value of the ship and its cargo, it would be impossible to insure the ship. For that reason the proposed new section was dropped, but if this is the case then I would like to ask who is going to pay the cost of the pollution damage, caused by that vessel? I submit that the cost will be borne by the same people who bear many of the costs against which there is no protection, that is the general public.

While proposed new section 495D has been dropped, and I think with good reason, I believe some other form of protection should be contemplated so as to avoid putting the cost on the public. Whether a ship causing pollution should have limited liability or unlimited liability is an open question. A shipowner may normally apply to a court, after being found liable for some damage, to limit his liability. I think the total liability would be based on the tonnage of his ship. It was argued by insurance companies and others that a ship with unlimited liability would be uninsurable, but in this situation I repeat the question, who pays the cost?

This problem was argued in the Transport and Communications Committee of the other place, as recorded at page 61 of report No. 6, and I quote:

> Mr. Shearer, sir, goes on to say in his statement that if unlimited liability were imposed on the shipowner by such legislation, it would be uninsurable. The position, as far as our group is concerned, would be that the shipowner would be uninsured as in respect of liabilities in excess of the amount to which the group and its re-insurers could provide insurance coverage. That figure may be between $10 to $15 million—somewhere in that region—but in excess of that figure a shipowner would not be insured; and your bill as it stands places upon the shipowner unlimited liability.

I think the public has to be protected as well as the shipowner, and we should look for some alternative at committee stage.

The minister suggested that this was not a complete revision of the act and that there would be major revisions later. I think some interim measures should be proposed by the mover of this bill to suggest to the house how the public might be protected in the meantime. We note that hovercraft, which have been subject to the Aeronautics Act, will now come under the Canada Shipping Act. This itself is just an interim measure, and when we come to more detailed legislation we might consider the matter of noise pollution caused by hovercraft. Any of us who were at Expo know that a great deal of noise pollution emanates from hovercraft.

We are also concerned a little bit with what the bill does not say. The Canada Shipping Act administers navigable waters but does not define what is meant by that term. In this respect I quote from page 215 of the proceedings before our Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, volume No. 12, as follows:

> Mr. Nesbitt: One further question, and this is all I have to ask. The definition of navigable waters is somewhat enlarged for the purposes of this act. Navigable water under, say, the Canada Shipping Act has a different interpretation. Would you get a conflict between the two acts this way?
>
> Mr. Fortier: I do not believe there is any definition of navigable waters in the Canada Shipping Act. There is a reference to ships and how they must be navigated, operated and inspected, but there is nothing that touches this particular item.

In this legislation we deal with the erosion of banks, yet there is nothing in the act that defines what is meant by navigable waters. So, when we are discussing the pollution

provisions in the bill we shall have to consider them with respect to the Great Lakes since jurisdiction over them falls under both Canadian and United States authorities.

There is just one other item I wish to allude to briefly, Mr. Speaker, and that is the recent tragedy concerning the sinking of the *Emerald Straits*, a steel-hulled tug, lost off Vancouver Island. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) has promised a complete investigation into this particular tragedy, but according to investigations carried on over a considerable length of time we find that in a period of nine years 24 of these steel-hulled vessels have been sunk. Some of them have sunk in as little as 13 seconds, and the loss of life involved has been approximately triple the loss of life experienced in similar accidents involving wooden-hulled vessels.

• (8:40 p.m.)

As the minister indicated earlier an investigation is being carried out by a board of review. The *Emerald Straits* is to be raised. However, I should like to leave the suggestion that perhaps in the further amendments to the Canada Shipping Act some regulations could be introduced in respect of improved construction of steel-hulled vessels so that tragedies of this type might be avoided. I would hope that if such amendments are not made that certainly the minister would articulate regulations covering this aspect because he has the power to do so.

That is all I have to say about this particular bill this evening. I hope I have indicated there is concern by members of this party about some of the matters covered by the act. I hope we will have an opportunity to go into these things in greater detail when the bill is finally before the Transport Committee for consideration.

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to look at this bill. The terms are pretty good. It is a bill of what one might call the housekeeping variety. So far as I and the group I represent in this house are concerned we are pretty much in accord with the bill. There are, however, some minor details with which we should like to deal when the bill reaches the committee. We shall do so at that time. There would appear to be some errors of omission in respect of this bill because there are some things which I think the minister could have presented as amendments to the Canada Shipping Act.

[Mr. Rose.]

For a long time now there has been a considerable amount of difficulty on that section of the Great Lakes under Canadian jurisdiction as well as on other waters which come under the jurisdiction of the Canada Shipping Act. During the last few years in the summer months there has been a great increase in the number of pleasure boats, be they small cruisers, sail boats or others.

In all the minor waters of Canada, as they are referred to in the act, the number of boats has increased greatly. On Lake Erie alone, at a place called Port Rowan, there are as many as 5,000 boats in the area. During the summer months when a great many people are out in these boats there are a number of accidents and a consequent loss of life. This is of considerable concern, as is the loss of life on the highways. Generally speaking the highway problem comes under provincial jurisdiction but under the Canada Shipping Act the Department of Transport has taken unto itself control over the minor waters of Canada. This has a direct relationship to the matters we are discussing here.

For the number of years I have been in this house I have continually mentioned this matter. I have requested that the department take a greater degree of responsibility for safety on the Great Lakes and on the inland waters of Canada during the summer months. I am rather gratified to say that over the years a number of amendments have been made to the Canada Shipping Act with regard to certain safety regulations and other related things. I have a suggestion I should like to make and I hope that when this bill goes to the committee consideration may be given to it.

During the summer months, particularly in the province of Ontario but I suspect to a lesser but very considerable degree in the provinces of Quebec, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia, the question of pleasure boats and the use thereof is of major concern. Over the years the Department of Transport and the respective ministers have made recommendations for changes to the act which certainly have provided a number of important safety features. These have involved such things as the use of life jackets and the provision of booklets on how boats should be operated on these inland waters in order to prevent accidents.

All these changes have been very helpful but one major problem still remains. In summer resort areas, which very often are areas not heavily populated on a year around basis

but which have a temporary population in the summer months, when an accident takes place there is the problem of how to get in touch with the authorities who can help save lives. In respect of water accidents, as is said, time is of the essence. Over the years we have heard the excuse given by the officials of the Department of Transport that all one need do is phone the R.C.A.F. Trenton, the provincial police or somebody else. The average person, however, does not know about this. If an accident should take place in a major city like the great city of Toronto or some other similar place, there is no problem in getting in touch with someone who is responsible. The situation is quite different, however, in some of the small summer resorts where there is perhaps only one policeman or none at all and the people do not know who to contact if a boat should upset or catch fire or if some other accident should occur. Nobody knows what to do. It might be helpful if people knew they could contact such organizations as the provincial police or perhaps the search and rescue unit at Trenton.

I had hoped, when these amendments were presented, something would be done to provide a remedy for this situation. I hope when the bill reaches the committee a recommendation similar to the one which I shall propose might be considered. One of the suggestions I would propose is one I have made before on a number of occasions. This involves the employment of university students. Goodness knows at the present time university students are in need of jobs to help them continue with their education. During the summer months, from the middle of June to the middle of September, university students might be given jobs at these summer resort areas. After a brief period of training the students could be appointed to be at the water areas of the summer resorts at all times so that if anything should happen they would know who to call on for help. The volunteer power boat squadrons do a wonderful job in this regard. The student would be able to contact this squadron, the provincial police, the R.C.M.P. or some other authority.

In addition, perhaps the student could help enforce the existing regulations under the Canada Shipping Act. At the present time much of this work is left to the R.C.M.P. The R.C.M.P. has a great many other duties, and I think perhaps more important duties to perform. This would seem to be the type of operation a student appointee could carry out during the summer months. He could see that the safety regulations are being observed and perhaps could be given authority to help enforce some of these regulations, particularly in heavily populated areas where boats are operated often at excessive speeds. There would appear to be little control over the speed of boats in harbours and waters where people are swimming or operating canoes and sailboats.

• (8:50 p.m.)

I am sorry to say that we do have young people who have little regard for the safety of others, who are out to show off, zipping up and down in high-speed power boats. This is very dangerous. I think this is a matter that could very well be regulated by the government. Without elaborating further, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the details could be worked out.

I think the general principle should be this. In areas of Canada with inland waters where there are large summer populations, many of whom have boats, a number of students could be employed in a safety program. These would be seasonal jobs. Our university students need jobs, particularly this year when there is a cutting down of the employment of students. Lengthy training would not be needed for such a program; several days would be quite adequate. There would be plenty of time to do it, because the holiday season has not yet started. I hope the government will pay some attention to this proposal.

I think these people should be given jurisdiction in certain areas—some places, of course, would require more supervision than others—to act as contacts in case of an accident. They would be able to get in touch with existing agencies such as the R.C.A.F., provincial police, power squadrons and the like. At the same time they could check privately owned boats in the area and make sure that existing regulations under the Canada Shipping Act were enforced. I think this is very important.

We have had this year a great deal of trouble finding employment for our students during the summer months. They need the money. Under such a program they would be performing a very useful function. I hope the government will consider this proposal. When the bill goes to the transport committee, as it will very shortly, I hope the government, if it does not move amendments itself, will accept amendments in this regard.

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to follow up some of the problems posed by my colleague the

hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) with regard to the matter of insurance and unlimited liability. I assume that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) is piloting this bill through the house in the absence of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), in whose name the bill is on the order paper.

If the provisions of the Canada Shipping Act concerning unlimited liability are being lifted, it seems to me that the insurance provisions regarding limited liability will need very high ceilings. To realize this one has only to consider the experience in Great Britain and the multi-millions it has cost the government of that country, as well as the experience off the coast of California and the multi-millions it has cost that state and the federal government.

We have only to consider what would happen if a super-tanker broke up in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. If the Minister of Fisheries thinks he now has trouble in the maritimes with regard to fisheries, I ask him to imagine the trouble that would be caused in an inland water such as the Gulf of St. Lawrence if a super-tanker were to break up.

I think all members of the house would be interested in hearing from the minister what the government has in mind regarding insurance coverage for shipping of the super-tanker category with a cargo-carrying capacity of 150,000 or 200,000 tons that arrives at salt water ports in Canada. One can imagine what would happen at the new super port of Roberts Bank, British Columbia, if one of these vessels were to meet with a catastrophe.

We are dealing with the question of unlimited liability, and let me give this example. I drive my car, which carries something approaching $250,000 public liability insurance. But you and I, Mr. Speaker, both know that there is something a great deal more valuable than the car, namely myself. I am a little leery about legal limitations placed upon insurance liability which use as a criteria the value of the carrier and its cargo. If unlimited liability insurance is not to be imposed, surely the limits of liability will need to be very high. This is surely an area wherein government foresight can provide for any unexpected circumstances that may arise.

I invite the minister to tell us what the government has in mind regarding insurance, particularly in respect of super-tankers and vessels carrying cargoes that are of a pollutant nature. This is surely not something in respect of which we can just wait until an accident happens. The very nature of some of our salt-water ports in Canada, some of which are a great distance inland, requires some sort of extra precaution.

I also suggest to the minister—he may be able to inform us on this—that there is validity in government participation in marine insurance with shipping companies, international insurance companies and carriers of deep sea cargoes, particularly in respect of massive vessels, to assist in the enlarging of so-called limited liability.

We would be very interested in hearing from the minister what kind of research and investigation has gone into this matter, particularly in light of the unfortunate experience in two other countries. Surely, in light of the kind of facilities we envisage building, and in light of the inland shipping waterways which undoubtedly 10 or 20 years from now will be enlarged to handle ever larger vessels which will carry cargoes of a pollutant nature, we require of the government enough foresight to make regulations and laws that do not just throw out this unlimited liability business, forgetting the kind of liability these carriers of cargo have to the public.

It is not sufficient to wait until an incident happens and then rely on the public purse to pay for all the damages. I invite the minister to let us know now what proposals he or the Minister of Transport have in connection with insurance for the new and enlarged kind of cargo-carrying vessels we have now and will have to a larger degree in the future.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.



## FISHERIES IMPROVEMENT LOANS ACT

AMENDMENT TO INCREASE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF LOAN

**Hon. Jack Davis (for the Minister of Finance)** moved that Bill C-195, to amend the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

**Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview):** Mr. Speaker, before this bill passes I am sure the minister wants to make some comments. I would gladly yield the floor to the minister in order that he may make those comments.

**Mr. Davis:** Mr. Speaker, I will explain this bill very briefly. It involves several amendments to the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act. The principal amendment is one that would raise the ceiling of an individual

loan from $10,000 to $25,000. The expiry date of the act is extended by one year to June 30, 1971, and the third provision increases the fund which the government holds to guarantee these loans. The fund for the new period is established for $10 million in respect of chartered banks and for $10 million in respect of other lenders. Those are the principal changes.

• (9:00 p.m.)

The most important recommendation, that of raising the ceiling to $25,000, was made as a result of submissions directed to the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry, and to the federal government by the provincial ministers of fisheries to the effect that the optimum size of fishing boats and of fishing gear today involves costs well in excess of $10,000, and sometimes in excess of $25,000. These are the main reasons for the changes.

**Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West):** I did not intend to speak on this bill this evening because I thought that the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), who wanted to speak on it, would be here to do so. But unfortunately the Committee on Fisheries and Forestry is meeting this evening and, in fact, I am rather surprised that the minister is not present at the meeting. I know that the hon. member for Skeena wanted to raise a number of points, but perhaps I can raise them briefly since he is not here to speak on the bill.

Certainly when the Committee on Fisheries and Forestry visited the west coast, its members heard many representations to support the idea of raising the loan limit from $10,000 to $25,000. In fact, there were suggestions that it might be raised even higher. There are a couple of problems associated with this because, in spite of the fact that the loan provisions have been raised from $10,000 to $25,000, the fishermen are finding extreme difficulty in receiving any kind of service through the lending agencies as a result of the particular conditions specified in the Fishery Improvement Loan Act.

It is all very well to raise the loan limit from $10,000 to $25,000. However, if you cannot borrow money from the lending agencies because the interest rate is not sufficiently attractive, then it seems to me that this act tends to be mere window dressing. It is all very well to have this figure established for a loan and it looks great, but if you cannot borrow that money what is the good of it? The problem is further complicated by the fact that many of the vessels in British Columbia are under the control of the fishing companies, that is the fishing companies have advanced loans to fishermen to finance these vessels. As a result, the fishermen are required to deliver their catch to a particular fishing company. Since the situation in B.C. is such that we have really only two large fishing companies left, the problem is even further intensified. There is a great fear among the fishermen that vertical integration will take place and perhaps in future there will only be one agency through which they may be able to market their fish. They are concerned, when this situation prevails, about their position with regard to marketing and the position which they may be forced to take with regard to prices.

Many of the boats—by the fishing industry's own count 2,094—are controlled by the fishing companies. The fishing companies have advanced loans in order to finance these boats. In some cases the boats are owned outright by the fishing companies and leased to the fishermen or the fishing companies have financed them. Since such is the situation, many of the fishermen are concerned about the fact that they are too closely connected with the companies and that they are indebted to them. They would like to be free of this particular obligation, and one way of freeing them is to allow the fisheries improvement loan to be granted not only for the financing of vessels but also for the refinancing of vessels. If the fishery improvement loan could be used to refinance through a disinterested source the vessel of a fisherman who has a loan with a fishing company, then he would have less obligation to that particular fishing company.

The minister explained in the committee today that for various reasons, because of regulations either of the Treasury Board or of the Department of Finance I have forgotten at the moment which, the refinancing of vessels was impossible and was not government policy. However, I really feel that not enough effort and thought have gone into exploring whether or not that would be possible in a situation such as I have described. It seems to me that if the fishery improvement loan is not available through the lending organizations for refinancing it has very limited use, and since it has a very limited use one or two things could happen. Perhaps there could be a provision, such as exists in

the regulations of C.M.H.C., enabling the government to make direct loans for the financing and refinancing of vessels. The minister hinted today that such direct loans were possible for the building of new vessels. It seems to me that such a provision might be extremely useful for refinancing vessels, if we are sincere, as the minister himself said speaking recently at U.B.C., when we say that we really do not want company domination of the fishing industry. The minister stated—and I hope I do not imply anything that he did not mean—that he would have no objection if the companies remained in control of the processing part of the operation and the fishermen were responsible for the fishing. This is one possibility, that direct loans may be granted to the fishermen not only for the building of new boats but for the financing and refinancing of existing boats so that they can get out from under what they consider to be unfair domination and company control.

The other possibility is that in order to overcome the limitations of the particular interest rates which the lending institutions do not find attractive enough at which to lend money for this purpose, it would not seem beyond the realms of possibility for the federal government to deposit funds in various banks, credit unions and other lending agencies concerned with this industry and earmark them for a specific purpose at the interest rate outlined in the bill.

There are probably a number of other items that could be brought up tonight in this debate. I am sorry that my colleague, the hon. member for Skeena, is not here to bring these matters forward. However, I think the two items I mentioned are perhaps the most pressing ones to be discussed at this time, so I will not speak on this matter any further.

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, I regret that it was not possible for me to be here when the minister made his statement on Bill C-195 but, as he is aware, the Committee on Fisheries and Forestry is sitting at this moment. Therefore, I apologize to him for my inability to be present when he introduced the bill.

It is a pleasure to express the approval of my party of Bill C-195. We are pleased to see the introduction of the most important clause of the bill raising the ceiling on loans to $25,000 because this means that the amendment which we proposed to Bill C-151 in the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry on February 6 will now become law. At the same time we regret that the government has taken as long as it has to bring this matter before the house. The need for raising the ceiling on loans has been apparent for some-time and was well known, at least to the opposition, at the time when the earlier amendments to the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act in Bill C-151 were given first reading on December 20 of last year. The amendments which are now before us, Mr. Speaker should have been introduced at that time. The need was known. The opportunity to change the bill was there. Why were these provisions not included?

• (9:10 p.m.)

The earlier bill was introduced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). Was the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) not consulted to see whether other amendments should have been introduced at the same time? It is easy to suspect that the officials of the Finance Department, whose knowledge of the problems of fishermen is probably minimal, were so concerned with allowing interest rates on loans under this act to jump from 5 per cent to the going market rate that they completely disregarded whether or not the loans actually met the needs parliament intended them to meet.

Then, in February, we saw the minister's well meaning but rather awkward attempts to retrieve his earlier fumble. In fact, clause one of the bill now before us is word for word the amendment the minister tried unsuccessfully to introduce in committee three months ago. Two fumbles and three months later we have this measure before us.

The government house leader is constantly harping about legislative schedules. The cabinet uses the time required for measures to be debated in the house as an excuse, though a feeble one, for its procrastination on matters of bread and butter importance to the people of Canada. Yet here we have an example of the government itself wasting the time of this house by introducing two measures where one would have been sufficient. The minister must be a frustrating skipper, for we find him here tacking back and forth over the same waters. We hope he will see the way clear soon to piloting our way on the longer and harder courses we all know we will have to take to establish a more thriving and a healthier fishing industry.

The effects of the minister's actions in having to go through the unnecessary ritual of amending the same statute twice in a session reach beyond parliament. The minister had told us that it is principally fishermen from his own province who use the loans provided

under this act. I ask him how many of his people took out loans under the old maximum, not because these loans met their needs but because they were limited by statute to the smaller amount? How many men in British Columbia are fishing this summer with less adequate equipment than they might have owned had they been able to get more extensive credit in the first three months since February 27, when today's amendments would have received Royal Assent, had Bill C-151 included the amendments we are now considering?

I should like to now turn my attention to the factors which have forced the government to raise the ceiling on the loans it will guarantee. We all know the fundamental reason—inflation. Since 1960 prices have increased by 23 points. This is a crippling rate of price increase, and is especially so to those fishermen caught in the squeeze between higher cost equipment, higher cost money, and lower priced products. What is particularly striking, too, is the fact that 20 points of the 23 point increase have come into effect since this government took power. And more relevant to this measure, an increase of a full 15 points has taken effect since the ceiling on loans under this bill was introduced in 1965. Much of the necessity for this rise in the amounts the government will guarantee flows directly from the inadequate and ineffective action this government has taken with regard to inflation. Hiding behind the comparisons the Minister of Finance makes with other countries, hiding behind studies, hiding behind the platitudes and bleating of white papers, this government has done nothing effective to stem galloping price rises.

Having pointed out that the recent bad record of the government in controlling inflation will to a considerable degree eat away the increases we are being asked to authorize, it is only fair to say that the balance of the increases will be welcomed by fishermen wanting to raise the standards of their equipment.

We are all familiar with the changes and modernization which are going on in our fishing industry. On February 6 officials of the department provided the committee with extensive tables outlining current capital costs which fishermen must incur in order to establish themselves. And fishermen already in business are faced with ever increasing demands on their capital funds in order to modernize as quickly as they must.

In this house and in committee, I outlined the magnitude of the problems faced by east coast fishermen moving into the offshore fisheries. A new vessel of up to 45 feet in length costs at least $1,000 per foot; for vessels of greater length the per foot cost can escalate rapidly as the need for sophisticated electronic gear increases.

And where do these factors leave the proposal of the minister to increase the ceiling to $25,000? Since February, when I proposed a ceiling of $25,000, I have come to believe that these loans will be of less value than we would like to think they will be to the man wanting to become a fully equipped and competitive fisherman. When we are in committee I propose we study the possibility of raising the ceiling on the amount the government will guarantee to a more realistic level, perhaps in the order of $50,000. I believe that the minister himself, judging by his statements in the committee today, is aware that the source of funds presently available to our fishermen for modernization and expansion is inadequate and that the high cost of modern equipment means that some alternative source such as direct federal loans must be made available if fishermen are to expand in this important primary industry.

I have one regret with regard to this bill. On February 6, one of the amendments I suggested was that loans be repayable in full in not more than 15 years. The minister concurred with our proposal that the ceiling on loans be raised; I am sorry he was unable to see his way clear to lengthening the repayment term as well.

I can see no reason for objecting to this modest proposal. The minister himself drew attention to the exemplary record of fishermen in repaying loans made to them under this act. My suggestion involved no actual or potential expenditure of government funds except in cases of the occasional default in repayment. As we know, such cases are very rare; it is quite exceptional for the government to be called upon to repay any of these debts owed by fishermen. The lengthening of the repayment term would in no way prevent fishermen repaying their loans in a shorter period than the proposed maximum of 15 years.

• (9:20 p.m.)

In addition, I feel there are several factors pointing to the need for a longer term of repayment. The returns from fishing, as we all know, vary from season to season. Allowing the longer term for repayment would give fishermen the margin of flexibility to enable

them to pay off loans with less risk of being caught by a few seasons of lower income.

In addition to the variations in catch caused by nature we have other threats today to the income of fishermen. Unsettled markets are not a new problem, but the fact that the problem is old in no way diminishes its seriousness. As we have seen in Newfoundland, we must now face the man-made problem of pollution which is ruining the fishing grounds and the incomes of the fishermen who use them.

In this regard I am very much concerned over the proposals that have been made by the federal Department of Fisheries to assist these fishermen. It is my understanding that an arrangement has been made whereby loans will be granted to aid those fishermen whose livelihood has been taken away from them.

If, Mr. Speaker, you should drive your car into the rear end of another automobile and thereby do it damage, the man whose car you damage would not ask you to lend him the money to fix his automobile; he would ask you to repay him for the damage which you caused. In this instance pollution caused by man—by a company, according to the minister's statement—has been responsible for some time for destroying the income of more than 400 fishermen in Newfoundland. Therefore, I urge the minister carefully to consider the program which was originally initiated as a means of providing support to these people who, through no fault of their own, now find their livelihood taken away from them.

I bring these matters to your attention, Mr. Speaker, to underline the need for an extension of the period within which loans may be repaid. To have a series of poor catches, or a disaster such as we have seen at Placentia Bay, or a period of unsettled markets, all of which force men to sacrifice capital equipment to meet bank loan terms that are more stringent than they need be in terms of the repayment period, just does not make sense.

As the motion before us is to send this bill to committee, I think it only fair to give the minister an indication of one aspect of this whole problem upon which I hope he will comment in committee. The minister has explained that it is the west coast fishermen who use this plan, that the Atlantic provinces and Quebec fishermen have preferred to use provincial loan and grant programs. At the same time, the minister agreed that the advertising the federal government does in the east to publicize the opportunities it offers our fishermen has not been effective. This is due to the limited use that our Atlantic coast fishermen have made of this program. On several occasion in February when we were considering Bill C-151 the minister spoke of the need to upgrade the information services surrounding this program. At the time of third reading he closed his remarks in this regard with these words, as reported at page 5440 of *Hansard* for February 12 last:

> But I think my department must take an initiative itself by publicizing the availability of loans under the federal act.

We will be interested to know in some detail in committee exactly what initiatives the minister has taken in the last three and a half months to make the benefits of this plan known to fishermen, especially those in the Atlantic provinces and in the province of Quebec.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I will say just a few words on the bill before us tonight, the purpose of which is to help Canadian fishermen and to increase the government guaranteed loans from $10,000 to $25,000. In fact, Bill C-195 recommends the following:

> His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the house the present measure to amend the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act to increase the maximum loan amount to a fisherman from ten thousand dollars to twenty-five thousand dollars, and to establish a new period during which the Minister of Finance may guarantee loans made by banks and other lenders to fishermen and to limit his maximum liability during the new period to ten million dollars for each type of lender.

That matter will probably be considered in committee as soon as the house has approved it, for it is important to know what categories of lenders are authorized. If there are ten categories of lenders, at $10 million per category, that would mean $100 million. So the government must state clearly what it means by its maximum liability of $10 million for each category of lenders.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, Canadian fishermen from western Canada, the Maritimes, Quebec or New Brunswick, represent a class of our society that did not always get a fair treatment from federal authorities. We know that in Quebec and in other provinces, loans can be made under provincial jurisdiction, but Ottawa has nevertheless a very important part to play with regard to Canadian fisheries, and this bill should be of some help to Canadian fishermen, from western or eastern Canada.

Any measure proposed by the government in order to help fishermen deserves to be considered and read by all members.

So, we of the Ralliement créditiste, are happy to see the government introduce a bill the purpose of which is to help Canadian fishermen from the west as well as from the east.

[*English*]

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, it is fairly easy at the outset to see that the government house leader is back in control of things because already this evening two items of business have been fouled up and confused. It is a matter of regret that the fisheries committee is meeting tonight to consider the estimates of the Department of Fisheries while we are also required to be here to deal with a legislative item under the jurisdiction of the minister. This accounts for part of the hurrying and scurrying back and forth between here and the west block in order properly to look at the item before us. It also accounts for the absence from the house this evening of members who would otherwise be here because of their interest in fisheries matters; they are trying to attend to two items at the same time.

On the surface, the bill before us looks good. It increases the amount of money available to fishermen for certain purposes and extends the period for which loans may be made. Yet underneath it all, Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is very misleading and needs extensive examination. From my reading of the bill it seems, when one considers the present act, that the government has given no thought to allowing fishermen to refinance their current indebtedness for boats or equipment and thus extricate themselves from the clutches of fishing companies. When the fisheries committee recently held a series of meetings on the west coast that was one of the major points brought to its attention. Many of those making presentations asked the government to make available to fishermen the opportunity to refinance existing debts in order to enable individual fishermen to become free agents. Since this bill contains no such provision, that indicates to me the government does not desire to help the fishermen escape from the clutches of the fishing companies on the west coast. On the other hand, it indicates a desire to perpetuate a system of feudalism which ties the individual fisherman so tightly to the operations of the fishing company that he loses those freedoms and rights the people of this society have.

• (9:30 p.m.)

On reading the conditions of a typical sales agreement between a fishing company and a fisherman on the west coast it appears that in many cases the fisherman becomes nothing more than a serf. One of the conditions of such conditional sales agreement, and I paraphrase, is that the individual financing the fishing boat or fishing gear with moneys advanced by the fishing company shall deliver his fish catch to that fishing company at whatever place the fishing company may designate. The fisherman may not offer his fish for sale to anybody else, not even to a cash buyer who may pay higher prices for the fish; he must deliver his catch to that company at prices established by that company and at no other prices. Surely, such provision is an infringement of basic freedoms.

The minister ought to recognize such provisions as infringing on the rights of individuals. Surely, fishermen have the right to refinance their debts and become free agents. Surely, they can sell their fish for the highest prices and thus advance their own economic well being.

The loan made under the conditional sales agreement is a demand loan, incidentally, repayable whenever the company wants its money, for whatever reason. Another condition of the typical sales agreement entered into originally for the purchasing of the boat relates to the purchase of additional fishing gear, supplies, equipment, grub, gasoline and repairs at the company shipyard as well as other sundry items. These charges are added to the original debt the fishermen incurred in the main conditional sales agreement.

Because of restrictions applying in the fishing industry, especially the salmon fishing industry, and because fishermen often are allowed to fish on only one or two days a week owing to conservation measures and other factors, many fishermen, especially native Indians who face economic difficulty in the best of times, at the end of the fishing season find themselves more indebted to the company than they were at the beginning of the season. Since this indebtedness is brought about in some degree by the structure of the conditional sales agreement, which in my submission constitutes an infringement of the rights of fishermen, and since the minister has not seen fit to correct the situation, it seems obvious that the minister is not interested in providing assistance to our fishermen.

There is one condition in particular of the conditional sales contract I wish to read:

I acknowledge that the Company is selling this property to me and financing me solely on my fishing ability and I therefore further agree that if at any time I should wish to sell or dispose of my interest in the property,—

That is the boat.

—I shall first offer the property for sale to the Company in writing at a price to be stated therein, and, should the Company decline my offer of sale at that price, that I cannot sell the property at that price to any person other than the Company without first obtaining written permission from the company—

One can hardly conceive of a situation in our society where a person who has bought something under a conditional sales agreement is not entitled to sell that property to whomever he wishes without first obtaining the written permission of the person from whom he originally bought that property. Such a condition, Mr. Speaker, is an absolute infringement of certain basic rights the people of this nation have, and the minister endorses this sort of infringement by refusing to allow fishermen to extricate themselves from the clutches of the fishing companies.

I continue reading from the conditional sales agreement:

Further, following such offer to the Company and refusal by the Company to purchase as aforesaid, should I subsequently wish to sell the property at a price lower than that set forth in my original offer to the Company, the Company shall similarly have the same right of first refusal and I must similarly first obtain the same written permission from the Company for sale to another and approval of that other person as a proposed purchaser.

Surely, in this day and age when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) so eloquently talks of the necessity of enshrining in our constitution a bill of rights to protect the rights of the people of this nation, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry ought to show concern for the rights of individual fishermen. Surely, this bill could have reflected that concern. Our fishermen are entitled to those rights that are accorded to all our people.

We shall propose a number of amendments when the bill goes to committee. At this time may I also say that the loan limit of $25,000 is inadequate. Fishermen wish to increase their economic standards by working with increased amounts of capital they might invest in boats or fishing gear. These days we cannot buy much of a boat for $25,000. When the committee toured British Columbia it heard many fishermen say how necessary it was to invest $50,000, $60,000 or $75,000 in a boat in order to make a decent living from their invested capital. They wanted increased catches, and need to operate bigger boats. If the minister were to think in terms of advancing say $50,000 as a maximum, that would be a step in the right direction and would help fishermen thrive.

I might say as an aside that I am not talking about these matters in isolation. We need research and promotional programs within the fishery itself, and we must find additional markets for those fisheries that are not now exploited to the extent that they ought to be. I am, therefore, not talking about the matters I have raised in an isolated way.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Another aspect of this measure is misleading. I may be somewhat in error about the actual interest rate permitted under this act, but I understand it is 7¼ or 7½ per cent. In any event, this interest rate is set by order-in-council. Many fishermen have gone to private lending institutions, such as banks and credit unions, and have been refused the opportunity to borrow money under the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act. They have been refused because these institutions now have a prime lending rate of 8 per cent. In other words, if a fisherman has liquid assets, cash or cashable bonds to the extent of $1,000 and puts them up as security, he will get a loan of $1,000 at 8 per cent. If the security is a property or something of that sort, the interest rate charged by banking institutions in this nation is 10.9 per cent. I checked this a couple of days ago to make sure these figures were accurate because the interest rate has been inching upwards for some time. Fishermen are told by the banking institutions, why should we lend you money at 7½ per cent on property such as a boat when we can lend the same money on a property at 10.9 per cent. The fisherman desiring to obtain financing is left to go begging.

The fisherman does not fully realize the opportunities that should be available to him. I do not wish it to be construed that I am advancing an argument to raise the interest rate in order that the freedom of the market will prevail. I wish to dispel any thoughts along that line. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), the minister in charge of housing and the government agree the interest rate under N.H.A., that is the CMHC mortgage rate, should be allowed to follow the trends of the market. The government argued this would bring down the interest rates on loans for housing. Is this same argument to

apply to fishing? I am not advancing the argument that we should lift the interest rate under this act or the Farm Improvement Loans Act. I merely put forward the proposition there seems to be a conflict of view on the part of this government with respect to different loans.

On the one hand, the government says lift the ceiling and interest rates will go down. On the other hand, they say they will keep the ceiling on interest rates. As a consequence no help is provided because private institutions will not lend money at the low interest rate. The government should do something which would be of assistance to not only fishermen but farmers as well because they are subjected to the same type of interest structure.

As primary producers, fishermen are one of the few if not the only group in our society that has relatively little or no control over their economic position. They have no control over the prices charged to them for goods and supplies, gasoline,wood and other items used to build a boat. That is determined by someone else. They have little control over the prices paid for the product they catch in so far as the international market is concerned. That is done by a conspiracy under a price fixing arrangement sanctioned under the Combines Investigation Act. He has little control over the prices paid to him by the fishing company in terms of establishing a negotiated price for his fish. This is always difficult to establish.

In the co-operative system, the fisherman has a larger degree of control over the prices he will receive because he owns the production unit. He owns the cannery, the reduction plant and the distribution system emanating from the co-op. All of the so-called profits or surpluses are returned to the fisherman. Apart from that he has relatively little control over his economic position. He is squeezed at the selling price end and at the buying price end.

The government should recognize the primary producer, especially in the fisheries by setting up a government fund under the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act to lend money directly to him, at the interest rate of 7¼ or 7½ per cent or at a reasonable interest rate. The government has already decided that is a reasonable interest rate and this has been approved by order-in-council. The government should set up this fund to provide money to individuals so that they may finance and advance themselves properly in the fishing industry, or re-finance their position.

I look forward to the time when we can explore in greater detail and informality the propositions contained in this bill and any amendments put before the committee.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

## THE PATENT ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE AUTHORITY TO MAKE RULES RESPECTING FEES

**Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (for Mr. Basford)** moved that Bill C-194, to amend the Patent Act, be now read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

**Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview):** When one looks at Bill C-194, one appreciates how innocuous it is. I almost hesitate to speak on this matter. I notice it was introduced by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) in March of this year when Bill C-102, the amendments to the Patent Act concerning drug prices, was passed. During that debate I referred to the minister as the shadow boxing champion of Canada. I did so because at that time the bill did little or nothing to reduce drug prices. I pointed out that the minister had done little or nothing with regard to consumer prices or to the problems of foreign ownership. In addition to those items I have mentioned, he has permitted the slave clauses to remain in professional and amateur sports contracts. He has done nothing to bring the Combines Investigation Act forward for review by this house and for action.

• (9:50 p.m.)

When I read this bill, the purpose of which is to increase the fees with regard to applications for patents, it makes me realize that the Minister has more than earned the title of shadow boxing champion of Canada. Here we have a minister who could do so much in the field of patents. With respect to drugs alone 95 per cent of patents are held by United States companies. There has been a great deal of talk about changing the 17 year rule to a 10 year or 7 year rule in order to break monopolies and reduce the prices of drugs, but this is the feeble effort by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to meet some of these challenging problems. It has really made me stand in my place tonight and repeat to the minister that he is the shadow boxing champion of Canada.

**Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to enter into a debate on some of the points that were raised by the previous speaker. However, I do want to say that the minister has done a tremendous job introducing legislation to protect the Canadian consumers, and some of the remarks made here tonight were unwarranted.

I am very pleased to say a few words about this bill on behalf of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford). As mentioned in the explanatory notes to Bill C-194, the object of this amendment is to remove from the Patent Act all statutory provisions relating to fees required in proceedings taken under the Patent Act, and to replace these with a simple statutory authority that will permit such fees to be prescribed by Governor in Council.

The Royal Commission on Government Organization, the Glassco Commission, recommended that patent fees should cover "at least the total of all costs, direct and indirect, incurred in performing the service." These indirect costs include provision for accommodation of the Patent Office and superannuation costs which do not at present appear in departmental estimates.

That is principle to which the government subscribes. It necessitates a periodic review of fees, and continuing fee revisions as may be required. At the present time, as many of the fees are embodied in section 75 of the Patent Act, any fee revision must be brought before parliament, with the result that valuable time must be taken from more urgent matters before the house. Most statutes which authorize the levying of fees for services give the Governor in Council authority to establish the fees and to revise them from time to time as necessary.

In 1964 the Appropriation Act authorized the Governor in Council to revise the fee structure under the Patent Act, and the present structure dates from that time. I think there would be general agreement in the house that it is better practice not to use the Appropriation Act to make this kind of legislative change. May I add that the Royal Commission on Patents, Copyright and Industrial Designs recommended changes of the kind now proposed in this bill. As regards the rest of the Patent Act, I would like to say it is under thorough study by the Economic Council of Canada and that we anticipate a report from them within a year. After the government receives that report it will give it a thorough study with a view to bringing in any other changes necessary, or perhaps even a new bill.



**Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington):** Mr. Speaker, I have taken note that this bill, C-194, is to amend the Patent Act. Since I have a complaint which has to do with patents and the execution of patents I feel that this is a good time to mention it. It has nothing to do with the explanatory notes to Bill C-194. I note that these say:

> The purpose of this bill is to remove from the Patent Act the present provisions thereof fixing the fees to be paid on the filing of applications or the taking of other proceedings under the act, and to provide authority for the making of rules under the act respecting the fees that may be charged and their payment.

The matter I wish to bring up relates to the infringement of patents. It has been brought to my attention by the people in charge of the local arena in my home town, the Napanee and District Memorial Arena, that some time ago they bought an ice rink resurfacing machine.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I think he is out of order. He is not speaking about the bill that is actually before the house.

**Mr. Alkenbrack:** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, how could I be out of order when I am bringing up a subject that concerns the Patent Act?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I want to remind the hon. member that the explanatory notes mention, and I quote:

> The purpose of this bill is to remove from the Patent Act the present provisions thereof fixing the fees to be paid on the filing of applications or the taking of other proceedings under the act—

Therefore, I think the hon. member is out of order.

**Mr. Alkenbrack:** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, at what time will this house approve of my bringing up this subject? Under what category would I have to bring it up?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** When we are studying the amendment to the act, or rather the estimates of the department.

**Mr. Alkenbrack:** At what time will we be studying the amendment to the act then?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. 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."

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might rise on a matter of order to ask, through you, for the consent of the house and the government, considering the indicated business for this evening included the vitally important matter of housing, to the house sitting on for a length of time for the minister to make his opening remarks with respect to the bill or bills with which it is his intention to proceed. I see him shaking his head, indicating he is not interested in housing.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** I am only putting forward this proposition so that the country and the members of the house will have an opportunity to study his views overnight and be in a position to comment on them tomorrow.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, a more sensible proposition than that advanced by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) would be that we give second reading to the bill amending the Patent Act, so that the minister in charge of housing and other hon. members might have a full day tomorrow to speak on the amendments to the National Housing Act. If the house would give that agreement we might continue until the second reading of the bill with respect to the Patent Act has been completed.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** If the house leader would tie in with that suggestion the assurance the opening statement of the minister in charge of housing would be given tonight we would be agreeable. Housing is a lot more important than the silly bill we have before us now.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order. The hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet).

• (10:00 p.m.)

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

[*Translation*]

### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—COMPENSATION FOR INNOCENT VICTIMS OF CRIMINAL ACTS

**Mr. André Ouellet (Papineau):** Mr. Speaker, every year, in Canada, and for a certain number of years, about 40,000 crimes with violence are reported to the police. In the majority of cases, the offenders are arrested, tried and imprisoned. Thus, they pay their so-called debt to society.

Our police corps, our government officers devote a great deal of time, effort and money to prevent crime, to capture the offender and then to rehabilitate him. Unfortunately, we have paid so far very little attention to the victims of criminal acts in Canada.

If the offender must pay his debt to society, it would be proper, I think, for society, in return, to compensate in some way that person or those who are victims of the criminal act of this offender. I think that the Canadian government should study carefully the report prepared on this subject by the Faculty of Law of Osgoode Hall.

Several countries, including New Zealand and Great Britain, several American States, namely California, New York and Massachusetts, have adopted laws providing for the payment of a compensation to the victims of criminal acts.

I feel that Canada should follow suit. Besides, several Canadian provinces guarantee a certain sum of money to the widow of a man killed by a non-insured driver. The legislators were right to provide for the payment of a compensation in such a case. They should now do the same for the victims of the most dreadful crimes afflicting our society.

Of course, financial compensation will not redress all the wrong suffered. I have precisely in mind the case of a personal friend who was the victim of a criminal act. In his case the wrong is immeasurable and irreparable. His widow will probably receive a certain financial compensation but this is little in relation to the loss suffered. Still, it would have been shocking if she had received nothing in such a case, since she has four young children.

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

May I be allowed an aside, since I want to pay tribute to Mr. Jacques Bernier, a fellow-lawyer, a personal friend, and the former executive assistant of the federal Minister of National Health and Welfare, who was killed at Oka, last April, by a man who was driving while impaired, who had no driving license since it had been suspended following three serious automobile accidents which had happened in similar conditions, when he was drunk. I think that in the case of this man who took the life of Mr. Jacques Bernier, it is a criminal offence.

I want to put on record that Mr. Jacques Bernier, a young Quebecer, a bright mind and an undisputably talented man, spent more than a year of his short life working here in Ottawa, within the federal government, more especially under the present Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen).

During that short period, he proved eloquently that a young competent French Canadian, who does not suffer from the complex of the vanquished, can compel recognition in Ottawa and earn the respect and the admiration of all those for whom and with whom he works.

Mr. Jacques Bernier, 30 years old, is a highway victim. His wife and his young children are deprived of a beloved one. Our country has lost a young man with a brilliant future. He was about to be appointed assistant deputy minister in the Quebec Department of Trade and Industry.

Mr. Jacques Bernier enjoyed the friendship of businessmen as renowned as Messrs. Jean-Louis Lévesque and Paul Desmarais, of Quebec politicians as well-known as the Hon. Jean-Paul Beaudry and Mario Beaulieu, of Canadian politicians as important as the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Richardson).

With his talent, his love of work and the assistance of his friends, he could have had an enviable career in the world of business or in politics. He is a victim of a criminal act. The compensation that the government may decide on, will evidently not repair the damage caused.

I have given you this example to show how important it is to take care of the victims of criminal acts, so that even if the persons have passed away, their wife and children can receive an indemnity from society and continue to live in better conditions, that is better than if nothing had been provided for them in such circumstances.

[Mr. Ouellet.]

**Mr. Jean-Charles Cantin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, you have already guessed that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and myself have much sympathy, not only for the particular case of which the hon. member for Papineau spoke, but also for the principle outlined by him.

The department of Justice already knows that legislation exists, not only abroad, but even here in Canada, in some provinces to give compensation to victims. I shall refer to Ontario, Saskatchewan British Columbia and even Quebec, where at the present time under a special legislation compensation is granted to the victims of hit-and-run drivers or criminal people.

But I will say more. The minister intends to go much further, for he wants the attorneys general of the provinces to deal with this very important problem, namely the compensation of the victims of criminal people.

Compensation means first of all civil damages and thus comes under provincial jurisdiction. That does not mean the Minister of Justice thinks that the federal government holds a certain responsibility as well, but only that the problem can be solved jointly with the provinces.

Then, at the next conferences with the provincial attorneys general, the Minister of Justice intends to put before them this very vital, essential and actual problem of the need to provide for this compensation, and also to refer it to the new committee on the uniformization of legislation in order to find a solution to it.

In the particular case now before us, I can say to the hon. member for Papineau that the minister and I have as much sympathy as he has for this victim and all the others.

[*English*]

AIR POLLUTION—COAL DUST FROM SHIPMENTS THROUGH VANCOUVER HARBOUR

**Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour):** Mr. Speaker, the other afternoon I directed a question to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) regarding the matter of possible coal dust air pollution emanating from a projected expansion of Neptune Terminals on National Harbours Board property in the Burrard Inlet area of the lower mainland of British Columbia. I asked the minister to assure the house that coal dust pollution from this planned operation would not be tolerated.

First of all, on behalf of my constituents I want to thank the minister most sincerely for his prompt action the other day in directing National Harbours Board officials to end their open burning of refuse in the area. This is action in the right direction. But there is continuous, serious concern and alarm that at least one company in the area, Neptune Terminals, are equipping themselves to handle the bulk shipment of coal but that the engineers may have made insufficient allowances for pollution control techniques. I hope that the fears of many are completely unfounded. Nobody wants to restrict a good enterprise which is attempting to establish itself in this country. But I hope that assurances can be given in this regard.

It must be the paradox of the age that technology can carry men to the moon while back here on good old earth we are in the process of making the environment unliveable because of air and other types of pollution. Modern technology can mine coal with equipment handling 200 tons a minute, carry it by efficient unit trains to the coast and load it aboard 150,000 ton super ships, but apparently that same technology can provide no firm guarantees that the loading and unloading operations of coal and other commodities will be clean and pollution-free. Apparently, these kind of guarantees are impossible to obtain. The technology which creates pollution in Canada must be matched by the technology which controls pollution. Surely, we have reached the point where adequate pollution control must be regarded as essential in respect of enterprises doing business whether it be in British Columbia or Newfoundland.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Wherever the federal government has power and jurisdiction, only one rule should apply to industry—clean up or shut down. If possible, we should move to enact legislation which will specifically empower the federal government to enforce clean air, clean soil and clean water standards in all areas under federal jurisdiction. We have seen encouraging progress made by the federal government during this session in these areas.

In saying this, I am aware of the difficulties which may exist in the matter of regulating air pollution in the absence of any single authority empowered to set and to enforce standards. In the area under question, which I know so well, the city of Vancouver has recently passed a very strict by-law but this of course, is not effective outside city boundaries, and pollution does not respect boundaries.

The by-laws of the three North Shore municipalities are either inadequate or nonexistent. The regional district does not have pollution controls as one of its functions, and the provincial pollution control board has not addressed itself completely to the problem.

I ask the federal government to seek practical solutions for itself and its agencies whereby they can clean up operations on land controlled by them. It is to be hoped that local governments on the lower mainland will take action through their regional district. The federal government could give strength to this concept by indicating that its agencies will co-operate in the setting of standards and the enforcement of them by the regional district and will comply with any regulatory by-laws, even though not technically bound by them.

It may be that tonight the minister can provide solid assurances that coal-dust pollution will not in fact take place in the projected Neptune Terminal operation. Beyond this, however, lies the question whether, particularly in an expanding, growing area like the lower mainland, chronically pollution prone industries should be permitted close to major population centres unless they clean up. We must ask ourselves whether, from a pollution standpoint in the years to come or from an aesthetic standpoint, pollution prone industries will even be tolerable near populated areas.

The other day, in what can only be described as a traumatic experience, I surveyed the lower mainland of British Columbia from the air in a light aircraft on a weekday morning. It was a shock to see one of the world's most beautiful vistas lying under an ominous yellow cloud of pollution. It is no solace whatsoever to console oneself with the thought that several other Canadian communities are in far worse shape, such as Toronto or Montreal to name just two centres.

Experiences like this should strengthen the resolve of members of all parties in this house to advance every effort in the war against pollution and the polluters of Canada's environment. It is to be hoped that the government will ensure that full air pollution control equipment measures be clearly and completely shown in the Neptune project and

that assurances be given that the control processes and procedures will be maintained and policed.

Finally, the National Harbours Board should enunciate a policy prohibiting pollutant causing industries from establishing in highly populated areas like the lower mainland harbour area of British Columbia. In the world of 1969 the cost of business should include the cost of protecting our environment from pollution in all of its forms, and the credo applied to industry should be "clean up, or shut down".

**Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I am in complete sympathy with the views expressed by the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault), all the more so because I have a personal knowledge of the area in question having visited it just last weekend. I want to thank the hon. member for his kind words with regard to the decision taken following that visit by the National Harbours Board at my instigation to cease the burning of so-called harbour cleanings in the north Vancouver area. I think this is a pretty clearcut indication that, where the authority is vested completely in the federal government, we are more than prepared, and certainly I give my full support to the best possible anti-pollution devices.

As for the question of the coal deposits at the Neptune pier, I suppose the hon. member would probably be inclined to agree with me that this is one of those issues where it is rather difficult to measure the advantages of industry and development against some of the possible disadvantages. But I agree with him fully that there is no good reason why, under all of the circumstances that exist today and the techniques that are available, the entry of a new bulk loading industry into North Vancouver, into that general and quite impressive industrial area, should create either a hazard or a pollution nuisance for the residents of that region.

The fact of the matter is that in cases like this—and I am thinking specifically of the Neptune pier—the National Harbours Board has followed the same procedures as it adopts with regard to all these facilities throughout Canada. Any lessee or user is required to abide by all the civic by-laws which apply in the area. I need not point out to the hon. member that regulations of this nature fall within the municipal or, perhaps, within the provincial field, but to ensure there is no flagrant disregard of pollution devices or regulations the Harbours Board does insist that these local regulations be adhered to. This has been the position in the case of Neptune. It was so during the whole of the construction period as far as I am aware, and the Neptune company was so advised, as was the city council concerned. They worked in concert during that period and to my knowledge no major objections were raised at that time.

However, I appreciate that all this may be regarded as constituting an evasion of the actual facts of the case. There is no point trying to tell residents who are threatened by pollution that it is all being done in the proper constitutional manner. I am well aware of this and I want to assure the hon. member that as far as the Harbours Board is concerned we shall ensure that the local by-laws are adhered to. Moreover, when some of the residents of that community who are concerned about this matter are in Ottawa, as they will be I believe on June 4, arrangements have been made for them to meet with representatives of the National Harbours Board so that they may get all the information which is available concerning this problem.

On the specific point, to conclude—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** I regret to interrupt the hon. minister but his time has expired.



## WATER RESOURCES—PLACENTIA BAY, NFLD.—ATTENDANCE OF MINISTER AT MEETING TO DISCUSS POLLUTION

**Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West):** The story of the pollution of Long Harbour is common knowledge in this house. I am sure all hon. members are well aware of what has been happening there in the last few months. I am afraid the same cannot be said about the severe hardship faced by those directly affected by this pollution, or the uncertainty which has crept into their lives especially as the waters in which they and their forefathers have fished for generations have been closed by the Department of Fisheries.

On January 29 of this year I directed a question to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) as follows:

> I should like to ask the Minister of Fisheries whether he can inform the house what steps are being taken to investigate evidence of a serious pollution problem in waters around Long Harbour, Newfoundland, where a quantity of dead fish have been found floating near the beaches.

Later, I asked the minister what steps had been taken by his department to prevent this serious situation from recurring. In Your Honour's wisdom or otherwise, my question was ruled out of order. This matter has been brought before the house by myself, as member for St. John's West, and by others on this side. It is extremely serious because, in effect, it has destroyed the means of livelihood of a large segment of the population of Canada's tenth province in the area of Placentia Bay.

The Minister of Fisheries has made several announcements on the subject. His most recent was made last Friday in reply to a question which I put to him. He stated then he had been informed by his scientists, his officials, that the cause of the pollution had been determined—that it was effluent from the Long Harbour Electric Reduction plant. To be fair to the minister, let me say I realize that under existing legislation he can only go so far. He is restricted in the action he can take to prevent this sort of thing from happening. I realize that under present legislation he can take punitive measures but very few preventive measures.

• (10:20 p.m.)

I contend that this problem has been in the forefront, as it were, in that particular area of Newfoundland, and indeed in this house, since the end of 1968, and certainly since the beginning of the present year. I also submit that the Department of Fisheries failed to take the necessary action to find the cause of this pollution, which as I have already said has resulted in the destruction of the way of life of a large number of people.

I believe it was only in the latter part of April, perhaps the first week of May, that a really concerted effort, at least in my opinion, was made by the department to find the cause of this problem and thus eventually close the plant. The bay to which I refer, Placentia Bay, was closed to fishermen in the latter part of April, I believe, and as a result close to 500 fishermen were prevented from earning a living.

Again, I do not wish to be too critical of the minister. I have great respect for him and I admire some of the steps he has taken to improve the lot of the fishermen in eastern Canada. But in view of the fact that this problem did come to the fore in the latter part of December, or certainly in January, why did it take so long for corrective measures to be taken?

Had this problem been pinpointed when it first became apparent in December or January, I am sure that a large part of the pollution could have been prevented and the plant closed. In all fairness, I do not think there was really any doubt in the minds of anybody connected with the fisheries in that area—I suspect the Minister of Fisheries had strong suspicions even at that time—that this Long Harbour phosphorous plant was the cause of the pollution.

I am compelled to debate this issue tonight in view of the action that has been taken in recent days in Newfoundland. A few weeks ago the Minister of Fisheries announced a program of assistance for those fishermen affected by this problem. Again, I realize that under existing legislation the minister was restricted as to what he could do and how far he could go in the matter of offering compensation. However, the government announced that it would make loans available to fishermen whose livelihood had been cut off by this problem.

These loans were made, and I believe the first cheques were delivered either on Monday or on Friday of last week. The amounts forwarded by the federal government were an insult to the fishermen affected. I have proof that in many instances people who received these cheques would have received more money had they gone on welfare; but being a very proud people with a great reluctance to accept welfare—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard):** Order, please.

**Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries):** Mr. Speaker, two matters were raised by the hon. member. First the delay, as he called it, on the part of the federal Department of Fisheries in recognizing the cause of pollution in Long Harbour. The hon. member says there was no doubt as to the cause of the pollution there in the months up to April. We had a team of scientists in Long Harbour monitoring the effluent from the plant and sampling the waters of the bay as early as January. They worked continuously, and these excellent people enjoy a high reputation.

Divers did not discover dead fish on the bottom until April. The cause was thought to be spill which was reported and acknowledged by the company in December. Most people thought this was a once and only spill, and would not occur again. Something occurred in April which was more extensive.

To give you an idea of the problem of those doing this research, even today there are cages of cod at different levels of the bay which are perfectly healthy and they were perfectly healthy when the plant was running full blast. It is now known, that there is a particularly high content of phosphorous in the mud at the bottom, but that was not discovered until April. They found it there in large quantities. There was some doubt, therefore, as to the cause of all this.

We have not in a general way paid compensation to fishermen whose immediate vicinity was affected by closures. Normally, closures are undertaken for conservation reasons, but this is an exceptional case and we are making payment to fishermen. The payments are averaged over their normal fishing year, which may be three months to eight months. The payments do not include the costs which the fishermen might otherwise have incurred; I am speaking of purchases of fuel, and so on. Otherwise, though, the payments are designed to give the fishermen up to their normal income. That, at any rate, is the nature of the calculation that we are using.

The first cheques were delivered yesterday and some fishermen are concerned, thinking this is the only payment. That is not our intention. Payments will continue until the bay is open again for fishing. I hope within the next week or two we shall open certain portions of Placentia Bay but we do not know how long it will take to open the entire bay.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

---

END OF VOLUME VIII

RL